

---

SUE SCHULER:                   Okay, Rick.

RICK WILHELM:                Very good. Thank you, Sue. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Today is 10 December 2020. Welcome to today's regularly scheduled meeting of the RDAP Working Group. I'm Rick Wilhelm from Verisign, your host for the day. Thanks for everyone for joining. We are going to try and go through our agenda that was sent out on e-mail a few hours ago and it's sitting here on the screen. Before we get into it, anybody have any questions, comments, concern? We'll do a little bit of agenda bashing. I'm looking for hands. I'm seeing none. We will go ahead and dive on in. We've got the URLs there for the accounts and the bootstrap files. I checked and those are still representative. So that's that.

We will not spend a ton of time at the microwave later but I do want to do a little bit of discussion on Galvin's e-mail. I didn't get any regrets from Galvin today but he hasn't shown up at the meeting yet, but we did have a topic on this thing of blank fields, a bit of a proposal from Jim today that came in about 40 minutes before the meeting started. Sue has very effectively thrown that up on the screen. Thank you very much, Sue. I wanted to bring that up here and bring that up for some discussion. I'm not sure if everybody had a chance to go ahead and read it, but I wanted to throw that open. At first glance, it seemed pretty reasonable to me but I wanted to throw it open for discussion. Any comments,

---

*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.*

questions? I'm looking for hands on this one. Let me see. No hands as of yet. Anybody have a chance to parse it?

Let's see. Sarah has a comment in chat. Marc, do you want to talk? Sue is going to ping Jim to see if he's coming. I think that maybe what Sarah's commenting about is maybe there's some overlap with what's going on in the IRT. Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. Hi. I thought that Jim's proposal here is intended to make the RDAP profile aligned with the policy requirements coming out of the IRT. So when you say that there's overlap, I would definitely think that that is the case, yes. And maybe I'm misunderstanding, but I'm not seeing that Jim's suggestion matches what I expect the new policy to require. I don't think Jim is in the IRT. I'm not sure that he has access to that new policy. Maybe this whole conversation would make more sense after it goes to public comment. That's another issue, yeah.

For number one, "When data does not exist, not collected, not generated, then the element is not returned." I don't think that's what the policy is expecting. I think the policy is expecting that if a field does not have data—so, for example, the domain owner is an individual person and has no organization, and so the organization field is blank because data is not collected nor generated, I still think the policy expect that the organization field will be returned as a data element with a blank value. So, number one doesn't match the policy requirements so I'm not super clear on why that would be the right change to the profile. But maybe I'm misunderstanding. I don't know. I guess it would make more

---

---

sense to wait for Jim and talk about that. He's coming? Okay. I don't know. Should I continue with my questions, or should I just wait?

RICK WILHELM:

Good question. I'm going to bring Roger up here in just a second. But I think that really the kind of thing that you're getting at, Sarah, is that we've got to make sure that—I think that Jim is trying to make the profile make technical sense and you're pointing out that the profile's got to be in support of the policy is sort of a key point here. We need to reflect the primacy of the policy—not to be alliterative—and not the other way around is sort of the point that you're bringing up. Is that fair?

SARAH WYLD:

Yes. That's what I was saying. If we're changing the profile anyway, then we should make sure that that change is the right change.

RICK WILHELM:

Yes. That's good. I think that Jim probably—maybe one point of feedback that he might have—we'll let him come here and speak for himself—is that we need to try to inform the policy about ways that they could articulate the policy in ways that could make better technical sense in the land of RDAP. Maybe that's a point. Sarah, please.

---

SARAH WYLD: I wonder if it might be helpful to have a few people from the RDAP team here invited to an IRT call so that we can have that conversation with the ICANN team as well.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Good point. Roger, let me have you come to the mic, please. Go ahead.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Rick. I would just add—and I think this is where Jim was heading down—let’s make a distinction between what ICANN wants people to see and what the protocol needs to provide. ICANN wants people to see organization and a blank. But the protocol doesn’t need to provide that. It would not provide a tag of organization. The client would be responsible for receiving the RDAP response with no organization and displaying organization as blank.

