

RDAP Work Group

17 October 2019

SUE SCHULER: Okay, thanks. Okay, Rick.

RICK WILHELM: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. This is Rick Wilhelm from Verisign, and this is our regularly-scheduled meeting of the RDAP Working Group. Today is 17th October. Thanks, everybody, for joining. As mentioned a brief bit earlier, I've gotten regrets today from Roger Carney, but otherwise, we have a good smattering of our usual crowd. And we will see a couple of the EPDP members, I'm expecting, trickle in, as that meeting seems to have ended relatively on time.

We sent out the standard agenda here a few hours ago. Hopefully everybody had a chance to review that, and Sue has it out on the screen. We'll do a little bit of agenda bashing here, and give a chance for folks to raise their hands, and see if they have any suggestions for the agenda, and/or any comments, anything that they would like to bring on as a walk-on topic to make sure that we get to, or anything like that. Looking for hands. Alright, seeing none, we will proceed onward post haste.

First up, any discussions, or topics, or reports in and around implementation status. While you're gathering your thoughts, we'll look at the URL count here. We did not have an update from IANA this week on the registrar URLs in the Bootstrap file. There were 834 last week, and an update was not published. Over on the registrar side, we had an update of 17 from the version that was published on the 10th.

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.

I expect that later today ... It seems like IANA is on a cycle of publishing this thing a few hours after our meeting. The version that I've updated here is from the 10th at 20:40, and so, presumably, the version that gets published may have a few more, but we've been getting a steady update. Sorry, I said 17. That should have been seven. My math was incorrect that I was doing with my eyes. So, sort of a gradual up climb there in the number of IDs in the registrar file. Any questions or comments about that? Going once. Going twice.

Seeing none, let's pivot onward to probably our main topic of the day, ICANN 66, Montreal schedule, mostly focused on the public session. We do have our working group slot, still on Monday. That hasn't changed from 10:30 to 12:00. We're embedded inside of CPH Tech Ops. I did not look at the official ICANN-published schedule that went out. Sue, I think we're still on from 10:30 to 12:00 on Sunday. Is that correct?

SUE SCHULER: Yes, we are.

RICK WILHELM: Alright, very good. And then I also assume that we're still on Monday from 15:15 to 16:45. I looked at that one. That's also correct?

SUE SCHULER: Yes, we are.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. When I looked at that meeting, I noticed that we did not have a blurb in our section, so I'm proposing the one that you can see there underneath the words "I would propose." You can see it's similar to what we had there in Kobe. We do need a few marketing words, in order to drive folks into the meeting, because everybody knows that you need a few marketing words.

"The panel session of RDAP Working Group members, providing an update on the recent RDAP deployment, along with a preview of next steps, and an opportunity for Q&A." Proving my mettle as a marketing copywriter, there you got it. Would like to get a consensus on this. You can express that by your yes/no checkmarks. Jim Galvin says yes. He's quick. Sarah Wyld says yes. Any other yeses? Jody says yes. If you object, very importantly, that's also important to get. Alright, everyone else is either ambivalent or says yes. Okay, very good. We've got consensus. Sue, that look okay to you? See any problems with that?

SUE SCHULER: Sorry. I was doing something else. Yeah, no, that's good.

RICK WILHELM: Alright. Very good. So, you can [inaudible]. You can copy and paste that into whatever needs to be done and take it from there.

SUE SCHULER: While I'm on this as opposed to typing it out, I just want to mention that there is a session on Sunday, from 8:45 to 10:15, called "Understanding ..." Well, that one's the "Understanding DNS." I'm sorry. There another one called "Understanding RDAP," and I

don't know why they couldn't find a different name for it, but there it is. It's from 10:30 to 12:00. It's under their "How it Works" series. This is a thing that's being given my ICANN, but they named it "Understanding RDAP." I don't know if that's going to cause confusion—if we want to change the Monday name—but this is part of the series that you guys have been doing. It's just something that I wanted to bring to your attention, anyway.

RICK WILHELM: Yeah. Okay, well I guess maybe we should change the title on ours, because theirs is part of their "How it Works" series. That 8:45 one is part of their ... I know which one you're talking about.

