ICANN
Transcription ICANN Panama City
GNSO: CPH TechOps Meeting
Wednesday, 27 June 2018 at 17:00 EST

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Marc Anderson: Good afternoon and welcome to the ICANN62 meeting of the Contracted Party House TechOps Group. My name is Marc Anderson and I'm the co-chair of the Contracted Party House TechOps Group. And on behalf of myself and my co-chair Tobias Sattler who could not be with us today, welcome everyone.

We have and agenda up on the screen which we'll be running through here. But before we get started, we have a fairly small group here. And there are a lot of faces I recognize but there are some faces I don't recognize. So I want to take advantage of the in-person meeting and sort of the smaller forum here to invite everybody to pop up to the microphone and just introduce yourself real quick. Give your name and who you're with if you don't mind.

And if I can start on the far end of the room and we'll just sort of work our way around, that'll also - I guess we have a roving mic so thank you very much. But if I could start back there.

Sean Baseri: Sure. Sean Baseri from Neustar.

Alex Schwertner: Alex Schwertner, Tucows.

(Eric Varlease):   (Eric Varlease), DOT Blog.

Donna Austin: Donna Austin from Neustar.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Stephanie Duchesneau with Google.

Jim Galvin: Jim Galvin with Afilias.

Vlad Dinculescu: Vlad Dinculescu, DNS Africa.

Roger Carney: Roger Carney with GoDaddy.

Zoe Bonython: Zoe Bonython, Registrar Secretariat, but I actually serve as support for this group as well. Thanks.

Dennis Chang: Dennis Chang, ICANN org.

Volker Greimann: Volker Greimann, Key-Systems.

Gordon Dick: Gordon Dick, Nominet.

Greg DiBiase: Greg DiBiase, Amazon registrar.

Eric Rokobauer: Eric Rokobauer, Endurance Registrar.

Janelle McAlister: Janelle McAlister, (Uniregistrar).

Man: (Unintelligible). May I ask what's the purpose in collection and data rules applying to this data collection?

Marc Anderson: That's a fair point. I should have asked for your consent ahead of time. So apologize, no informed consent.

Man: (Unintelligible), (Synergy).

Peter Larsen: Peter Larsen at Larsen Data, Copenhagen.

Man: (Unintelligible)

Woman: (Unintelligible)

Man: (Unintelligible)

Man: (Unintelligible)

Woman: Hi, I'm (Unintelligible).

Marc Anderson: Thank you, and, you know, again I think it's a great opportunity for us, you know, meeting face to face to be able to put, you know, faces with some of the names and voices we hear on these calls. So, you know, thank you everybody. And again welcome to this ICANN 62 session of the TechOps group.

                 Do we have a - could we scroll to the first slide? I wanted to kick things off with this session by giving a little bit of a recap and background on the TechOps group, how it got formed and sort of our genesis if you will, how we got from a start to the big group that's sitting here today.

                 And I think from my perspective, you know, the TechOps group really got its start, you know, back at the second GDD summit in Amsterdam. And during that GDD summit, we had a number of breakout sessions.

                 And during one of those breakout sessions we had an opportunity to talk about technical challenges, in particular technical challenges between the registry and registrar touch points.

So one of the advantages of the GDD summit is you have, you know, the contracted parties together in one place at one time. And during that breakout session, you know, we talked about, you know, all these technical challenges, you know, the problems we were facing, and had, you know, a really good breakout discussion.

And, you know, that was, you know, really well received, very, very positive experience. But then a year later at the Madrid GDD summit, we had contracted parties together again. Registries and registrars had a breakout session, and we talked about the technical challenges and came up with a list of challenges, and it was the same list as the year before.

And so we realized that we needed to do something different besides just getting together every year and talking about these technical challenges. Just once a year wasn't enough time to really delve into some of these more meatier issues.

And so that was - you know, that second GDD - or the third Madrid GDD summit was really what led to the idea of having a TechOps group. And, you know, I think coming out of that Madrid session, registrars took the lead on this one. And, you know, I think in the discussions they were sort of challenged to identify a first issue that we could maybe sink our teeth into as a group as a starting point.

And so to the registrars' credit, they came together as a group and developed their own TechOps group and walked through some of the issues, developed a prioritized list of some of the technical challenges specifically on the touch points between registries and registrars and came back to the registry stakeholder group and presented that and asked if we would be able to get together on a more regular basis.

And that led to the creation of this TechOps group. We started meeting - I guess we started meeting every other week sort of on a bi-weekly basis, and

talking about, you know, the list of issues that registrars had put together initially.

But then GDPR sort of hit the radar hard and that actually worked out sort of to the benefit of this group because some of the challenges of GDPR are technical in nature and certainly touch on the touch points between registries and registrars.

And so the fact that we had this group already formed at a time when we quickly developed a need to have communication between registries and registrars on technical challenges I think really aided the formation of this group. So that in some ways maybe was a blessing in disguise for us and really sort of was a catalyst for some of the discussions that we had as a group.

I want to note, you know, sort of from my perspective one of the real successes we had as a group was when registrars identified one of the technical issues that GDPR created which specifically was around the transfer of domain names in a post-GDPR environment. And so they identified that as a pain point and something that we needed a solution for.

And so the TechOps group came together and developed a proposal for how to handle transfers in a post-GDPR world. That proposal was presented to ICANN staff, who met with the TechOps group on a couple of occasions and eventually accepted that proposal verbatim and included it in a temporary specification.

So I think that was a real win for us as a group and sort of helped validate that this a good effort. For myself I've been pleasantly surprised at the success of this group. But I think much of that is due to the participation of the people in this room.

This is a - this type of group is only as successful as the people who are participating in it. And I think, you know, like I said, from my perspective, that comes down to all of you who are showing up to these meetings, participating and contributing valuable insight and discussion.

So I wanted to start off with that. You know, I know there are some new faces and, you know, people who might not be as familiar with this group and what we do and some people that might be observing as well. So hopefully that background was useful.

If anybody else wants to add anything to that or, you know, speak in general about background and TechOps… I'll go to Jim first.

Jim Galvin: So thanks Marc. Jim Galvin for the record. You know, it's interesting you said two things along the way, and it kind of piqued a question for me. You said both contracted party house and you said registries and registrars in general, which makes me want to take a step back a little bit and ask the question is there a reason why – aside from the fact that that's just where it started – that we restrict ourselves to contract parties or gTLDs?

I mean, why shouldn't we broaden this a little bit to include CCs or at least find some way to work better with ccNSO and what they're doing? Just curious.

Marc Anderson: Good point. Roger do you want to jump in or anybody else want to…?

Roger Carney: Yes, and I think I can - I don't know, Jim. It's one of those where I think the group started because we wanted a focused area of the current problems that we're having between each other. And it wasn't between anyone else. It was between us and the gTLD registries.

And that was - at least that's how initially it got started was okay what are those pain points that we have. Now, should we expand that? Maybe we

should. I think that's a valid thing to bring up, so I think that's something we should look at.

Alex Schwertner: Yes, just to add to that – Alex from Tucows. I think we started with gTLDs because we find generally the implementations and the interfaces between registrars and registries in the gTLD space are similar enough to build on that and add standardization to it.

Once we look at the ccTLD space, that level of standardization is hardly there. So any discussion that would lead to let's make it all the same is so much more difficult. That is not to say that we wouldn't want to invite ccTLDs into this dialogue. It's just we should be realistic as to what we can achieve and what is more difficult to achieve.