RICK WILHELM: That’s a very good point, Roger. That’s an interesting point. What the protocol returns and what the user sees can be subtly different. Anybody have any comments related to that? Roger, please go ahead again.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Rick. Again, I think I’ll take this to the next step of redacted data, whatever the field. Registrant name is redacted. We wouldn’t have to return in the protocol registrant name and

---

then redact it. We would just return something that says this field is redacted and then the client would be responsible for displaying that however ICANN wants it displayed. I think, again, on those lines the actual protocol doesn't need to return exactly what ICANN needs to show. It needs to return so that the client can make sure they could show what ICANN wants. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you, Roger. Jim, please go ahead.

JAMES GALVIN: Thanks, Rick. I think I caught up with what's going on here. Let me say an overarching point here that I was trying to capture in the first sentence of my message there about presentation requirements versus protocol behavior. I tried to say this, I don't know, a month or so ago. We only meet every other week so it was only a couple of meetings ago. But I think it's really, really important here. The distinction that has to be drawn is that the policy is talking about what the behavior looks like to the user, and that is 100% completely independent of what the protocol needs to do. So we just need to provide in the protocol. That distinction is really important and that allows us to say that the policy is fine. I'm not suggesting any changes to the policy here in my note. Now, at the bottom, my last paragraph is simply suggesting, well, it would probably be helpful to add a little bit of explanation from the IRT about what's really going on. But I do think that the policy is fine, and then we just have to tweak a couple of things in the profile so that we say how to use the protocol to convey the right message to the policy, to the client so it can do the right kind of display.

---

The only last thing that I'll say is—I came in at the time when Roger was talking about the null issue. I put null in quotes there. That was a very deliberate thing there. I'm simply saying that we actually, in the profile, have to speak about what null is for each data element type. That's a concept that when I say defines null in my item three there. I'm defining a concept there. We have to expand on that in the profile. I hope that that helps and I don't mean to repeat anything that's been discussed. I apologize for being late. I'm happy to say more if that isn't clear enough. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Thank you very much, Jim. I think very good points there. Marc Anderson, please go ahead.

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

RICK WILHELM: Yeah, we can. Thank you.

MARC ANDERSON: Okay. Good. My Zoom crashed in the middle of—when Sarah was [speaking,] so I missed part of that. But I think I did get the gist of it. Also, think I get where Jim Galvin is going with his e-mail, though I have to admit just reading the e-mail on face value, it's not overly clear. Sorry, Jim.

---

I do think Jim's point about differentiating between what's delivered via the protocol, what's displayed via the client is important. I think that is a distinction that is 100% lost or not understood by ICANN Org, Dennis or probably any of the ICANN staff that are involved with drafting the policy. So that's probably the distinction maybe Roger, Sarah, and I need to attempt to explain to Dennis and staff on an IRT call. I think maybe if they understand that distinction, it would be helpful in moving this forward in the way that makes sense.

Jim, I don't remember if it was last meeting or two meetings ago when you were talking about this. You talked about buckets and saying the protocol needs to deliver three buckets' worth of information—one where there's data, return the data; one where the data is redacted, indicate that it's been redacted; and the third where there isn't any data, indicate there is no data. I thought that was important and that's something that seems to be missing from this e-mail. I think that will be important for staff and perhaps Alex Deacon, who's often our opposition on the IRT, to accept that because of concerns over understanding when the data is absent by error or when the data is absent by intent, so if you understand the distinction there. I think if we capture all that and deliver that in the protocol and the response from the server and leave the display up to the client, I think that meets the intent. But I think that that distinction is probably not understood by staff, and so we have an education task that's necessary here, if that makes sense.

---

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you very much, Marc. So that is a good point. The three buckets, we didn't hear about those. Jim, please go ahead.

JAMES GALVIN: Thanks, Rick, and thanks, Marc. The intent of my message is to capture those three buckets. I just didn't write this in layman's terms. [I wrote an engineering message] here and I didn't put all the context in there, which is fine. Feel free to call me out on things like that. We'll get this right. We'll work on getting the right explanation here.

When I wrote this message, I was focused on the fact that I think policy is fine. The policy as stated is okay. The only clarity that the policy needs is to really explain what publish means, I think. This is just my view. Because you're right, what you often see—and I don't know if we want to blame this on ICANN staff or whatever, I don't really think it's them in particular. I think this is sort of a general issue—people do often directly associate what a protocol actually does and what presentation actually does. As engineers, we understand the seven-layer model, and those are two different layers. I mean, what the protocol is doing is a different layer than the presentation layer, that the RDAP protocol is at a lower layer, that stuff that's going on there. And I think making that clear to the people who are thinking about the policy is what's important, that there's a distinction between what the protocol does and what presentation is. Publish is about the presentation. Publish is about ICANN wants to specify what the user has to have the ability to see, and that's critical. That gets us to the three buckets. The user

---

needs to be able to distinguish between data that's present, data that's not present, and data that's been redacted.

