
ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the Registration Data Policy IRT meeting being held on Wednesday the 17th of August 2022 at 17:00 UTC. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom Room. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. And before I turn it over to Dennis, I did just want to let everyone know that the ICANN 75 session will be on Wednesday, the 21st of September at 9:00 AM Malaysia time. I'll be sending out an Outlook calendar hold for everybody. And everybody who wants to attend either in person or remotely does need to register in order to get the information for their calls. So I will turn it over to Dennis now.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Andrea. Is that going to be like before, there's limited seating and the IRT gets priority seating?

ANDREA GLANDON: No, we shouldn't have that issue in Malaysia, the rooms are bigger, and they have cut down the social distancing to three feet. So we should be able to just have one room. That shouldn't be a problem.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh my gosh, that means if I extend my arm and they extend their arm, we could actually touch each other.

ANDREA GLANDON: Yes, but you shouldn't.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, yes. So just a quick note about the ICANN 75. You know, our plan is to open public comment next week, Wednesday. So we will be in public comment, because we're going to be opening for 60 days. So the main purpose for the public comment session is to engage with the public, and answer any questions that they might have before they file in the comments. This idea is an opportunity for us to provide explanations so they do not have to submit them as comment. It'll really cut down on our work. So it's one good hour well worth the time, it can save us like 100 hours later.

So I wanted you to know that, why we're doing it. So I would appreciate, of course, IRT team members being there. We won't have a working session. But it's really nice to have all of you there to answer questions directly if they may have questions about the operations of the registry operator and registrar and how they might work and the transfer of data in between and all that stuff, data escrow.

It is a complicated, as you know, complex, complex, complicated, big, large scope, very far reaching. So I expect that is going to be a challenge for many reviewers. So we're trying to guide them to make it as easy as possible. And not only will we be looking at the OneDoc, which is just a

couple of pages, that's simple. But we will also be showing them and sharing the RedDocs and what they are, what they mean and what really has changed, go through that. I think, one at a time.

That's my current feeling. I haven't designed it yet. But I wanted you to know what I'm thinking about right now and give you some expectation. So if you have thoughts on this, send it to me, let me know.

But for now, we're all focused on opening public comment and get this thing cleaned up. Our first topic, as I promised, is the RDAP profile documents. There's two documents and you have them in your hand. You have the documents, you have the old documents, you have the new documents and you have the redline that we provided to you. So consider this session as an opportunity for you to ask questions directly to those RDAP working group members who created this draft.

So, Gustavo, I'm going to ask you to share your screen and start sharing the technical implementation guide first. So let's go there. So this is basically what it looks like, you all have received it in your inbox, you have it in the Google doc form, you have it in the PDF form. So I think just a word of thanks to the working group, RDAP working group, just great job taking on this technically complex work and providing it to us in such a clean, beautiful manner.

So I'll turn it over to Gustavo and turn it over to the IRT. And as I said, in the email, we probably won't go through line by line or anything, but if you had any kind of comments or questions, guidance or instructions, this is our chance to hear you and answer if we can. Go ahead.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Yeah, hey, guys, good morning. This is the technical implementation guide. So I don't know if you have any questions about this document. If I'm not able to answer, we also have Marc here on the call, who can help me, or Jody.

So I went to scroll down through the document. This is not a redline, this is a final document. And as Dennis mentioned, it's a pretty well written and structured document. The technical implementation guidance defines general technical requirements about the RDAP service and profile, which is your document sort of response profile goes into the details about policies and how those policies map into the RDAP service. But this document is basically just the technical requirements that any RDAP service for the gTLD space should comply with. I don't know if you have questions. It's three pages long.

DENNIS CHANG: Marc has a hand up. I think he may have a comment. I hope he doesn't have a question.

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah, no, not a question. Maybe just sort of a high-level comment. Maybe if I could just sort of tee it up at a very high level, if you go to the introduction at the top. Here, the previous version of the RDAP profile was drafted against the temporary specification. And that was mentioned in the introduction.

So we did some cleanup in the introduction, sort of updated the language in the introduction to reflect the fact that it's not drafted against the RDAP profile anymore.

And you'll see another thing here is mentioned IETF STD 95. And maybe if we can scroll all the way down to Appendix A. At the end, you'll see that STD 95 is mentioned here.

This is sort of a new thing. an STD in IETF terminology is where a number of RFCs are sort of encapsulated into sort of a single standard. And this came about because the RA/RAA negotiations, in those discussions, STD 95 was referenced rather than calling out the individual RFCs. So we updated the technical implementation guide to make that in line with what's going on with those discussions.

And then maybe one more thing, not necessarily specific to the technical implementation guide, but sort of maybe a theme throughout, is we took a look at where there were references to something called jCard which is—you'll see that in section 3.8, for example.

We took a look at where jCard was being specifically referenced and tried to make the language in the implementation guide and the response profile a little more agnostic with an eye towards the fact that in the future, the IETF is looking at the possibility of replacing jCard with vCard. And so a little work was put into considering how that would affect the profile, both the technical implementation guide and the response profile.

So for my money, those are kind of the big highlights. The technical invitation guide wasn't nearly as impacted by the work in this group,

you'll see that a lot more in the response profile. But I think those are the major changes besides sort of some administrative cleanup type items. So hopefully, that's helpful.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Yeah, and I think it's important to mention for the nontechnical audience here, jCard is the way that the contact information is structured and shown in the RDAP response. And as Marc mentioned, there is a new standard being developed called jSContact. And the idea is that in the future, maybe JSContact is going to replace jCard. And the response profile contains a path forward for that in the future that will be, let's say, backward compatible, and should be able to allow the current clients to work and future clients that support the new specification to also operate within the RDAP space of the gTLDs.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you guys. Can we go to the profile now?