And the other part is that within the gTLDs, registries and registrars operate in the same contractual framework whereas that is very different in the ccTLD space. So it is much easier to come up with solutions that apply to many, many TLDs within that space. And it's much more harder to that in the ccTLDs.

Marc Anderson: Thank you. Before I go to (Pam), just one comment, you know, I'll say. At least today we restrict. Membership is open only to members of the registry or registrar stakeholder groups. So it's - at least right now it's a closed group, open only to registry and registrar stakeholder group members.

But, you know, like others have said, if there is value, you know, I think we should explore it. And certainly there is outreach we can do and have other sessions. But (Pam) you're…

(Pam Little):   Thank you Marc. (Pam Little) speaking. Hi everybody. This is my first time joining this TechOps session so thank you for inviting other members to join. I have no technical background. I just want to maybe respond to James's

question about inviting ccTLD. And my reason was actually been alluded to by Alex.

I was thinking more about a second point you raised which is we have contracts with ICANN; they don't. So - and in other areas I often wonder whether - why we have this sort of demarcation between (C) and (G) and we are subject to this entire (unintelligible) and now the uniform access model that ICANN is pushing.

But we basically don't have a unified sort of domain regulatory regime and they are just this huge - there is just this huge demarcation (G) and (C). But I will say if the technical aspects or implementation is based on contract, then probably it wouldn't make sense to bring them into the fold. But if not, then apply to (G) and (C); then it will make sense. Thanks.

Marc Anderson: Thank you. I forgot your name already.

Greg DiBiase: This is Greg.

Marc Anderson: Greg, thank you.

Greg DiBiase: So this may come up later. I just wanted to flag an issue and comment on something you said, that ICANN adopted the TechOps group suggestion verbatim. That's not exactly true, and it's an issue registrars are having.

The TechOps letter said we will not have to send the gaining registrar FOA. ICANN's policy said you will not have to send the gaining registrar FOA if the registrant e-mail is not available – or you will have to send the FOA if the registrant e-mail is available.

That is technically unfeasible. I think that's the consensus of everyone. So we flagged this in the registrar group and maybe this is a topic for later on in

the session. But the registrars were thinking about sending a letter saying, hey, you've almost got our advice right but it needs to be tweaked.

I'm just wondering if that might be stronger coming from the both houses, given that the letter came from both of us. And we could say, you know, close with one minor tweak removing that seemingly impossible check to see if this registrant e-mail is available caveat. That'd be great.

Marc Anderson: Thank you. This is Marc for the transcript. Before I take that around the room, I'll - I think there are a couple people looking to get into the queue. But I'll just point out I think, you know, from my experience working with ICANN staff on that particular proposal, ICANN staff was very willing to listen to the TechOps group when we provided them a reason for that.

So if I'm channeling ICANN staff here I would say, you know, we would need to explain to them why that's a problem. So I think – you know, I would just say, you know, if we can articulate what the issue there is before we take that to staff, I think that would be very helpful.

And also since that proposal did come from the TechOps group, at least from my perspective I think it certainly makes sense for us to cover that. And I don't mind sort of jumping the agenda here a little bit and bringing that up now. Anybody else - I saw - Jim do you want to start us off?

Jim Galvin: Not on that. I want one closing comment on the previous discussion if that's okay?

Marc Anderson: Yes, absolutely.

Jim Galvin: At least, you know, my point of view.

Marc Anderson: Last word on the previous one, go for it.

Jim Galvin: Yes. Well I think that we should take on board asking ourselves the question of inviting others to participate. And my suggestion for a way to accomplish that is taking the point from Alex and others that, you know, you're right. We all operate within a similar framework. And that's kind of what's going on here, both a similar legal framework and a similar technical framework.

And I think the way to extend an invitation is we should open up the door to CCs who operate within the same technical framework. We don't have to worry about the legal side of it. You know, are they contracted or not contracted.

If they're using EPP and they are essentially using it in the same way that we do, and operating in that same architecture, why wouldn't we want them coming to the table here and talking to us and, you know, trying to create a uniform solution, especially since there are a number of ccTLDs that actually have moved into the gTLD space.

So to the extent that they're doing that, they're - you know, they're probably eligible anyway. But, you know, why not make that explicit and call that out and invite them? We don't have to answer it here but I guess I'm just asking the chair to take that question on board and let's, you know, deal with it going forward, maybe have different plans when we get to the next ICANN meeting.

Marc Anderson: Thank you Jim. Thank you for raising that. I think some fair points there. Go ahead.

Gordon Dick: I'll just say coming from Nominet, working in gTLDs and Dot UK out this way, we are looking at what's happening here from both perspectives and certainly looking to understand it. And if we do want to reach out to the ccNSO we can help with that.

Marc Anderson: Great, thank you for that. Stephanie, go ahead.

Stephanie Duchesneau: In response to Jim, I'm not sure that it's necessary to delimit it. Like if we think about what the group's mandate is and what we're trying to accomplish, my sense is that membership - we could extend the invitation but membership would naturally be more appealing to parties that are interested in operating within that framework and are interested in consistency. And there's a lot of CCs that frankly are going to have absolutely interest in that whatsoever.

Marc Anderson: Thank you. Just a quick reminder, some people in chat are having trouble hearing, so – or some people remote are having trouble hearing, so make sure you are close to the microphone when you speak. Roger?

Roger Carney: I don't want Jim to get the last word on that last topic so I'm going to get the last word. No I just wanted to bring up you did a good job of overview of how this got put together and all that. One of the things that we decided – and I guess I should back up a little.

I bring this up because there's been questions at IETF about this group and what this group's purpose is. And for all you IETFers or those that know people that go to IETF, I'm appealing to you with this.

One of the things we talked about early on in this group was should this group produce standards or not? And it came across as a very resounding consensus of no. IETF does the standards for EPP and for all the integration between registries and registrars. And we should make them do their job, even if it's an idea that comes from us.

The idea can come from here but let that work go through the correct process. And I think – and I bring this up because there is some pushback in IETF saying why are we accepting documents from the TechOps group and not having it debated in IETF?

And my response to anybody that's ever brought that up is no, it should be debated at IETF. It's just coming from a different group. It's no different than any one individual bringing a spec to IETF. And actually maybe it's - actually it is a lot better because it's more vetted by the time it gets there.

But I think that one thing when I go to IETF and I mention this to several others that go often is I'm going to bring this up and try to get them to understand this group is just trying to collaborate on known big issues and we're not trying to do standards. So I just wanted to bring that up about that.

And on the transfers Greg, the way I read it is not the way that you described it. So that's why I'm curious about - and I assume it's in the temp spec is what you're talking about. The gaining registrar piece says that if the registrar is unable to get the registrant information then they can follow without doing an FOA.

Greg DiBiase: Right, but that seems to presume that we would have to check to see if we could get that information, right? So if someone's transferring hands...

Roger Carney: I don't know if you need to assume that. Legally…

Greg DiBiase: I'm just telling what ICANN Compliance is telling me.

Roger Carney: Legally you should check with your legal department to see if you even want to go get that information because that may be a GDPR compliant issue on your part of even attempting to look that information up. Just throwing it out there.