What I've done here in my steps one and two is suggest that those three buckets are there. The first point, one, is data that's not present. When data is not present, you don't return the element, which is currently what the profile says. What the profile has to add is step two. Step two there is making the distinction between data that's present and available and data that's present but unavailable based on whatever the policy distinction is. So the protocol response will either give you the data or if data exists, it will either give you the data or it will give you a "no value" for some specification of what null is, which is going to vary by data type. That's the point. So that's the three buckets. There are two buckets in step two and one bucket in step one. Then the policy is fine. The profile has to add this distinction about null and it has to say what null really is for each data type so it can provide the right signal to the client to make the right presentation for the user as specified by the policy.

I kind of just threw all that out there. I'm happy to help write this down and get this right but I think this covers everything. And I do identify two particular things that are worthy of some additional thought by the engineers in the group on the technical side. My intent there is to provide that mapping between the protocol response and the policy. I think all of that works with the exception of my two little concerns there that I called out that we should talk more about here once we agree that we've got the policy covered. I hope that helps. Sorry to be a little long-winded. Thanks.

---

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you, Jim. I think one of the things that we'll need to think about is if we think about requiring something of the client is that we sort of had here before been contemplating a vanilla web browser as a reasonable client. So if we're thinking about something, in other words, a sophisticated user with an ability to visually parse JSON could look at the raw JSON being returned and get a response back. We'll have to contemplate whether what we're thinking about requires a more sophisticated client than just an unvarnished browser. Thoughts on that? A couple of hands there. I think that Sarah shows first in my browser window. Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. I definitely think that this separation between what the protocol returns and what the client shows is, as has been said, not clear to the IRT team and that is definitely a gap. I'm just not sure how they resolve that. But who's writing a client? I mean, Marc Blanchet, right? But I'm not writing a client, I'm not required to do so, I believe. I think I'm required to output the data according to the profile. Yeah, I feel like there's this gap and I'm not clear how to bridge it. Thank you.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you, Sarah. Marc Anderson, please go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Rick. I was going to ask. Some of you I think are working on the discussions with ICANN about the RA and RAA amendments, and aren't there discussions there about ICANN

---

building a web client for access? Wouldn't that ultimately fall on ICANN? I know there could be third-party clients as well. Sarah mentioned Marc Blanchet and no doubt others will. Am I wrong in thinking that ICANN's planning to build a web client?

RICK WILHELM: Well, ICANN has a web client right now. Lookup.icann.org is obviously working right now. One of the discussion points in the negotiation is if the registries would be dropping the contractual obligation to have web-based—well, not dropping but not having an obligation to have web-based RDAP in the same way that registries have an obligation to have web-based WHOIS. Therefore, that obligation would be picked up by ICANN to have centralized web-based RDAP. Basically, lookup.icann.org would take over for www.whois.registry, that sort of a thing. Does that answer your question, Marc?

MARC ANDERSON: Yes. So lookup.icann.org—I dropped the link in there. That is hitting RDAP clients today, right, for registries and registrars?

RICK WILHELM: It is an RDAP client that's hitting everybody's RDAP server. Correct.

MARC ANDERSON: Okay. So I guess there is already a client in place, and this is parsing the results and displaying in a user-friendly manner

---

instead of just returning the raw data in not very human-readable format. So it seems like there is a centralized system already in place, so maybe some of these requirements around how it displays are really for lookup.icann.org. Again, I think maybe there's an education step we need to do with Dennis and the rest of the IRT staff.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Jim, please go ahead.

JAMES GALVIN: Thanks, Rick. Let me try to say it a little differently this bit about distinction between presentation and protocol. RDAP really does bring us into kind of a new space with respect to ICANN. Marc, you sort of touched on that when you talked about lookup.icann.org. We've been having this conversation about whether or not registries in particular are required. Like currently, registries in particular are required to have a web page for WHOIS lookups. There's been this dialogue about, well, you don't carry that forward into RDAP. That's just wrong because you shouldn't do that. The browsers should ultimately just take the JSON in and do something with it, or there should be NAP that just takes the JSON in and does something with it. It's really not appropriate for registries anymore to have the client.

