
SUE SCHULER: Thanks. Okay, Rick.

RICK WILHELM: Thanks, Sue. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everyone. Today is 2nd April 2020. This is Rick Wilhelm from Verisign. And today is our regularly scheduled meeting for the RDAP Working Group.

So, thanks, everybody, for joining. As we can tell by our attendance today, the Transfer Review Scoping Team appears to have ended its work because we are certainly are not giving away free prizes today for attendance at the RDAP Working Group. So, we've gotten great attendance today. I did get one regret from Jim Galvin who is unfortunately not able to join us.

I did have a chance to send out some meeting notes for our pro forma agenda. Did that earlier today a couple of hours ago. Hopefully, you had a chance to read them. So, we will do our obligatory agenda bashing here at the beginning to see if anybody has any comments on the agenda. We'll look for hands. Seeing none, we will go ahead and dive right in and maybe towards the end, we will have ideas for prizes next time.

So, onto implementation. The file has been updated on 3/28. We are still at 825 URLs in the file for registries. So, it's been basically stable here for the most recent three months. And over at the registrar side, it ticked up a little bit. We did touch the 2300 mark which is nothing

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.

magical at all other than it is a nice round number. It says an update from 3/17. That number was ... Let me look here in my browser. I've got a small typo in my notes. The registrar file, that should have said 3/27 there. So, typo in my notes there. Sorry about that. Go up just a little bit, Sue. Yeah. As of 3/27, it was 2300. So, we did touch that a little bit ago.

So, moving onto some old business. We had a discussion earlier way back on 3/10. Sarah brought up this topic of the WHOIS accuracy URL. We had some discussion on email around this, that we sort of got to the notion that the current profile document was correct. We had a good comment from Owen on the thread, which Owen is one of the folks that wasn't able to join us here.

But then further—if you want to scroll down a little bit more, Sue—we did have a comment on March 24th from Karla, who had a [inaudible] to some confirmation, and if you follow those links there that you can see that link there on the RDDS Labeling Policy 270201 does confirm this one, I think. So, I think that this does close this out.

So, I think this is closed out. Anybody have any questions on this one? So, we're using the [Wick If] link instead of the InterNIC link? Yes, that is correct, Sarah. So, the profile is accurate. Anybody else have any questions or comments?

SARAH WYLD:

Hey, Rick. It's Sarah.

RICK WILHELM: Go right ahead, Sarah, Please.

SARAH WYLD: So, thank you very much and I really appreciate this team's attention to that question. I will have some work to do on my side to make that update because I had certainly missed that in the past. So, I kind of think maybe our technical implementation guide would benefit from just a note about this because if you're just starting with the RAA requirements and then you go straight to the profile, it's kind of not clear [inaudible] that this. Thank you.

RICK WILHELM: Okay. Your audio chopped a little bit there for me but I think that what you were saying was that it may be a good idea to put just an elaboration note into the TIG, to just point this out. Yeah. Okay. And maybe what we could do there, I guess as the saying goes, as it's said in the IETF "suggest text".

And to Roger, we don't right now have active draft versions of the new ones because right now we don't have a reason to have active drafts but that's easily done. We do have a spreadsheet for tracking changes that's running around. But that's easily enough done. So yeah, that's a good idea. Very good. Anybody else on this one? Seeing none. Okay. Very good. We'll move onto the next one.

This is one we've been holding open around RDAP. Source complexity. I think this is pretty straightforward. We're just kind of holding this one open to see if Jothan has any use cases that are not handled by

redirects. And I see Jothan here. We'll let him either raise his hand or comment in the chat if he has anything new.

JOTHAN FRAKES: I won't raise my hand because I'm using my mobile. I don't have any new reports, nor do I have any research cases since the last meeting.

RICK WILHELM: No problem at all.

JOTHAN FRAKES: But I do appreciate us leaving this open. I suspect that's a good course of action to hold it open. Thanks, Rick.

RICK WILHELM: No problem at all. We'll keep tracking it. Very good. Okay. And on the meeting planning item that we just sort of have there as a standing one, GDD Summit, of course, has been canceled.

And it was mentioned yesterday by Keith Drazek in the Registry Stakeholder Group that ICANN 68, Kuala Lumpur, is heading virtual. Not seeing that published on email but that's what was described there. So we'll probably, since it's going virtual we will probably, if it does go that way will probably just keep with our regular tempo and do our consistent practice of just keeping with our regular tempo rather than using a slot during the ICANN week to take a meeting and that will allow our schedule to continue. Allowing these folks here to participate during

other sessions during ICANN 68 week assuming that it runs roughly like ICANN 67 did.

So, we'll just kind of keep that penciled in for now. We obviously have a fair bit of time and these are certainly very dynamic times. So that's just a comment on that.

Anybody else have any thoughts on meeting tempo and such? We've gotten plus ones on bi-weekly tempo from Roger and Jothan. Anybody else has any comments there? Justin agrees with bi-weekly. Very good. All right. Let's move onto the microwave.

Heading first to the EPDP IRT. Perhaps we can get one of the IRT members to raise a hand and give a quick update for the RDAP group here. Let's see, Marc Anderson, please go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Rick. Can you hear me okay?

RICK WILHELM: Yes, we can. Please dive in.

MARC ANDERSON: I kind of agree with what Sarah is saying in chat. There's not really a whole lot to say. We did have a meeting last week of the IRT. We continued through some of the open items there.