Greg DiBiase: That's great. I love to hear this. I love to have it resolved without needing to go through the temporary spec. I'm just hearing - you know, we had a meeting with ICANN Compliance on one of these days. And they said, "Yes, we're going to ask and you're going to need to confirm that it wasn't available." So I just want to put this issue to bed basically.

Marc Anderson: Alex do you want to jump in?

Alex Schwertner: Yes I'm with Greg on this one. Alex from Tucows for the record. If the language allows it legally then at least it's misinterpreted by ICANN Compliance because we've seen compliance enforcement that goes in a different direction.

And I would definitely support us sending that letter to ICANN telling them hey there is something with your language that makes Compliance think this is a problem. We can't do that so either you tell Compliance to back off or change the language, but do something about it because that was not our intention when we wrote our proposal. I think we need to do something.

Roger Carney: And I'll agree both with Greg and Alex that it would help to actually send something that states that. I was just looking at it and trying to provide somebody that's getting compliance notices today a way to look at it.

Greg DiBiase: Right so let me make sure I understand. You're saying that since you're not able to process that registrant e-mail then it's not available to you? I agree with that too but I think there is confusion among the registrars and there's confusion among compliance.

I would like to have a uniform explanation that under GDPR we cannot process that third party's data by looking under WHOIS. That's not available. And maybe that's faster than trying to change the (unintelligible) to agree on the interpretation among Compliance and everyone else.

Marc Anderson: Thank you Greg and others. Does anybody else want to jump in on this one? Okay so I'll say probably the first step here is maybe for somebody to take the pen. And I'm going to look over to Greg, see if you're willing to get that started.

Greg DiBiase: Yes, I'll start it.

Marc Anderson: Okay. Sure so the way we've handled this before and, you know, I think it's worked so far is we've put together a letter and then reached out to ICANN staff. We've done so in informal manner, you know, maybe giving the letter to tee up the issue and then ask for a call.

We've gotten on a call with them and sort of explained our position. I think we could probably take that same approach. You know, and again I just ask that, you know, as much as possible in the letter if we can explain, you know, what the issue is from Contracted Party House perspective, I think that would be helpful in taking it to ICANN staff on it.

I don't know if anybody from ICANN staff wants to jump in on - wade into that at all or not. Feel free. Okay. Thank you. So yeah, I think if you're willing to get that started, we used a, you know, Google Doc before and just send the link out to the list and we can sort of run with it from there.

But good topic. I think that's a good point and certainly we want to make sure everybody's on the same page there, so thank you. Anything else here or should we go to the next agenda item or next slide? Thank you Zoe.

I wanted to - I also want to take a moment to do a little bit of recap on the GDD summit. I also wanted to, you know, sort of highlight the GDD summit as a success story for the TechOps group. You know, in addition to producing the transfer process recommendations, I thought the GDD summit was another real success for the TechOps group.

In this year's GDD summit we had a - for the first time we had a multiple track approach to it. Previously there had been essentially one track for the entire GDD summit. But this year there were essentially three tracks, with the majority of one of those tracks being dedicated to sessions for the TechOps group.

And we as a group came together and proposed a number of sessions, identified session leaders and agendas for each of those sessions. We had - we followed a format of having breakouts. We had white boards, had people actively participating in each of those sessions.

And, you know, a lot of people came up to me afterwards and were appreciative of the format, said they got a lot out of it. It was very well received and I think it was a real win for the TechOps group in general and also for GDD summit participants.

And again I want to thank the people in this room. You know, it's success like that really depends on having active participation, and we had great participation and a lot of people stepping up and volunteering for sessions.

You know, we actually had more proposals for sessions than we had room for, which is sort of a great sign for the TechOps group, although maybe it's an indication of the number of challenges we face as well. So some good, some bad there.

I have up here a list of the topics we ended up covering. And we're going to touch on some of these in more detail. But, you know, I just wanted to run through them, you know, real quick. And I'll give - you know, anybody that wants to talk to any of these in more detail or, you know, maybe give their thoughts or recap on them, please feel free to jump in.

But just running through that list, we've talked about the transfer process already. And I think it's important though to note that when the TechOps group proposed this, they proposed it as a temporary solution.

And so we recognize that there's a need both for a temporary solution to address the immediate GDPR challenge in front of us but also that in the long term, we're going to need a long-term fix to the transfer process.

And so one of the largest session - and in fact we had two sessions at the GDD summit talking about what we needed to do from a long-term perspective to create a transfer process that really fits the modern needs of the registries and registrars.

The existing transfer process is fairly dated. And, you know, one of the main topics of discussion was around the (off-code) which didn't even exist at the time the existing transfer process was identified. So we spoke to that in a lot of detail. You know, does anybody want to add anything more to that before moving on? Greg's hand is inching close to the button. No.

Seeing no hands, the other one is standardized registry reporting repository. This is – this comes back to the list of items that registrars identified as topics for the TechOps group.

There's a lack of standardization in the reporting that registries provide to registrars, and so this is a newer initiative. You know, we're not particularly far along on this but this initiative is a – is an attempt to look at the reporting that registries provide and maybe identify some baseline best practices around, you know, what reports are needed, what reports would be useful for registrars and also the delivery mechanism for registrars to get those reports.

So a little newer and again we had a good discussion on this/a good breakout and we captured a lot of ideas on how to move this one forward. We had a – an excellent session on a Guide to China Regulations.

I'm sure everybody in the room's aware that there's a lot of regulations in China around TLD registrations impacting both registries and registrars, so we got an excellent summary on that.

Thank you Pam. I think you did the heavy lifting in coordinating that one, and I think again that was a very well-received session and very timely so thank you.

Roger already spoke a little bit about IETF and REGEX in general, but one of the – I guess I'll just say two things. You know, the first challenge -- again Roger spoke with -- is how does the TechOps group coexist with IETF?

And certainly that was a – an early topic that we discussed and, you know, as Roger, you know, I'll just sort of echo what Roger said. You know, we, you know, I think we violently agreed that we're not a, you know, we shouldn't be and we're not a standards-based body.

We should, you know, that work rightly belongs in the IETF but there's certainly a lot of interaction we can have with the IETF and specifically the REGEX group.

A lot of the work we've done within TechOps is also – has been about education, what IETF and REGEX is and what it does and how it impacts registries and registrars.

So that's provided an opportunity for outreach, you know, and I'll – I want to thank Jim and Roger on that one for really leading the charge there and, you know, providing a lot of information about how those groups work and, you know, and sort of explaining why it's important to registries and registrars and why they may want to participate in that. Anybody want to add on to that? Jim, please go ahead.

James Galvin: Thanks Marc. Jim Galvin for the record. I want to add a key phrase, which I think is useful. I mean, Roger spoke about the problem space of the relationship between ICANN and IETF.

And, you know, I'm just going to jump over all of the various politics on both sides about what people think or don't think, but there really are only two things to know.

From the point of view of the IETF and I speak as a Co-Chair of the REGEX group, okay, the TechOps group is simply a design team for any specification that it produces.

It really is as simple as that. You know, the - anybody in the IETF who thinks they have a problem with the idea that we're taking documents from this group - they can easily have that issuance.

It just has to be phrased to them in that way and that should set it aside, so the interactions in that direction take care of that. This is just a design team. The one issue which is sort of interesting and Roger and I have talked a little bit about this, you know, for a different document but we haven't quite solved this problem yet is given that there are people in this group who don't participate in the IETF and there's actually quite a lot of them who don't, it can be a design team, all of which is fine.