One of the benefits of RDAP is specifically that you don't want a registry or registrar to implement a client. That's the feature of RDAP, that it in fact provides you with everything that you need and then you get to act in a local way in your local environment,

---

including doing things like translation and transliteration automatically on behalf of the user. You can put up labels any way that you want. You can color things any way that you want, whatever is appropriate, whatever font works for you. All kinds of things you can do. This is what RDAP gives you. This is its feature. This is why we wanted to move to it, and I think maybe that's a helpful way to present this to ICANN, too. You have to embrace the full user valued features of RDAP, and the way in which you do that is you want to have a certain behavior out of the response. You want the response to be able to make certain behaviors possible but you don't want to obligate anybody else to do a client because that's not appropriate anymore. RDAP is full-featured. You want clients to be able to do interesting things on behalf of their users. It's just important that the protocol give you the ability to make certain distinctions, and as long as it does that then the policy is met.

I don't know. I don't know if I'm helping or hurting here but I hope that storyline is helping at least a little bit and putting some of this on it. I mean, ICANN and I think the community at large has to get that and the lookup.icann.org is a client as we've said. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Very good. Thank you. Can I go to Mark SV? And then I want to cover up some things in the chat. Mark SV, please go ahead.

MARK SVANCAREK:

Thanks. Jim said a bunch of the things I was going to say but let me say from my own perspective. It's incomplete to think of

---

presentation as visual rendering of text in a browser. So Microsoft consumes a lot of WHOIS data today and will use RDAP to collect data in the future. So we're using RDAP as a protocol. Now, if I make a request for public data and I get a JSON structure back, that structure is composed of name-value pairs. I know which possible name-value pairs could exist. One of them—let's just use organization—is organization equals something. You think of it as within some parenthesis, organization, space, and then whatever that value is. If that name-value pair doesn't come back, I'm assuming that means it wasn't collected. You can call that null if you like. You can call it whatever you want. So just the lack of existence of the thing tells me, "That probably wasn't collected," assuming that the person on the other side who's using the protocol, their protocol is performing to spec. If I got a name-value pair organization equals something, like with no entry there, what does that tell me? That seems like maybe that's an error. It needs to be defined. That's talking about string values.

If we're talking about numeric values, what does that mean? Is there a way that we can represent rather than having a name-value pair where it's not actually a pair, where there's only the name and not the value? I think these are some things that Jim is talking about. So there will be other uses for the thing than just a human looking at some text in a browser on a screen. There'll be automatic systems and they need to be able to make these distinctions between "this doesn't exist because it was never collected" or "it exist but it contains this weird value that looks like nothing but actually it's something," or "the structure is not well-formatted." Actually, the server is throwing error of some sort—not throwing error. No. Producing malformed responses.

So just keep in mind that there are other ways to present the data. Other presentations, ways that we can consume it. I think these are some things Jim is trying to say and I'm just hoping that my personal real-world example maybe clarifies that a little bit. I hope so. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Thanks, Mark. I think that's a great point. The fact that RDAP is machine-readable means it will be machine-read. Just like WHOIS is machine-read now. Even though making it machine-readable is an extremely difficult technical problem, people still do it and are doing it as we sit here today. And RDAP being a proper protocol will mean that it will be machine-read even more. So therefore, these situations like whether or not the data doesn't exist or whether it exist and is blank are differences that we as technology folks need to be aware of and have our protocol account for. So I think those are very great points.

Marc Anderson, please go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Rick, and thanks, Mark SV, for that. What you just said is kind of the genesis of this whole discussion. I agree with you and I think you're preaching the choir a little bit, but I think the point you just made is not understood by Dennis and staff, which is kind of what started this discussion in the RDAP discussion group. Dennis and staff are expecting—using the organization field again—they're expecting the organization field to be returned at all times, whether there's data or not. And they don't understand the

---

---

point that you just made that as somebody writing a client, you assume that if the RDAP field isn't returned in the response then that data doesn't exist.