SUE SCHULER: Yeah, it's at 10:30 on Sunday—the "Understanding RDAP."

RICK WILHELM: Okay, so we should probably change the name of ours. Maybe it's like ... There you go. Sarah is quick on her feet. Jim Galvin has his hand up. We'll go to Jim, but I liked what Sarah typed into the thing. Jim, please go ahead.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah. I thought, unless I'm completely confused here ... I was just about to go look at the detailed agenda to see what I remember, but isn't the Sunday morning meeting ... That's the Tech Ops session.

SUE SCHULER: Yes, Jim. This is a session that's being given by ICANN, and is part of their "How it Works" series. This has nothing to do with the RDAP Work Group at all.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. I'm sorry. Maybe I'll just defer to you, Rick, because I'm not tracking what the problem is here at the moment. Are there three meetings scheduled with the same name? I'm just confused. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Yeah. The problem is that there's a name collision—as Sarah types in there, two different meetings called "Understanding RDAP." This one apparently escaped the notice of the NCAP project. They're using the term "Understanding RDAP" here in the same thing. And so, therefore, it probably makes sense ...

This "Understanding RDAP" topic has been presented before as part of the "How it Works" series. Last time, it got two conducts—I think one on Saturday, and one on Sunday, I believe. This is sort of a canned presentation that someone from ICANN staff gets. It's like an introduction to RDAP. But it's a different level of ... It's like beginner's RDAP kind of a presentation.

The situation we have is that our presentation—our panel session—and this one both have the term "Understanding RDAP," and for the uninitiated, it would be very confusing. So, I'm wondering if the term that ... If we used either the verbiage that Sarah proposed—"RDAP Working Group Public Panel Session—" or maybe something like "RDAP Working Group Public Outreach Panel Session—" something like that, maybe that would be helpful. Jim, is that a new hand or an old hand?

JIM GALVIN: Same hand, I guess, but another comment is coming up. Thank you for that. You're saying all that out to me, but now I have to confess. I'm looking at the calendar for ICANN 66, and I don't even see the Monday afternoon session at 3:15 listed.

RICK WILHELM: Okay. It's there, because ... It's the one that ends in 917. There we go. Sarah is like ... She must have just reloaded her coffee, because she's on fire today.

JIM GALVIN: Oh, son of a gun. Yes, she is. I got it now. Okay, I see it. Thank you. I've connected all the dots. I agree with you, Rick. We should change our session to something else on Monday. Okay, thanks. Sorry to distract. I got it now.

RICK WILHELM: That's okay. Let's see if we can work on a new title here. Maybe something like ... Okay, I like what Sarah just typed there—"RDAP Working Group Public Outreach Session." How about that? Okay, Jim says plus one. You can indicate your agreement, either with your plus ones or by your checkmarks in the whatever that's called—your yes/no things. I'm in agreement. I kind of like it. Katrin likes it. Alright. Sue, does that look good to you—changing the name to "RDAP Working Group Public Outreach Session?"

SUE SCHULER: Yep. I can get that done.

RICK WILHELM:

Alright, look at us. Setting them up and knocking them down. Very good. Okay, so now we have a blurb. We have a new name. It's like this session is molting in front of us, like a caterpillar or something like that. Actually, I don't know what caterpillars do, but it's almost like we're professionals. Let's keep that secret. Maybe we'll need to edit the transcript. Okay, very good. I think it's birds that molt.

Okay, very good. Now, let's change gears only in the slightest, and let's go look at the actual content. Now that we've been flogging both the title and the blurb, let's get to the actual content. I will go ahead and paste the link to the Google Doc here in the window, so that you can click on it. That should be the same link ... Yes, ends in mam/edit. That should be the same link as in the thing. So, you can have a look at that, and that can be both up in your editor, and Sue has it on the screen.

This is based on some notes that I'd taken, and then I did some actual thinking, dare I say, while I was working on putting this together. So, tried to get together some thoughts about what this content might be for our session. We've got our list of panelists up here, those folks that have volunteered—Roger, Jim, Quoc, Sarah. And then, we've got some stuff in here, where we've got some comments from Jim, some comments from Sarah.