But what does that mean to comments that you get on the IETF side to a document, okay? You don't want them to just be thrown over the wall from – you don't want it to be thrown over the wall from TechOps into REGEX and then you sort of lose track of what's going on.

You know, I mean, the whole point of doing the design over here is because you had a good thing, so I think something for us to keep in mind and - going forward.

It is important to join the mailing list – the REGEX mailing list. If you're actively engaged in anything produced here you need to join the mailing list, because the IETF works on a mailing list.

And Roger and I have just sort of informally in an ad hoc way said to ourselves, "We'll find a way to make sure that, you know, substantive comments that need to be brought back here somehow get back to this group so that folks have an opportunity to comment on them and deal with them."

There are a few others in this group who actually, you know, sit in both places so, you know, there's plenty to keep us honest. But – so there's those two directions of communication path.

One is fairly easy. TechOps to REGEX design team, you know, no issues. It's the other direction which is, you know, a little bit challenging at the moment but I'm hoping that with some successes we'll sort of get past all of that and I just wanted to highlight that for folks. Thanks.

Marc Anderson: Thanks Jim and a great point there. And again, you know, thank you to Jim and Roger for really, you know, bridging that gap. I think that's been both helpful and informative for a lot of us in the group.

The last item on there – we had our registry mapping and registry transition and unless I'm mistaken Jim and Roger you Co-Chaired that session. Do you guys want to say anything about that or put you on the spot again?

James Galvin: Actually it was Jim and Jody but I'll let Roger channel both of us and – or I can do it I guess if you want. So the registry mapping is – it's a document which currently – it just – it's not actually officially a document of the REGEX group but it is something which we are working on right now, and we will be adopting it probably at the next IETF meeting in Montreal coming up in July.

It's a way of specifying the policies and other technical choices that a registry has made, so it would be essentially an XML specification of what a registry looks like.

If you have – if you've been a service provider, you know, or a registrar you know very well the pain of taking on a registry and onboarding a registry. As a registrar there's a lot that you want to know to make your systems work.

You know, I mean, even as a registry service provider if you're taking on a new TLD there's a lot of configuration that goes with that too. So the point here is to create a specification as a way to establish what that is, and it makes it very nice and convenient to onboard registries on both sides.

And we have the – once you have this as an XML specification you can do all kinds of things with it, right. It can be available in OT&E environment. You know, you can make relatively quick changes to registry configurations, that kind of thing because registrars can just go grab it from some central source and, you know, configure their systems and it's all good.

So that's sort of what that document is and the objective and it's very much a work in progress. That work is just getting started. The registry transitions document was something which – it was a topic that was – it was introduced a little while ago but at the GDD Summit was the first time we actually had our first working meeting about it and we adopted the format that we used at the Summit.

We had a bunch of breakout corners and we collected a bunch of information, which I have the action at the moment to turn into a document that we could use to progress the work.

The idea there is that there is certain administration – administrative information that goes with a registry and a registrar relationship. So the canonical example that I've been using is maintaining, you know, contact information and, you know, authentication information and things like that between registrars and registries and there's other kinds of things of that ilk that could be part of this that you want to know about when you move a registry around.

And so in our brainstorming session at this meeting we were collecting a bunch of the ideas that would go into this document and the thing that happened.

We really want to standardize that and to make it easier for everybody when elements change, and of course there are sources of some of this data. Some of it - ICANN has a source/a centralized location of some of this data so, I mean, there are practical issues about using this information and stuff.

But that work actually just kicked off at the GDD Summit so it's very much open and I will at some point here in the not too distant future I hope have our – I'll put up in the Google Doc all of the stuff that we collected there and we'll be able to progress that work along too.

So we certainly have enough stuff that we're doing on our agenda at the moment, so I haven't felt urgently in need of getting that done with respect to TechOps and trying to insert it on our usual agenda.

But we'll pull all that together when it's – when there's an opportunity to put that in there. I don't know if Roger wants to add anything to that.

Roger Carney: This is Roger. I have forgot to say my name every time I've talked so far. So – but yes I was just going to add onto the registry mapping piece of that that all the registries that work with us know the genesis of this.

And they may not know it in the front of their mind but it's the 400 questions that we send to every new TLD provider that says, "How is your system configured? Please answer these 400 questions."

And this is - what we want to start to avoid is move all those 400 questions into something we can actually consume - this XML description so…

Marc Anderson: Thank you Roger and Jim and appreciate you letting me put you on the spot there, but a good highlight of the excellent work. And, you know, again just to sort of highlight – so there's a need for, you know, coordination on some of these issues, you know, where there's touch points between registries and registrars.

These are, you know, sort of common technical challenges that, you know, we as registries and registrars face. And so I think having this forum has really opened up some doors to, you know, enable better communication on these common challenges.

Roger Carney: This is Roger. I just wanted to give credit where credit was due. You mentioned that, you know, we brought – for the registrars brought forward the reporting repository.

And actually Gavin Brown kind of kicked that off from the registry side because he gave us a good response back when we requested some new reporting from them and he's like, "Well why don't you do the same way everybody else is doing it?"

And it's like, "Okay yes let's talk about, you know, standardizing that." And again I think the registries get benefited a lot because they quit doing things individually for each registrar and obviously registrars gain it as well. But yes I just wanted to make sure that Gavin Brown got credit for that so…

Marc Anderson: Fair enough. Thank you and unless I'm mistaken Gavin has recently joined the TechOps group so we all benefit from having his expertise and experience with us.

So I think we're – unless anybody else has anything they want to add here I think we can go to the next slide Zoe. Thank you. I mentioned the temporary specification around, you know, I mentioned that around the interim transfer policy.

But there are a couple of other items on the temporary specification that the TechOps group was involved in and when we were setting up a – when Tobias and I were setting up the agenda for this session we wanted to put a couple discussion items on the temporary specification.

And, you know, this is really, you know, our time to do it with - as you will so I want to give everybody an opportunity to sort of talk about their experiences with the temporary specification.

We can talk as much or as little about these things as we want, but there are sort of three items where the TechOps group had a specific touch point on the temporary specification.

I've already talked about the interim transfer policy and Greg do I have that right? Greg? Okay Greg brought up, you know, maybe one issue with the interim transfer policy that we're going to have a follow-up item on.

But if there are any other items there we can bring them up – around usage of the Web form. One item that was debated and discussed a lot within the TechOps group was usage of the Web form versus anonymized email and, you know, enough so that we didn't develop a consensus on this and that was actually reflected in the temporary specification.

Temporary specification allows for use of a – of Web form or anonymized email left to the discretion of the implementer, you know, based largely on advice from the TechOps group.

But I wanted to throw that out there as something we could talk about and particularly give registrars an opportunity to talk about maybe what kind of usage they've seen as to the – or of the Web form.

Are there, you know, best practices or experiences with that that they'd like to relay or talk about? And then on the last bullet point there the registry to registrar relay of users.

We started a little bit with how to word that one but this was a discussion point that came up on the list as one of the challenges that registrars are facing.

In some cases - registrars for Thick TLDs in some cases have not operated their own WHOIS service; instead have a – I'm getting nods from Stephanie so let's see if I get this right.

They have a Web front-end that points to the registries' backend and post-GDPR the requirements of GDPR make that no longer possible. Stephanie looks like she wants to jump in so – no I got that right.