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Well, the other document is the response profile. And as Marc mentioned, this document contains more updates, because this is basically mapping the different consensus policies and the future [inaudible] consensus policies into the RDAP service and how those policy requirements map into technical requirements for an implementer.

So yeah, this contains more updates than the other one. And as Marc mentioned, that is referencing the IETF standard 95. And, well, there are

changes all over the document, I think that Dennis shared a redline with you, if you are interested in seeing the actual changes.

For example, in the previous version of the profile, there was a requirement that if this parameter has not been registered, then you need to use certain parameters. But now that all those parameters that we were discussing years ago have been registered with IANA, we can reference them. So those requirements that in the past were three or four sections, now there is just one section. And they were simplified. That's a really good result of these changes.

This new section is also really important, because in the past, we had this section all over the place, it was kind of confusing, but now it's clear that that event must be shown for all the types of responses.

And most of the changes, also release 1.6, what was the section that I was talking about regarding the path forward to implement or support JSContact in the future. So this is going to allow those implementers to start playing with that new technology without impacting the current clients so far.

And as Marc was mentioning, most of the changes are going to be in the 2.7 section which is related to contacts, and this is basically where all the requirements related to redaction in which data elements of the contact information must be shown or shall be shown in the response.

So if you're interested in the let's say meat of the changes that we did regarding the original policy, this is a section to look forward. And, well, I can scroll down. I don't know if you have any questions. But that's basically the section that's offered most of the changes.

And the also really important section is I'm going to scroll down to the end. It's Appendix E which basically defines how the redaction is going to work for each specific data element based on the new draft that is being developed.

I should mention this at the beginning. The IETF is developing this new specification called draft IETF regext RDAP redacted, that is going to allow the RDAP server to provide an indication of which elements have been redacted in the response. And this is what this appendix is trying to define here, is how the technical requirements for that indication of redaction is going to happen for every data element in the [inaudible] policy.

So that's also the really important appendix that was added in this version of the response profile. So those are the high-level changes. Marc, I don't know if you want to add something else.

MARC ANDERSON:

That was a great summary. I don't I don't have anything to add to that. Other than maybe just give a shout out to Gustavo for all the work he did, including he suggested some nice changes to make the profile much more readable. You know, sometimes, I think the profile was suffering from edits to edits to edits and got a little unwieldy and Gustavo suggested some rework that really cleaned it up and made it much more readable and really helped us move things along. So great summary, and just want to tip my hat to the work Gustavo did in the working group. It was really key to getting us where we are today. So thanks, Gustavo.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Sure. Thank you guys. Dennis, back to you.

DENNIS CHANG: Hey, Jody, do you have anything to add?

JODY KOLKER: No, I don't have anything else to add. I think, tip my hat to Gustavo and to Marc, I think both did a great job of reviewing this. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, guys. Thank you very much for the kind words to Gustavo too. So let's move on then. So let me share, I guess, my screen again. And let's look at—so I wasn't going to have a special meeting on this. But as long as we're here, let's just take a look at these cleanup things. I want to be as clear and transparent as possible. And what we're doing is making a few minor edits. Because we had time, we decided to go ahead and do this to sync up with the RDAP review and everything else.

So if you had any comments on the changes that we did, it's like there's nothing wrong with having it as A5.2.1, A5.2.2., but I must tell you, we have some members who are—we love them as we affectionately call them our [inaudible] champions, and they really wanted to see it in order. So I said, okay. We love that.

And then just another consistency in language. It is obvious, but let's just make it even more obvious. We want to make it as easy as possible

for the reviewers to get at it. And it's really clean. We've been going over this document for many years now. So I think that's what I wanted to show you.

And then these are the final three—maybe not final, but the three outstanding tasks for the IRT. And you'll note that they are all completing tomorrow. And that's by design. And at the end of tomorrow, Thursday, I am declaring pens down Thursday. And we're turning it over to our public comment team.

Andrea happens to be on that team. And she and her team is just going to pick the whole thing over and go to public comment process and there's going to be some processing to be done in a few days. But we're opening on Wednesday next week. It's a big moment for all of us. I just can't thank you enough for hanging here with us all this time. We're finally getting it done.

Anything else? I didn't have anything else on the agenda. Let me know if anybody would like to ask questions, say something. How are you guys all feeling? Relieved? Eric? No apology necessary. I kind of warned you on the email that this might be a short meeting. I'm glad you caught it. But we're done.

If not, how about we end the meeting super early? This is the shortest IRT meeting in history. Wait a minute, Marc has a hand up.

MARC ANDERSON:

I don't want to keep the meeting from going longer than necessary, but I'd be remiss if I didn't thank you, Dennis. This has been a long slog,

challenging at times. And you've been there leading this from the beginning. So thank you. I really appreciate your patience and thoroughness and the job you've done, and I think that's probably safe to say others feel the same. So thank you very much for an amazing job. And congratulations on getting us to public comment.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you, Marc. Yes. Congratulations to all of us. It was truly a teamwork. I say that again and again, teamwork all around, here and out. I can't just express how much appreciation I feel for all of you guys supporting us. Thank you so much.

I don't think we're going to have another meeting before KL. We may if we see a need. So why don't we say goodbye and see you in KL? Now, just a quick show of hands. If you know you're going to be there, can you just raise your hands? And Andrea take notes. Don't be afraid to raise your hand. I may have a job for you in KL. So that's great. Thank you so much. Shall we say au revoir, KL? Have a safe trip, and look for the exciting announcement coming out from Andrea's team. And we can truly celebrate online. Bye now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]