Why don't we go through and have some discussion about this? We can just go ahead and proceed in any order that we want. If you've got some comments that you'd like to make, please come to the mic. Jim is first. Please, Jim, go ahead.

JIM GALVIN:

Thanks, Rick. I'll just fill out a little bit on my comment there. Actually, I like your outline here. I don't have any fundamental issues with your outline. I think it's just fine. I think we have a choice, in terms of how we actually conduct ourselves. You can do a very quick, high-level bullet thing, and wait to see if we get any questions, and then dive down, so that we can get directly more to discussion and Q&A. Might be an interesting thing.

But I had one specific question about content, and it's really just a question, I suspect, that could fit in a lot of places. We do have all of Blanchet's work, and what he's been doing. I'm just wondering if that's what you're calling as minimal here—if that's what you mean by the comment. If not, then I'm calling it out as another bullet item. Then, I guess the impact would be ... That's the update into the core RFCs. I assume that's what's meant down below, at the bottom. The last thing is, again, Blanchet's work. I don't know if you were thinking in the outline that it falls in two places, or you had a different model, or did I miss something? That's it for me. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Sure. Thanks, Jim. Good comments. I'd actually not specifically thought about bringing in Blanchet's work, but I think that's a good one. I think that maybe what would be a good spot to talk about ... Maybe we would add another topic in the area of servers, and mention Blanchet's work there, and talk about servers, and about how we've seen ... We could talk about ICANN-accredited TLDs, ccTLDs, and also mention Blanchet's work in—the work that he's done in and around giving feedback to folks.

Maybe also, in the area of servers, we could talk about the pilot work that people have done. How about that as a way to expand

on that? Because the IETF impacts, I was thinking there more in the terms of minimal impact to standards. The text that you have highlighted there, I was thinking when I was typing it, was more minimal impact to standards. Thoughts about that as a possible improvement to the document? Jim, how does that sound. Works for me, I think.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah. Thanks, Rick. I said, “Works for me” in the chat room. I’m typing another comment on a different topic that you can get to when we get there. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Okay, very good. I added that stuff in there. Ya’ll can see that. Very good. Let’s see. Anybody else want to ... Sarah had made a comment in there that she said, “I can pick up on this stuff here,” about the profile. I think Sarah, based on your work in and around the PDP and the IRT, I think that’s a good spot for you to make those comments there, in and around the profile. Jim, you said that you had another comment that you wanted to make.

JIM GALVIN: I did, so thanks. I’ll just expand here. I made a comment there about ... Since I had briefly said I wondered if the way that we were going to run this session would be, potentially, really short intro—one slide to the moderator, if possible. That kind of puts this outline out there. In fact, maybe it should go in the intro description that we put on the page on the website, for example. Then, we really open up the floor immediately for questions and comments, and really drive towards promoting more discussion.

But if we're going to do that, I was thinking we probably need to tweak our session blurb a bit to make it clear that that's the format, if we're going to go down that path. Then, we can always backfill with detail, if we're struggling to get questions from the community. We certainly have enough material here that we can start to backfill with, if nobody jumps up with questions. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Okay, very good. Good point. Anybody have any thoughts or comments about that approach? Let's open it up and see what folks say. Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Good afternoon, everyone. I want to support that approach. I think it's really important to continue to push for engagement among other people who are not involved in this working group. One of the ways we can do that is by not having a lot of content to display. I think RDAP does have a bit of ... People see it as being a very dry and technical topic. It's actually quite interesting, and these meetings are a lot more fun than I think people who don't come to them would expect. So, one thing that we should do is certainly, as Jim said, try to emphasize discussion and ...

SUE SCHULER: I think we lost Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: Do you hear me now?

RICK WILHELM: Now you're back. You said, "I think we should try and emphasize discussion," and then the signal jammer kicked in.

SARAH WYLD: Okay. Thank you. Probably, that's the whole point. We should emphasize discussion. We should update the description to make it very clear that we do want to bring in people who are not part of the working group. Thank you.

RICK WILHELM: Okay, very good. Anybody else have comments or thoughts in this area? Okay, so given that, one of the things we might do is revisit the blurb slightly, to emphasize, "Bring your questions—" that sort of a thing. And then, one of the other things that we can do, then, is a little bit more ... would likely fall on my back. I'm not sure quite what the look is I have on my face.