Stephanie Perrin: Most of them are operating a WHOIS service because they have to for Dot Com, but for the Thick TLDs it's where they send the request to the registry server rather than responding directly.

Marc Anderson: Thank you. So that's another challenge that's been discussed in the TechOps group so these are sort of the, you know, discussion topics that we developed. And so I've done a lot of talking so far, which is fine but I'd like to, you know, I'll throw that out to the room and we can discuss these as much or as little as we want.

But, you know, I want to give everybody the opportunity to talk about these challenges/questions/lessons learned on any of these topics or anything else related to the temporary specification. Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: I actually think that we should link these two problems. On the one hand I think this transfer is not operating the way that we intended it to. It's causing a lot of operational burden for registries and registrars.

On the other side I think the failure to kind of deal with this case where it's legitimate to have these requests going to the registry server but in that – those cases they might not be having all of the information.

This is a – also an unintended consequence and a place where we can sort of voluntarily update the spec to include that. But I think giving something that's at - the parties who are requesting WHOIS data are going to want while we're sort of asking for the tweaks to the transfer processes is potentially a good way to posture this, because I think both of these things should be changed.

And I don't know if any folks disagree but I think if we link them in the correspondence then everybody wins.

Marc Anderson: Sorry. I'm looking at – Jim looked like he was going to raise his hand but wasn't sure.

James Galvin: Well, you know, I guess I don't know whether you want to, you know, get into talking about solutions and stuff. And I – I'm fine with putting these things on an agenda for something that we want to talk about and that's okay.

I won't respond to the proposals that she's making for solutions. I'll hold back on that instead.

Marc Anderson: Fair enough. Anyone else want to jump in on these? So Jody welcome. Do you want to jump in? Jody we can't hear you so far. Still not hearing you Jody.

All right, he took his hand down so he says – and looking in chat he mentions he'll post in comment instead, which also makes me notice that Justin has commented so let me – I'll read that now from Justin.

"Regarding the WHOIS referral issue I believe that many WHOIS clients do not parse and follow the referral service to the registrar with the historical exception of Thin TLDs.

We may all need to update our Port 43 WHOIS clients to always follow the redirect, and registries will need to ensure registrars have their servers listed properly." Rubens?

Rubens Kuhl: One – Rubens Kuhl. One possible issue to that: that registrars are not obliged to have Port 43 for Thick registries so that referral could be to nowhere. They're obliged to have Web WHOIS but not Port 43.

Roger Carney: Yes and I'm just going to add not for gTLDs but some ccTLDs actually require us to redirect to the ccTLD to the service not – so the registrar's not supposed to publish it. It's up to the registry to publish it on some ccTLDs.

Marc Anderson: Any other comments on – Jim then Alex.

James Galvin: So Jim Galvin for the record. Maybe I'll offer the following comment about all of this. I mean, yes there are some interesting topics that have come out of the temporary specification.

But I really think that perhaps the greater obligation on us is to pay attention to where the EPDP goes and what happens there, because there will almost certainly be a technical impact there and this would be a good forum in which to discuss those issues as they come up especially – I – we still don't know if it's going to be an EPDP addressing the technical specification only and its scope.

And there's the question whether accreditation and access is part of that or a separate document or a separate PDP and there's all kinds of interesting things going on there.

So I think that that's what I would say under this topic is we have an obligation to pay attention to that and use this forum for working through issues that we can drive to our policy folks and contacts into the EPDP process.

Marc Anderson: Thank you Jim. That's a great point and, you know, I think the first place - since Stephanie left I think we can all agree to leave that as her action item. And second, a great point Jim.

You know, as, you know, as the PP – EPDP progresses there's certainly going to be impacts on registries and registrars. You know, there's going to be things we have to do and, you know, two things I guess, you know, is first, you know, it's on us to monitor, you know, that and make sure we're staying on top of those but also to the extent we can make sure we're funneling feedback through our constituencies to the participants in those – in that PDP so make sure we're, you know, we're both monitoring and providing feedback, make sure that that group is developing policy that makes sense for us and is implementable so great point. Thank you. Does anybody else want to raise – Roger?

Roger Carney: This is Roger. I wonder – I think that most people in here are going to follow the PDP fairly closely, but I wonder if we shouldn't have someone designated from this group as a liaison that is maybe just an observer of that PDP and can bring back any issues that – or possible issues that could come up.

I'd – just an idea/just a thought to look at. And speaking more to these three items that you have here on the temp spec, I actually thought that the group came up with a pretty good consensus on use of Web forms and email; that it was a good idea to allow both, not to pick one.

So I thought the group was a fairly good consensus on that point, but I do wonder, and we didn't have time and we did talk about it a little, if we should

get into more of the mechanics of the Web form that we said, "Yes it's a good idea. Go build your own."

Maybe we should look at is there better ways to standardize that or not? Just a thought as well so…

Marc Anderson: Thank you Roger. A lot of good points there. First, I love the idea of having a liaison and so, you know, I'd like to ask for somebody to, you know, you don't have to do – volunteer now but I'd like to ask for somebody to maybe volunteer to do that.

Maybe we could have a standing agenda item when – and when we meet ask that person to provide a recap on what's going on with the EPDP once it gets underway.

I think that's a great idea so – and maybe we can ask for somebody to take that as being a liaison, you know, an unofficial liaison hat. They monitor that, flag items that might be of interest to this group and report on that as a standing agenda item moving forward.

The other thing you said though is that I want to – and I'll maybe take a moment to pause on is usage of the Web form. I think probably all of us have heard a frustration from the community around lack of standardization.

It's a different experience for end users and so to the extent that maybe we can develop, you know, best practices or help, you know, develop a less fragmented experience for end users that might be something that is beneficial all around so that's a great point.

Maybe I can ask you, you know, how do we run from there? What would we do next if we wanted to take a stab at that? Going to Roger then Jim or Jim then Roger.

Roger Carney: Well I – this is Roger. I was just going to jump in because Alissa online asked and maybe it helps us start this is how many registrars are using a Web form and maybe using the alternative?

I think that's a good question and we can pose it. I – I'm guessing most are using a Web form but that's just a guess. I haven't looked so…

Marc Anderson: So for the registrars in the – any – do we want to just like raise hands? You know, who's using – I'll go the other way. Who's using anonymized email? Okay so we have four hands, maybe five.

James Galvin: Oh Jim - I'm sorry. Jim Galvin for the record. You need to be more specific. They're all using anonymized email. It's a question of whether you are creating a pseudonym in an email address or using a Web form, right, so sorry. Thank you.

Marc Anderson: A - precise language – very important. Thank you. All right, maybe I should ask you to ask the question here so we get that right.

James Galvin: So there are two choices: creating a pseudonymous email address that you then display and it looks just like an email address but it's obviously not directly to the real person, or you have a URL to a Web form in place of the email address and – in your display.

So those are your two choices, okay, so Choice 1 would be how many are using a pseudonymous email address in the room here? So I see two hands. All right.

Oh three/four. All right, thank you. And five. And how many are using a Web form? And that's three in the room so…

Marc Anderson: Thank you and, you know, to Roger's point you made a good point there, you know, that it wasn't so much that we had lack of consensus. It's that we had

consensus that it should be both, and that recommendation from the TechOps group is what was included in the temporary specification so a good point there.