They further completely don't understand that if it is returned with blank or null value then that is sort of bad behavior that you assume—as somebody writing a client—it could be an error or otherwise some kind of wonky or bad form of response. That is a point that's completely lost on Dennis and staff. Really, that is what led to this whole discussion, I think. Dennis and staff are trying to insist that fields like the organization field be returned regardless of if there's data in that field or not. That has really led to this multi-meeting discussion that we're having today. So I hope that context helps. Especially from your perspective as writing a client, I hope you can bring that to the IRT. I think you're on the IRT, too, so I think if Dennis heard that from you, that would be helpful.

RICK WILHELM:

Thank you very much for that, Marc Anderson. Mark SV says in chat that "I can bring that to IRT." Galvin says, "A lot of people miss that point, though let's not single out staff is being somehow especially 'bad'." Roger Carney echoes that. But I think that really between these kind of comments, we're bringing this home and bringing it all together, is that maybe what we're getting at is that staff and the old-school way of looking at this, the WHOIS-bound way of looking at this means, "Oh, you need to return this data in this fashion," but the RDAP way of looking at it says, no, that actually being more explicit like that actually is harmful because it makes it more difficult to build a mechanized client, the kind that

Mark SV was thinking about. Because coughing up the data in this way and returning data when there really is none actually confuses the mechanized client.

So that sounds like the discussion that sort of agreeing with staff that we want the servers to be robust and complete and saying that we want them to show when there is and isn't data and provide that clearly and transparently. But in the RDAP way of doing things, the way to do that is with Galvinian buckets—waving my hands—and then here's how we go about doing that, not in the verbose WHOIS-ish way that it used to be done. How does that sound as trying to restate what we've been talking about? Does that sound fair, reasonably well? Okay. Roger, please go ahead.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Rick. I think that we've brought this up before but something not to forget is—and Mark SV kind of hit on it but didn't dive deep into it—some of this data is actually formatted or should be formatted. You run into the problems of, okay, if you return a phone number and instead of a phone number you put a blank, that causes problems. Or if you put spaces back, that causes problems. Or if you put redacted in there, that causes problems. Just something to remember, that many of these fields are expected to be certain values or at least constrained values. And when you try to force them all into basically text, it breaks them. Thanks.

---

RICK WILHELM: That's a great point, Roger. That's a really good point. Jim, please go ahead.

JAMES GALVIN: Just to build on what Roger said, that point about using the word "redacted" and having some token, there was some discussion on the mailing list about that. That's why I talked about null in my item 3 there. The idea is we're not going to force magic token values into the data elements. We're simply going to use—the signal is going to be about the presence or absence of the element and then the presence or absence of a value in the element. And that null can be whatever it needs to be for whatever the type is. If it's a string, then maybe it's an "empty string" and that's all that you put there. If it's a number, then maybe zero is the right thing. And I think in the context of this application, using zero or maybe not a value and not having a value—you can't really not have a value in there, maybe in JSON you can—but that's the point. In the engineering way, that's covered in that step three there, we have to, in the profile, sit down and spend some time figuring out what null is so that the right thing can be put in the JSON for use by the clients. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you very much, Jim. When I look at the chat, Sarah says, "So maybe the next step is to get some RDAP folks invited to an IRT meeting or maybe we have some RDAP folks that are there." I think Mark SV is on the IRT so he's obviously—or maybe there would be an action, maybe have Jim come as a

special guest. Maybe that would be sufficient because I think we already have Roger there as part of the discussion.

Any others that would—Jim, is that an old hand or a new hand? I can't quite tell. Old hand. Sarah says, "That works for me." So I think that this is a good conclusion. And everybody's rushing to go register some domain names and get some t-shirts made up. So, very good. Good stuff. Any other comments? I think this is very good progress today, although we've certainly blown our 30-minute budget. I apologize to all the Roger Carney devotees that are in the audience for that. Any other topics? Any other follow-ups on that one?

We had some comments in the chat. I think I saw a comment from Justin here. Let me scroll back to that one and let me just see if that one was overcome by events. Justin was commenting on, "Can the RDAP profile cover both the JSON output and language about clients? A profile that matches policy..." So this is about, do we need to discuss anything in the profile about clients? I'm not sure. I'm hesitant to bring the discussion about anything ranging the profile in the clients. That seems like a little bit uncharted territory, although I'm not sure. Justin, did you want to expound on that? The comment went by in the chat and I don't want to just kind of blow past it. So happy to take a hand on that if you'd like.