I'll probably have this sheet that we put together here in front of me, and I would, then, have these topics teed up, such that if we're starved for questions, I would say, for example, "Jim, while we're waiting for someone to come to the mic, maybe you could ... You were deeply involved in the pilot. Maybe you could talk about some of what the community learned about servers that came online during the pilot—the server side during the pilot." Then, that would lead you to give a couple of sentences on that.

It would turn into more of a Q&A, where I would tee up and use this set of topics here to be asking you questions, as a proxy for audience engagement, if we run out of stuff from the microphone. Is that where we would end up at? We also don't want the thing to end, if people don't get up out of their chairs to ask questions at

the mic. Is that fair? Does that sound about right to everybody?
Plus one, says Jim. Okay.

And then, we would also encourage, I think, members—and we would have a chance to do this on Sunday—encourage members of the working group to be in the audience, to be plants, as we would say in the standup comedy game, to bring questions to the mic that are a little bit staged, if you will. In other words, even if we know the thing—not necessarily that Jody would come and ask a question of Roger, but also it could be that someone comes to the mic and says, “I don’t have a question, but I do want to make a comment.” And then, people on the panel can react to the comment—that sort of a thing.

So, let’s look here at the ... I think that’s Jim that typing into the ... Sue, could you scroll up in your window, to go more to the top? Jim, is that you with the new proposal? Let’s look at this as a possibly-refined blurb. “Panel of RDAP Working Group members, who will be available ...” Let’s work on refining this, because this looks good. I’d like to refine it to give a little bit more of an impression that we will share some information with them, but have some of this be like, “And we’ll also be available to answer questions—” something like that. Does that make sense?

I’m keeping my hands off the keyboard right now, to let other folks chime in on this here. Folks can come to the mic, too, if they’d like to, or you can just start typing in the Google Doc. That’s the magic of Google. Sarah says, “I like discussion-focused.” Sarah, you want to come to the mic and expound upon that? “It’s better when you do all the talking, Rick.” I love it. So, Sarah says, “Discussion-focused.” Sarah, do you want to try and ... Jim’s going to come to the mic, and Sarah, do you want to try and work “discussion-focused” into there, maybe? Jim, please go ahead.

JIM GALVIN:

Yeah. Thanks, Rick. I'll give your voice a little bit of a break, and really just vamp a little bit, and say that I agree with you. I understand what you're getting at. You want to make sure that people do understand that they're going to get something out of coming to the meeting, and coming to the discussion. I do agree that that's important. It shouldn't look like they're just coming to get questions answered. They should feel like they can come there, if they just want to hear a little bit, know that they're going to walk away with something, as well as giving a good amount of time, and make people understand that they really can come with any kind of question that they have.

I think that's the key distinction that I wanted to make. In promoting discussion, I really wanted to be able to say something about, "Please bring your questions—" some kind of reference in that way, and give that an equal balance against what you're saying, which is that we need to make sure that people understand they are going to walk away with something if they come here, as well as anything specific that they might have, that they want to address, too. I think that's what you're after. You can confirm that or whatever, and I'll just say thank you.

RICK WILHELM:

Yeah, Jim. I think that's a good way to phrase it. It's sort of like if we think back to University, we want to be ... We want it to be more than just, "You're coming to watch office hours happen." You're not just attending your professor's office hours. You're going to get ... It's more like you're coming to a lecture, but then you can also bring your questions—that sort of a thing.

Let's see here. "Panel of RDAP ..." Okay, so let's try and work on this. "Panel session—" I'm doing a little typing here—"of RDAP Working Group members, who will ..." Okay, so someone's typing. That looks like Sarah is typing "brief updates." Yep, I would say, "brief updates on RDAP deployment." Yep.

"A preview of ..." I'm going to stop typing there. Someone else is ... So, we've got "next steps" in there twice. Keep going, Sarah. Oh, I like that. Yep.

SARAH WYLD: Certainly, people should feel free to disagree. I'm not married to any of this text, but I think it gets to the points that you were making.