James Galvin: So Jim Galvin again for the record. I guess the question that I would ask - and maybe we don't have to answer it here. I guess I'm struggling with how much conversation you want to have about a set of things here.

But what is left to standardize? Roger's – was making the comment, you know, standardized for the users and I'm like, "Well what users?" I mean, I think our immediate focus is making things easier for the registries and registrars.

Well we've done that. You – as a registrar you have a choice of an email address or a Web form. You know, we're not doing something here for the Internet at large.

There's obviously a fairly restricted set of users as compared to the Internet at large who need to take advantage of contactability, right. The obligation is providing some mechanism for contactability.

I'm just wondering what other work they're – I consider that work done and of course I don't really have a vested interest here. I'm a registry so this doesn't apply to me but just an observation from the peanut gallery if you will. Thanks.

Marc Anderson: Thanks Jim. Alex, please go ahead.

Alexander Schwertner: I think Roger's – and I don't want to speak for you but I want to try to rephrase what you were asking for and I think – because I think it makes sense what you were asking for.

We've heard a lot in – during this week that registrars are not cooperative. They're not helping the community to work through these changes. It's super difficult to get any information, yada yada yada.

I think where we can help where it's pretty much – or not a lot of effort for us to help is if we implement a Web form as a registrar that we can create some form of standardized expectation as to what this is going to look like, so that as a user of that Web form it doesn't really matter which registrar you are ending up with.

The Web form will look like this and, I mean, let's be honest. It's not that complicated. There isn't so much that you can do but it would be a great gesture from us as the Contracted Parties towards – to the rest of the community if we would say, "Yes we're looking at standardization.

We're trying to look – to make this look similar and to have a similar experience for users of this just to make it easier for everyone to use this process."

And I think that's – Roger correct me if I'm wrong. I think that's where you were going.

Marc Anderson: Thanks Alex. And I'll just note for the record that Roger now just had – and there were a few other nods in the room. Jim do you want to jump back in or…?

Okay no. Fair enough. Oh you have the next topic. All right. So before I go to Jim I'll just say that, you know, listening to those comments I think maybe the next steps for us as a group would be to maybe take a stab at what a – best practices would look like. You know, I thought it was a good suggestion but, you know, while everybody was talking I had a chance to, to think about, you know, okay where do we go with that? And it seems like may be a best

practices, you know, document would make sense. Does anybody want to take the pen at a first stab at that?

Okay and we can push that to the list. We don't have to have that solved today and with that I guess Jim next topic, back to you.

Jim Galvin: Yes so thanks for that, Jim Galvin for the record and thanks for that explanation. I appreciate that especially since it really doesn't affect me so I just step back. I want to make a similar assertion about the registry to registrar relay of users. I guess it's not clear to me what the remaining issue is there. And I'm hopeful that someone might expand on that a bit. You know, and I won't do this to the interim transfer of policy because we already had that discussion. There's clearly something, you know, to talk about. But I'd appreciate if - and it's unfortunate that (Stephanie) left the room here since she had brought that up. But if we could talk a little bit about what that is. Thanks.

Man: I think this is – so just to harp on that and in terms of what (Stephanie) said and for thick registries okay the registrar will not go to the registry to get the information. The registry says go to the registrar. The registrar says go to the registrar. Where does the request go?

It's something in the data as a registrar for my thick registry and the thick registry telling me, you know, and it's probably used Whois response go to the registrar to find out more information about this so, so as the Web bureau or the Web form or the, and email so forth. But then the registrars is using the Port 43 to get the information from the thick registry it's getting the same information that the user originally got. So the person kind of sits there going well where do I get the information now and where do I go? And that is essentially the only issue that I think is left for us to solve I think.

Marc Anderson: Excellent jump in. Can I go there first?

Alex Schwertner: Yes I think we're seeing the tip of the iceberg of a much broader discussion here. And that huge iceberg that's on the water is thick registries are considered to be a sort of authoritative and registrars are not considered to be authoritative for any registry that is thick. Now with this temp spec we have something whereas suddenly the registrar is, has a role in providing output that is relevant and authoritative for a Whois ready for a thick registry. The entire framework around this doesn't really support for that it doesn't carry that. And that and so that is why we end up in this situation where a registrar would refer to a registry for the output. The temps spec says the registry needs to refer back to the registrar which is not even in a place to deliver have any sort of Whois output.

That underlying iceberg discussion is a huge one. And I don't think we will be able to handle that in this group and it will probably be at a longer discussion but that is where it's going back to. So we may want as this group what we could do is identify the contractual obligations that we have right now that are not being taking care of in the temp spec that lead to this because there is at least ambiguity in the language that we find in our contract says to what we are and are not supposed to do around is for thick Whois, is for thick registries.

Marc Anderson: Thanks Alex. I have the same question as Jim actually and that was helpful. Does any – Roger you want to jump in?

Roger Carney: Well I just want to add to what – this is Roger sorry, just what Alex was saying the registrars are still authoritative collectors. It's the thick registries are authoritative, yes thank you Jim, publishers.

Marc Anderson: Jim go ahead?

Jim Galvin: Yes so Jim Galvin for the record. I think I'm agreement, I am in agreement in principle. I want to clarify for me a couple of issues. I agree with Alex, this is just the tip of the iceberg. And I think all of the underneath that iceberg I'm

expecting that that all gets addressed by the EPDP. There's just an overarching architecture policy framework and legal framework that has to apply to this before we know what we're doing. With respect to the temporary specification and the bullet item that's there, you know, going back to the previous comment I still think that this work is done for us okay, because if the issues is that registrars are not providing the data all right, then that's a compliance issue. I don't think there's anything for us to do. I mean all we did as a registry in order to comply with the temporary specification in this new regime is we added to the little copyright notice and other terms of service notice at the bottom of every Whois output a statement that says go to the registrar of record. So when a Whois context in a Port 43 context there's not a URL, there is no technical thing. I mean the use or who's actually looking at that Whois output has to go do that.

But you're right, for those registrars that are depending on the registries Port 43 for their particular presentation of for Port 43 I would - I mean I guess I would argue that they're are simply not in compliance with the temp spec but I don't think there's anything for us to do here with respect to that. I still think in the context of the temp spec in this discussion there's no work there, we're done. But as Alex said there is a lot of work down the road which is going to happen and we need to pay attention to that and see where all that goes and what to do about it. But I just wanted to frame not a little differently, the discussion. I hope that, wonder if anybody disagrees with me or wants to say that differently. Thanks.

Marc Anderson: Pam go ahead.

Pam Little: Pam Little. Jim can you please elaborate a little bit last comment you made if the registrar something is not complying with the temp spec? I didn't quite understand that. Thanks.

Jim Galvin: The registrar is required by the temp spec in combination with their contracts to provide a port - let's see, I need to be careful here because maybe I don't

know exactly what's there. But you are required to publish Whois results and out of your a WebEx that's right. So you are required to do that. And what a lot of the registrars do or some number of them, anyway I shouldn't even say a lot because I don't really have an empirical evidence of what the percentage is here. But clearly some registrars what they do is instead of actually doing and providing a Port 43 service directory in their own systems on the backend they're querying the registry and then they display that okay. And if they're doing that with the temp spec now they will no longer be in compliance because the temp spec doesn't - it only has partial data and it's telling people to go to the registrar to get it. And so, you know, I mean they might not display anything anyway but they might actually in their situation display more or at least, you know, that's where folks would get it.