Following the call, staff requested that the meeting that would have occurred next week be canceled, meaning there will be a full month

between IRT meetings. And my take based on what Dennis said on the call is that the staff is struggling a little bit with the impacts of the Coronavirus working from home and that maybe the IRT has been impacted as a result. So, they essentially asked for a little more time between meetings. This, of course, impacts us. They are unable to give a date on when they expect the first draft of the Phase 1 Policy to go out for public comment. I think that would be a natural point for us to consider picking up the pen on a rewrite of the RDAP profile. but considering where we are, it feels like this group continues to be in a holding pattern awaiting further progress of the IRT. So that's kind of my 5,000-foot take on the IRT.

RICK WILHELM:

Okay. Very good. Thank you very much. So, we will continue to hold. Very good. Any other IRT members have anything to add? "Good update," says Roger. Very good. Okay. Thank you very much, Marc. Moving on to EPDP Phase 2. Mark Svancerek?

MARK SVANCAREK:

Hi, everybody. Today we started looking at the public comments. The public comment period closed on the 23rd, except it kind of didn't because we have exceptions until sometime in May because of Coronavirus which means also that the comments we've received now are sort of weird half collection of some groups that have submitted them and some groups haven't, some third parties have submitted them, most of civil society hasn't. But we decided that we would plow

ahead anyway. Today was the first day that we attempted to look at the public comments.

But unfortunately, the process that we were to follow was not well described in advance. We spent about 45 minutes of a two-hour call just debating what the process for today should be and—surprise—we didn't actually come to any good consensus on that.

So, it was a pretty unproductive call today. I do have some concerns about some of the discussions that we had today. But hopefully the next meeting will be better. Hopefully, there will be more clarification on what we're doing and how we will approach it while we're in the meeting. We'll see. So, Marc can add anything he wants to add but I think that would be my summary of where we're at right now. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Very good, Mark. And let's go from one Mark to another Marc. Go ahead, please.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Rick. I agree with what Mark said. And just tack onto that, I will say that last week we did finish our work on the Initial Report Addendum. I want to say the 26th is the actual date we wrapped that up. So that did go out for public comments and I believe that has a 5 May close day. So, the Initial Report Addendum is out for public comment. And I just agree with Mark, we started our deliberations on public comments on the initial report itself. It was a little bit of a rocky

start but that may be par for the course for this group and this subject matter.

RICK WILHELM:

Very good. I think that's an old hand from Mark SV. Very good. All right. Anybody have any questions on Phase 2? Good stuff. We'll be standing by there also.

So once again holding once, holding twice. And as you know how this will all go. We will get hit from both the IRT and Phase 2 at once as Murphy's Law will no doubt have it. Okay.

Let's move onto IETF REGEXT. We don't have Jim Gould here but maybe, Scott, could I call on you? Scott, there we go. Got his hand in the air. Scott, please go ahead.

SCOTT HOLLENBECK:

Thanks, Rick. The IETF me last tweek virtually for the first time ever. But the REGEXT Working Group did not. The agenda was trimmed down significantly. REGEXT did not make the cut. There is a virtual interim meeting scheduled for 27 April. It looks like the agenda for that will be pretty much like the agenda we had planned for the in-person meeting.

So, lots of discussion about things that are going on. But nothing of immediate concern or action. And we'll see what comes out of the interim meeting after the 27th.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you very much. April 27th for those of you who are interested in attending. If you don't have the meeting info on that one for the April 27th, you can just reach out to Galvin or Scott or you can just do a little Googling, IETF REGEXT, and you'll be able to find that, should be able to do that. I could provide that for you too. Marc Anderson's hand in the air. Marc, please go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Rick. Just to add to the REGEXT note from the TechOps group. We are looking at scheduling a joint TechOps/REGEXT meeting. And we have proposed 22 April as a date for that. We're waiting to hear back from Jim Galvin if that date will work but that is a potential date for a joint TechOps/REGEXT meeting.

RICK WILHELM: Okay. Very good. Thank you. It will be interesting to see if Galvin wants to do that joint meeting before the interim meeting or if he wants to switch those around but that we'll defer to him and [Antoine] as co-chairs about that.

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah. I'll say Jim liked the idea of having it ahead of the virtual IETF 107 meeting, but like I said on the TechOps side we're waiting to hear back from Jim. So, the ball is in his court.

RICK WILHELM:

Okay. Great. Sounds good. Very good. Okay. On the RA/RAA Amendment, I'll give a quick update here.

The Contracted Parties House group has been meeting working on the term sheet language. Getting pretty close to having that ready to go the various stakeholder groups for review, but it's not quite there. We'll be working on that again soon and that will be going to the various stakeholder groups for their review. So, stay tuned for that inside of your particular stakeholder groups. But no major changes there. Progress is steady but certainly slow. Any questions on the RDAP RAA Amendment topic?

Seeing none. Okay. ICANN feedback on the NSp situation with the software updates. I thought I saw ... There's Karla. Hey, Karla, any updates on ICANN stuff? "Nope," she says. Very good. I'm sure the ICANN team is very busy, so no surprise there. We'll standby on that one. Okay.

So, let's head over to any other business. Do we have any other topics that anyone would like to bring up today in Land of RDAP? Looking around for hands. I don't have any. So, let's look real quickly at the calendar. Today is April 2nd. Two weeks from today by my math is April 16th. I see an item that Sue has sent out calendar invites, at least in my diary. So, if you don't have one for April 16th please holler to Sue and let her know.

I think that's about it. So, let me do one last call. Otherwise, we will I think be pretty much wrapped up. Anybody have any other last ones?

Very good. Seeing nothing we will give you all back a little bit more time in your day. Sue, you can take us on out.

SUE SCHULER: Well, here's the prize. Unfortunately, it has to be virtual but there's a beer.

RICK WILHELM: It's 5:00 somewhere, folks.

SUE SCHULER: There you go.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Well done, Sue.

SUE SCHULER: Good job. Michelle, please end the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]