RICK WILHELM: Yeah, I think this is good. Okay. Let's say we're going to answer any RDAP questions. Okay, how's that look for folks? "Panel session of RDAP Working Group members, who provide brief updates on RDAP deployment, and provide a preview of next steps. The panel will answer any RDAP questions, and discuss open issues with members of the community, including the impact on RDAP internet standards." How's that sound? Do we think that the ... Does the thing on internet standards sound too out of place? Let me pose that to our resident IETF gurus, Jim and Scott. Jim, please go ahead.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah, it's funny you should say that, because I was just thinking that in the back of my mind, too. Let me try to express the point that I'm after. Maybe some folks have some better words here,

because it's easy for those of us who are entrenched in this to want to use phrases that we're used to and we like a lot.

What I really want ... To take a step back here, what I'm trying to express that I want people to see, especially for others who might not be actively engaged in the working group, is that, with respect to Blanchet's work in particular, we are noticing things about the standards. This gets us to the JSON work that Scott and others have picked up to do. There are technical issues that affect implementations, that we actually have something to say about. I'm trying to draw out the information a little more, and trying to say it maybe too succinctly.

Just want to make this session sound more interesting to technical people, who are going to be like, "Oh! I might have some work to do here. I should probably come listen to this." So, I'm happy to change that last phrase, but that's kind of what I'm after, in trying to pull that out. Any help in trying to do that would be appreciated. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Yeah. Got you. Very good. Really, I wonder if the word "impact" is the one that is hitting. I wonder if we want to say "interaction with." We want to be careful about the ... It's really not so much that this is impacting the standards, but the standards also impact the work. Scott, any thoughts as you see these words go by, from your perspective?

SCOTT HOLLENBECK:

No, I'm pretty much thinking the same thing as Jim.

RICK WILHELM: Okay, so do you have any issues with using the word “impact” there?

SCOTT HOLLENBECK: No. The impacts work both ways. We change things in standards space, we need to think about them from a policy perspective. We change policies, then we need to think about the standards implications, so works for me.

RICK WILHELM: Okay, very good. Let’s do this. Just because I’m sort of nitpicky, I’m going to nuke the word “any” before the “RDAP questions,” because I want to be careful about ... I’m always sensitive about the words “any” and “always” and “never—” these absolutes. So, let’s take that—“answer RDAP questions and discuss open issues.” I think that this one sounds a bit more engaging, and I like the thing.

So, now we’ve got Sarah’s thing here about ... Let’s go back to chat window. Over there on the lower right of your chat window, Sarah says, “Do we want to say something about encouraging people to bring questions for discussion?” Do we think this is enough? Is there a historical precedent for that kind of straight-up encouragement? Or is this enough, do we think? Anybody have any thoughts about that?

We could just do that—this blurb that ... I’m not sure who typed that in there. Is that Sarah that typed it in or Jim? I can’t really tell. It doesn’t really matter. Anybody have any perspective there? Jim says, “I have seen that before.” Does any one have ... I kind of like it, because I’m a direct person in my communication style, so I

kind of like it. Anyone have any objection to this? There's a hand.
Mark, please come to the mic.

MARK SVANCAREK: Thanks. It kind of implies that some people are going to be coming unprepared, so it seems a little pejorative to me. I think there was some other wording that Sarah had, I think, that I liked a little better. I think we do want to encourage people to ask questions. I do think that there will be some people who come prepared with questions, because they're already involved in this. "Please come prepared," though, that just seems a little judgy. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Okay, got it. So, Mark, being sensitive and reflective of, perhaps ... Maybe we should be concerned with our tone. "Please bring your questions—" just a little bit more direct—something like that. Ooh, there you go. "We encourage participants to raise questions for discussion." How about that, in the chat room? Wow. It's utterly polite. What do we think about that? "We encourage participants to raise questions for discussion." I love that. Okay, Mark says, "Works for me." Plus one from Jody.

Alright, I love that. Let's go ahead and delete "please bring your question." Whoever is the red editor, in there doing their work, you can go ahead and delete "please bring your questions." We'll do that. I love that. "We encourage participants to raise questions." Very good. The anonymous buffalo has taken that out. Okay, Sue. What do you think of that, Sue? Alright, Sue loves it. I think we've got a now-revised thing. Great collaboration. Thank you all very much.