Pam Little: Just very quickly I, it is my understanding that registrars are not required to provide Whois via Port 43 if it's the new gTLDs?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Pam Little: Right?

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl. This is about web Whois. The question is that yes but they - he mentioned because more, a good number of registrars implement their Web Whois by doing a Port 43 query to a registry. And then the problem (unintelligible).

Jim Galvin: Right so now we get, so Jim again and now we get into the issue that Roger was talking about, you know I mean for com and net and thin registries the registrars have to run a Port 43 service because the registry doesn't do it because they only have thin data. But you don't have to run a Port, you don't have to run a Port 43 for thick registries. But you do have to provide the Web access and they do the Web access by depending on the registry. And that's what they have to do differently.

Marc Anderson: Thank you everyone, I - good discussion. I - that helps clear up some questions I had at least. And, you know, one of the things, you know, I want to draw a line in the sand on this one because we have at least all right, just time track here. We're at 20 more minutes and there's, if we don't cover everything in the agenda that's fine. You know, we have topics for another day.

But there is one topic I want to make sure we get to today so I'm going to make sure we have time for that one. Before we do I think, you know, there is may be an immediate item to make sure we flagged this for people on the EPDP Drafting Team. You know I - it sounds like there is a little bit of a gap here and we want to make sure that this is something that gets addressed in the EPP. And we have...

Man: Yes.

Marc Anderson: …Donna here who's I guess suddenly perked up hopefully. So maybe there's something we can, you know, we can flake this for you to make sure it's on your radar when drafting.

Donna Austin: Thanks Marc, Donna Austin. It might be helpful because the council's in the process now of drafting the charter for the EPDP. So if - it may be worthwhile - Rubens is probably more across this than me but I can see with this as well. So it might be worth a conversation just to make sure that in the drafting of the charter that we pick up on the conversation that's happening here because, you know, the risk is if we miss get in the charter then it's missed all together. So yes now would be an opportune time to make sure that it's captured.

Marc Anderson: Thank you for jumping in there. And, you know, if there's maybe something, you know, my guess is if you had something in writing that would be helpful too. I mean you know is there - I forget who, you know, is there, maybe we can ping (Stephanie) or if there's somebody that's want to take a stab at

trying to put this in writing so we can get something concrete to the councilors.

Jim Galvin: Okay so Jim again. I mean I'm sorry. I'll just - I'll say again I think we're done here really. I don't know what the temp spec issue is that we're trying to pass on. The fact is the EPDP is going to deal with this issue in a large sense. This is sort of a detail of RDAP services that are going to have to be specified and what that's all going to look like. It seems to me that is going to be part of the charter of the EPDP. I don't see how it can escape that anyway.

I mean I could be wrong and I'm hoping for someone to tell me that I'm missing something which is fine. But I don't think there's anything for us to tell the Charter Drafting Team because I fully expect that it's already in scope because the temporary spec is in scope so everything in it is going to be revisited and looked at and whatever other issues they're going to put there I think we're covered. I'm, you know, don't know where the gap is.

Marc Anderson: A couple more hands. Pam go ahead.

Pam Little: Pam Little. I'm a little concerned about Jim's optimism because I think that the charter as currently drafted or the principle of the EPDP really is to do maybe just three things right, to confirm or not confirm or modify what's currently stated in the temp spec. So for example when we were early talking about a transfer policy earlier the current language in the charter which may change but currently this should a temporary specification language be confirmed until a dedicated PDP can revisit the outdated transfer policy? Obviously we would reword it by some of the discussion here because it's still - it's already not working.

We know the current language is confusing or it's causing contradictions right? So that language doesn't work in the current draft charter. So I would actually encourage this group to think about specific topics and maybe it's then will give us the, contract parties councilors to take into account when we

are really refining or finalizing the charter language, otherwise it will go in like that. It's almost binary or very, very specific rather than Jim's idea that the EPDP's going to fix everything. The EPDP had four months and will be very narrowly tailored specific.

Marc Anderson: Thank you. Alex has been waiting to get in. Alex do you want to go ahead?

Alex Schwertner: Yes, for the record Alex from Tucows. I agree with Pam. I think what we can expect from the EPDP is certainly not too thick versus thin Whois. I think that is another long discussion. I think the EPDP may be realistically addressing the way thick registries would refer users to registrars to have access to that Web form. And maybe the language changes in the scope of yes well you don't put that in your Whois but you put it somewhere else on your Web site I think that's the extent of change that we can expect from the EPDP on this but nothing further than that. So anything dealing with thick Whois and Port 43 obligations I think that is unrealistic for the EPDP to achieve in four months.

Marc Anderson: Volker please go ahead.

Volker Greimann: Just a slight contradiction. I think that temporary spec has already in part solved the thin versus thick problem by directing registries to direct all comers to the registrars making the registrars the authority to (unintelligible) again. Well there will still be a lot of discussion to be had on the question of thick versus thin, the question who is authoritative for the contact data for the registrant contact ability at least has been partially pushed back to the registrars. I think ICANN has made a very interesting choice there.

Marc Anderson: Go ahead Jim.

Jim Galvin: So Marc I'm sorry. Being - Jim Galvin for the record. And being conscious of time here I don't want to - I don't want my apparent optimism to be overvalued. You know, I really - I get all the new nuances and the issues that

escape here. Let me frame, take this back and frameless in a way for this group, okay?

I don't mean to suggest that the EPD P is going to solve everything. My specific question to this group is I don't see a technical gap that there's anything for this group to speak about okay, that there's' any need for us to say something to this charter group okay? Now that does not take away from Pam's suggestion that when you look at the charter language, if you've got issues with the words that are there you absolutely need to speak up if you don't like what it's saying. All of that is true. I'm only responding to the very narrowly framed question and what I believe are responsibilities of this group which is that I don't think there's any work here. I think it's done and I'm not aware of any gaps. So that's what I'm looking for. If someone wants to suggest something different, so thank you.

Marc Anderson: Thanks Jim. Alex you had your, Alex took his hand down. Any other thoughts Roger?

Roger Carney: This is Roger. And Jim your speaking of the last item on the screen yes, not of all the items because we agreed at the interim or the transfer thing. Okay just to make sure and because no one caught the bait that Jim threw out there. I think Jim is missing something but not on this topic.

Marc Anderson: All right thank you and yes, you know, given the time sensitive nature of this I was hesitant to draw a line and I think this is important in time and time sensitive obviously. GNSO Council's working hard to get this chartered. But to Jim's point, you know, there's, you know, there may be not a technical action for this group but that doesn't mean the points raised here are not valid and that individuals should be flagging this through the appropriate channels to make sure the right, the necessary information gets put in the charter so well put. Thank you Jim. (Zoey) can we move to the next slide? All right thank you (Zoey).

So this is yes the agenda item I wanted to make sure we had time for. And yes we, unfortunately are limited to about ten minutes here for this one. But, you know, I'll at least - you know, I teed this off earlier when I said that this group recognized that the transfer policy that we propose to address GDPR is really just a stopgap solution and that there needs to be a holistic look at what, you know, what the, you know, transfer policy, you know, what a modern transfer policy should look like, how we can address what, you know, really is a fairly outdated policy at this point, getting nods and smiles in the room here.

And so really what, you know, the slide really says it all, what are the next steps for tech ops in this long-term transfer policy? And, you know I, you know hoping to channel some of Jim's optimism but I did not think we were going to solve this question today, you know, and we don't have to. We don't have to have this all solved today. But I do think that focusing on this and looking at what the long-term solution is going to be is something that we have to turn our attention to and start working on what next as far as the transfer policy. And so I'd like to tee up that, at least tee up that conversation here so that we can, you know, we can start that discussion and, you know, Roger than Rubens can jump in.

Roger Carney: Thanks, this is Roger. Just want to back up for two seconds. On the Web form there was a couple comments in chat if we can get that included in our notes just to make sure (Justin) and (Jody) had a couple back and forth there. But to move on to the long term transfer I think it's as Pam mentioned this is going to be covered in the PDP. I think that what we can do, what we should do is provide the PDP a recommendation. I think we should send them a letter just like our transfer letter was to ICANN during the temp spec, I think we should provide a recommendation to the PDP team on what this needs to look like in the future. And hopefully that can easily check their box off and they can move on to other topics in the PDP. Thanks.

Marc Anderson: Rubens had his hand up. Rubens do you want to…

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl, just a note that temp space already include some let's save medium-term policy which is LDAP-based which is not what CPH tech ops think as a temporary transfer policy for DDPR. So there is already a new transfer policy established we think the temp spec. So you should probably be looking to say if you like that or not and start suggesting to ICANN, to EPDP to either accept that or change it.

Marc Anderson: Thank you. I saw a couple hands. I'm sorry, I didn't – don't know the order they went up, so I'll just tell start that way and work our way around. Alex do you want to jump in?

Alex Schwertner: Alex from Tucows. Yes I don't want to be the person who is like least pessimistic about the scope on the possible results of the EPDP. But again I think what we can expect from the EPDP is a confirmation or a slight change of what has been suggested in the temps spec.

I think what we are looking for is a long-term solution for transfers that may even be different to what is in the temp spec by eliminating this entire confirmation process. And without going into the details as to what has been discussed in Vancouver at the GDD, I think it would be helpful for us for this group to and now leading into what could be next steps to to present some written document as to what the group consensus was in Vancouver where were we had differentiating views. But my understanding and from what I heard from the discussion there is consensus in many parts as to what we would like this new transfer policy to be and how transfers should work in the future. So I think it would be helpful for us to craft such document then probably circulate it within our own stakeholder groups to get coverage at least from all registries and all registrars and then prepare for a longer discussion to actually float this in the community and eventually change the inner registrar transfer policy as it is today because I think that is where it ultimately needs to lead, end up in. I think the temps spec and the EPDP again will not be able to solve this issue within the four months that they have.

Marc Anderson: Thank you Alex. Just to note Alex had nods in the room. And I don't know who went next but Jim's hand is up there. So Jim do you want to jump in?

Jim Galvin: Oh Jim Galvin for the record. I want to agree with (Ale)x. I want to build on it and if I may just sort of frame it a little bit differently. I think we should in this for this group to defer our discussion of our relationship to the temp spec and EPDP in this issue. I believe that the task in front of us that we adopted especially based on output from the GDD Summit and so let's just test this with the group is a technical discussion of an appropriate transfer process okay, post GDPR. And that is well within the remit of this group and arguably independent of anything else that's going on but that's actually not completely 100% true. When the EPDP charter comes out and we see what that group is doing it then becomes incumbent upon us to look at that and see what is the relationship between our job of a long term inter-registrar transfer process okay, our relationship of that work with the with what the EPDP is doing. And at that point in time we can decide if there is something that we need to do.

Do we need to influence that work in some way? I mean I have no idea what exactly is going to be the work product over there. It may be that they're just going to be confirming the temp spec and they'll say they'll defer to whatever comes out later or something. I mean, you know, there's a variety of ways that this could play out and I don't think we should get hung up on that.

So I wanted to reframe this as yes there is a discussion to be had about an inter-registrar transfer process posts GDPR. Let's have that discussion and there's nothing keeping us from having at. Let's just do it and we'll see what our relationship is to other work when it's appropriate to do that. Thanks.

Marc Anderson: Thank you Jim. Pam did you want to jump in?

Roger Carney: This is Roger. No, I completely agree. I mean that's a good way to go at it. I'm going to steal a little of Jim's optimism from earlier and say that I think if

we get the work done and provide a good foundation for the technical transfer I think the EPDP can actually probably get this put in place without having a separate transfer policy PDP going on. So just my thoughts. Thanks.

Pam Little: I would also like to mention there is a transfer policy post implementation review going on as it was mentioned by Jennifer Gore at GDD Summit. So that's, - the first step of that review is staff, ICANN staff produce status report of how the policy is working or not working post implementation. So we're expecting that report to be delivered to the council by the end of June. So that report should be of interest or inform the deliberation within this group on this workstream.

Marc Anderson: Pam, Roger?

Roger Carney: Yes just a question for Pam. Was that a post review of the interim transfer or of the IRTP work?

Pam Little: The IRTP as a whole I believe.

Man: If I may ask then so please Pam, so what happens that the report comes out for the GNSO, the GNSO then reviews it and what decides to send the IRTP back into a process of review and then an IRT afterwards for the IRTP? You know, I mean these going to a - let's give the policy and a whole new policy will come out and then an Implementation Review Team will have a look at that and do we feed into the policymaking process or we feed into IRT process?

Pam Little: Oh, great question. I think that was that the report will be we informed the council as what next, what the appropriate next steps would be. Maybe we should get a more data, maybe then decide to convey a formal review team as a policy review. We haven't done that with any policy. So we're also trying to develop or finalize a process for doing this kind of post implementation review. So we'll keep you posted.

Marc Anderson: Great. Thank you and great discussion there. However being mindful of time we've got two minutes left in this session. So, you know, I think it's, you know, it's a good sign of discussion in this session if you have more agenda items than when you get to the end so a good discussion. But I want to take a moment, you know, if you've been following along in the tech ops list you notice that there was a, you know, there was a lively discussion on there today around auth code, something that we've spoken about a number of times as a group and also may be germane to the conversation about long term transfer policies. And as Jim put it, you know, what, you know, the, you know, where this group has a clear remit is on the technical problems that solve between registrars and, registries and registrars and their, you know, what the requirements of an auth code may look like and how it would be used is particularly germane. And I bring this up because I want to, you know, we have items that we didn't cover and I'm sure there's a lot of points that people wanted to make that they didn't get a chance to get to.

I want to encourage everybody to use the email list. We've had some excellent discussions there and it's a good tool for us as contractor priorities as registries and registrars to be able to communicate and generate discussions on these items and not wait for these biweekly calls or face to face meetings. So please take advantage of that email list, participate. And I think we have some action items from today that we'll look to that list to sort of coordinate responses. And, you know, I missed Greg stepping out but look for Greg to post a document soon around the transfer policy issues that have come up.

We are out of time but I'll give, you know, anyone else want to say sort of last closing thoughts before we wrap this up? Okay. Thank you, again thank you everyone. You know I want to say, you know, my job is so much more, so much easier because of the great, you know, the great participation we've had in this. You know, I've really been pleasantly surprised with the successes that we've had of this group and, you know, it really is due to the

strong participation that we've had. So, you know, thank you everybody and with that we can end the recording and adjourn the session.

Jim Galvin: Thank you.

END