So then, what we'll do ... We've got our blurb, and we've been working on this. I would continue ... My attention span is waning a little bit on looking at the topics themselves. I'm grinning. But we're more than happy to look at this document here. We can scroll down a little bit, Sue, in terms of these topics here. What we'll do is we'll plan on being short on the intro content. Maybe what we'll do is we will find a slide of metamorphosis—one of those great pictures that you find somewhere royalty free on the internet. That will be our intro slide—something like that.

And then, I'll basically keep these topics here on the one-pager in front of us. Depending on what our questions look like, what we'll do is in the intro, as we go down the row, each person can say ... Maybe what we would do is that each of our panelists might pose a question to the audience, if they wanted to, as part of their opening statements—something like that. I'll keep these things in the background, and then depending on what the audience participation looks like, we'll go ahead and be throwing these things out. We'll really be focused on this being a discussion.

Then, the other thing is this will really ... We'll really be leaning on the community to come up with topics. And then, if we do get into a situation where I'm throwing topics, we'll be looking on each of our four panelists to be able to ... You'll have a chance to expound a bit from time to time, and we'll need to get into some discussions ourselves. So, it'll be time to work on your various stump speeches I guess, if you will. I'm grinning. Sarah says, "I already regret volunteering." Or you can just bring slides that have a bunch of memes on them or something like that. There's always that. Any other comments in or about this one?

Alright. Seeing no hands, let's go back to the agenda, Sue. We're down to about 15 minutes. Let me just go briefly through our old

business. Quality control and registrar Bootstrap values ... We have no update on this one. And also on the timing of the MoSAPI updates, and which one is authoritative—registrar IDs versus the MoSAPI—no updates there. Both of these are still open with RDAP.

Was anybody else other than me on the Contractual Compliance Webinar on Tuesday, April 15th? If you were, you did see RDAP get mentioned at about the 17-minute mark or something like that. You can look at the slide there. Interestingly, Contractual and Compliance was talking all about the registrar IDs dot txt file. Did not make a single mention of the MoSAPI file—something that I certainly noticed, and that would presumably warm Jim Galvin's heart.

I did take note of that, but as I mentioned, we still have that topic open with ICANN support. Just mentioned that in passing. You can take a look at the recording yourself there, and skip ahead through the magic of Zoom recordings, which are a great thing. Questions or comments there? Okay, seeing none, we will head into the microwave. We can go first to the EPDP IRT. Let's see anybody want to pick that one up? Sarah Wyld, on fire today. Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD:

That sounds remarkably uncomfortable. IRT work continues. It's not as fast as I'd like it to be. I think that's pretty much a given. Nothing's ever as fast as I like. And it does not really affect the RDAP Working Group at this time. We are starting to close comments on some of the recommendations, really starting with the ones that were easier, in that they did not require IRT work, so we're done with those.

We talked a bunch about the policy effective date, and I don't think we came to any conclusions yet, other than it will not be February 29th, 2020. We talked about how to implement the recommendation about disclosure of nonpublic data separate from the Phase Two work of the SSAD, which is not considering RDAP for that implementation, so that's okay. And we had a very pleasant argument over consent for publication of the tech contact data. That was the IRT work, but again, I don't think it really matters to RDAP work at this time. Thank you.

RICK WILHELM:

Very good. Thank you. Anyone have any questions for Sarah? Alright, moving on. EPDP Phase Two—dish number two coming out of the microwave today. EPDP Phase Two ... Who's drawing the straw? Marc Anderson. Please go ahead, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Rick. I was waiting to see if Mark SV wanted to jump in, but I guess I'll go today. Similar to Sarah's update, I don't think there's a whole lot going on in EPDP Phase Two that directly impacts this group.

Items of note ... The EPDP did send out—I believe it was sent last Friday—a letter from the EPDP to the ICANN Board, soliciting their input on the amount of involvement that they are willing to agree to for ICANN Org, both from an operational and a legal liability perspective. I think this is a really positive development. It gives us a chance to get direct Board input that can help inform our deliberations. I see this as a pretty significant development. Obviously, the effectiveness—how useful it is—will ultimately depend on what the Board responds with, but I'm still encouraged by it.

Within the EPDP itself, we're continuing to deliberate on building blocks. Those building blocks basically constitute the main policy recommendations that were in the zero draft, and expect to be in the 1.0 draft that we'll be looking at when we get to Montreal. I will note, we had a call today, immediately preceding this call. The letters RDAP were thrown around a couple times during our discussion, including a couple interventions, including one from me, and one from Greg Aaron, talking about making sure our recommendations, ultimately, are implementable using RDAP.

So, we certainly have RDAP in the back of our heads, and the charter does specifically reference RDAP, in making sure that our recommendations are implementable using RDAP. That's certainly in the back of our heads, and something we're keeping in mind as we go through our deliberations and work on our policy recommendations.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thanks, Marc. Mark SV, you want to go ahead?

MARK SVANCAREK: Sure. Question for Marc Anderson, I guess. It feels to me like if we're going to create something that is implementable, we need to take an iterative approach. Here's the policy. Let's think how you implement it. Then, let's go back to the policy. Then, let's tighten up the implementation. That's how anybody would do any sort of a system design, I think, if you really wanted to shift the thing. It's not clear to me that that's actually how a PDP works. Certainly, it's not clear to me that that's how this EPDP works. So, I was just wondering what's your feeling about that? Thanks.

MARC ANDERSON: I guess my feeling is I 100% agree with everything you just. I don't know that that's going to make you feel any better, but I agree with what you said.

MARK SVANCAREK: Okay, thanks. Just need to know if I need to tie the knot in the rope or not. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: I don't think there's any need to be that drastic. There's always coffee.

MARK SVANCAREK: Okay, you're right. There's always coffee. There's always bourbon.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Got you. Very good. Anybody else have any other questions for Mark? Very good. Okay. IETF Regext. Jim, anything there?

JIM GALVIN: Not that immediately comes to mind. I didn't come to this meeting fresh with anything that I wanted to mention. I think we're okay at the moment, unless Scott wants to remind me of something I'm forgetting about. But I think we're good. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Got you. Okay, very good. I think it is still on track to have a joint meeting at CPH Tech Ops on Sunday in Montreal. Is that correct?

JIM GALVIN: Yes, that's correct.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Okay. And on the RAA Amendment, I can take that one. I think the group is just generally awaiting the notice from ICANN to begin the official negotiation period. That's sort of where that is right now, but no updates other than that. Jim, please go ahead.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah, Rick. This might be a little out of context—out of scope for this group—but I also thought ... Jeff had made a comment about ... Or no, it was Graeme who ... One of them had made a comment about whether we still want to get together ourselves, sometime before ICANN announces, to talk about the technical issues that are there. But I haven't seen anything more on that, since that question was raised. I guess that's probably beyond this group, so you can just say that and move on, if you want. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Yeah. I haven't heard anything else. I'm expecting to hear ... I'm halfway expecting the call to get together for a coffee at some point during Montreal, but that's all I'm gently expecting. That's all I've heard. I guess I haven't heard anything, and so that's what I'm expecting. Okay. Any other business that any would like to raise in or around this? Okay, nobody, AOB?

Okay, quick schedule ones. Ya'll can see what's on the schedule. My assumption is that we will keep 10/24 meeting that we have calendared. Typically, working groups, unless there's something

pressing, as the days get closer to travel, tend to start to wind down. I don't see anything that would be so pressing that we would need to be meeting on 10/31, the day before folks start to travel. I would be proposing that we would be able to skip 10/31. I'm pretty sure that I know a number of the EPDP members are going to be traveling on Friday for Saturday meetings.

So, my proposal would be to skip 10/31's. I'm not seeing anyone complaining in the chatroom. For one thing, our work docket is in pretty decent shape here. For one thing, we're going a good job of getting our plan together for our meeting right now, so that Sue is not panicking that we will not have our act together for Montreal, so that's all good for you, and for everybody here.

Now, let's look post-Montreal real quick. I would like to straightaway get the 11/14 meeting booked on the calendar, because if we look out at November, it looks not that great for a meeting schedule, because 11/21 would collide with IETF Singapore. Our meeting timeframe would put us at midnight on Thursday night, or very early Friday on Thursday, which is not the best time.

So, while we may still have our ... I'm not sure how many people are planning on being in Singapore. I'm planning on being there, but as it turns out, I'll be getting on a plane right around the time that our call will be happening, to get on a plane to come back. So, I won't be able to make our normal time. We theoretically could move our time, but that starts to cause other problems. I'm not sure who else is going to be going to Singapore and such.

We also don't have to decide this now, but my expectation that we would either need to cancel the 11/21 meeting or move the time to something earlier in the day on the 21st. And then, the 28th, we'd

skip it for the US Holiday. But right now, I'm actually, candidly not seeing that we would have a ton on our calendar coming out of Montreal that would drive us to really need a meeting on the 21st. So, unless that would change, I would tentatively pencil in that we would skip the 21st. So, that's where I would be right now. Jim Galvin, please come to the mic.

JIM GALVIN:

Thanks, Rick. Here's a new proposal. I say we just declare November a wash, and move on, and start on the 5th. I say that, agreeing with your assessment about the 21st and 28th, although we could leave open the idea that on the 21st, we might move it if we find something urgent in Montreal.

But I think that it's much more typical not to meet, both the week before and the week after an ICANN meeting, unless you really have work to do on a schedule and a timeline. I'm thinking that we're not, so I'm supportive of not meeting on the 31st and the 14th, since those surround the week of the ICANN meeting. So, yeah. Let's just declare November a wash, and next meeting is the 5th, after next week. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Let's put that out there. We can put that out there. Anybody else have any thoughts? No one else has any thoughts. Katrin says that's fine. Jody says, "I'm fine at this point." Okay, so let's put it out there at this point. We can also take it under discussion on Sunday, in Montreal, at our meeting. If we decide that we want to have a meeting on the week after ICANN, then we can book that. I think that's a fair point, Jim. And we can talk on Sunday, 11/3, and go ahead and do that.

Why don't we go ahead and do that? I am a little bit ambivalent about taking the whole month off, as I sort of have my scrunchy face on, but I understand, Jim, your point, and I think it's a very fair one. We'll chat on Sunday, 11/3. I think that takes us up to the hour. Anybody have any last topics here?

SUE SCHULER: Hey, Rick?

RICK WILHELM: Yes, please. Go ahead, Sue.

SUE SCHULER: Just a query ... Are we going to stay at noon, or are we going to stay at 16:00, when I go to book, because of Daylight Savings Time?

RICK WILHELM: For me, the noon hour Eastern works well, but I'm not sure. My preference would be to stay at the noon hour. By the time we rebook, everyone will have flipped. Sarah says, "Can we coordinate against the EPDP schedule, so we do not return to an overlapping meeting time?" I think, let's be sure to do that, so we don't get an overlapping meeting time with the EPDP. Let's make sure we go adjacent to the EPDP. Do we know what the EPDP is doing in the future?

SUE SCHULER: Sarah, can you answer that? I don't know.

RICK WILHELM: EPDP will stay at 14:00 UTC, and so that means ... Okay, so I would prefer ... We wouldn't overlap if we stayed at noon Eastern. Is that right?

SUE SCHULER: No. If we stayed at 16:00, that would put us at 11:00 a.m. Eastern. So, if you want to move to 17:00, that would keep us at noon.

RICK WILHELM: Yeah. It's far enough out that I could go either way. If you guys want to be adjacent to the EPDP, that's fine, if that helps you, for the EPDP folks. I'm flexible in that regard. We're going to be rescheduling these into fresh calendar territory, so I'm flexible. EPDP members, we'll let the three of you comment here, and see if you have a preference. Thoughts? No comment? We'll take it up on Sunday in Montreal. We're grinning—maybe with a cup off coffee and a ... Sarah wants to abolish the time change. Okay. We'll take it up on Sunday, Sue.

SUE SCHULER: Okay, then I won't [schedule] into December. Okay.

RICK WILHELM: Good catch. Thank you very much.

SUE SCHULER: Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Alright, we're done, Sue. Thank you very much.

SUE SCHULER: Thanks. Okay, Michelle. We can end the recording.

RICK WILHELM: Alright, cheers.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]