JUSTIN MACK:

Hey, Rick. Thanks. Just jumping on so you can see my COVID cut.

---

RICK WILHELM: I love it. I love it, man.

JUSTIN MACK: I hesitated going down the trail of trying to mandate what clients can and can't do. But the idea of keeping that distinction right between what's at the data layer in the JSON and what's presented, I just didn't know if we should even embark down that path of having the policy suggest things for clients to adhere to. And it doesn't mean that all clients have to do that but if you wanted your—just like we put in the RDAP profile of, "Hey, this is the ICANN format and here's kind of the version," clients could potentially do the same thing. "So here's my client that's following this ICANN determined policy." Not all clients would have to but if you wanted your client to adhere to the policy, then it could and it allows us a little bit more flexibility at that JSON layer to have things like non-existent fields and empty fields wrapped in a redacted element container, if you will. So it potentially gave you that flexibility to cover both sides, but just want to make comment about that. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: I think, Justin, that that's an interesting point. And maybe something that we give some thought to is, do we look at areas of the profile where we make comments to client implementers or say that—they would be non-normative comments, obviously or have an appendix. Jim Galvin says to bring it as part of an appendix. I think that Jim Galvin and I are both in the same thing, that we've got to make sure that it's pulled out to make sure it's non-normative, something like that. But comments—because that

---

might help make the distinction between what is the server and what is the client and hints about to the client might also help server implementers.

Marc Anderson, please go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Rick. I think I was going to say something similar to what you were saying. Reflecting on what Justin said, I think it's interesting. As part of this, we're now a long-running RDAP Working Group, we haven't previously talked about clients specifically. We focused purely on what the server output would be. I wonder if it's appropriate for us to get into how clients should act. But certainly, if we consider that, if we have certain instructions on what a server is responding with and we provide sort of client implementation hints as to, "Hey, we're providing this output because we expect the client will do X, Y, Z with it," that may be helpful. I think this is worth considering further. I think it could definitely lead to a better implementation, if we're considering what the client is doing with the data it receives. That's not something we've specifically delved into before. So maybe it's something we need to spend some time with.

I think maybe the only thing I'll add on top of what's been said already is that we should note that the registries and registrars are obligated or will be obligated to do what's in the profile, whereas clients will not. So a client is free to implement it how they want and do what they want with the data that they receive. So we should just keep that in mind. We can provide hints maybe as to how we expect this will be implemented. But we have to

---

remember that they're under no obligation to implement it the way we expect it to be implemented or the way we're describing it be implemented. It's not something we've done previously. I think there is definitely value in considering that.

RICK WILHELM:

Very good. Thank you, Marc. For example, one of the things that when we look at these Galvinian buckets in the way to deduce what is coming back from the server, that might be in a place where some client implementation notes might be helpful to help a client implementor that's not as familiar or at the "state of the art" might be helpful in that regard. So, something to think about there. Good point, Justin. Very good point and certainly something to think about.

As we look at this and as the implementation IRT comes closer, and as we start to think about this next round, I encourage folks to look at the profile and think about places where we might be putting such annotations, or if we think about having this as a non-normative appendix, what sections that non-normative appendix might reference, that sort of thing. Very good. Thank you very much, Justin. Good stuff.

Let me go—our budget is absolutely in tatters. Meeting planning. This is our last meeting for December. We're going to break for the holidays to give everybody ample time to eat enough doughnuts between now and the work schedule resumes at the beginning of 2021, as the remnants of 2020 get thrown into the dumpster fire that was the rest of the year. So I wanted to kind of take up the topic real quick of when do we want to have our first

---

meeting? We had originally penciled in for January 7<sup>th</sup>. I was wondering if we wanted to move to January 14<sup>th</sup>. Part of my thinking there was driven by I think that right now we're on the same schedule as CPH TechOps, in terms of a bi-weekly cadence. And then this also has us not exactly rushing back into it on the first week of January. Any thoughts? I'll admit that I didn't check with Sue on this before the thing, although she certainly didn't edit it out of the notes that she threw onto the screen. So it at least met with not a raging objection from her. Any concerns with moving to the 14<sup>th</sup>?

Sarah has no preference. Roger Carney says plus one for the 14<sup>th</sup>, Jothan says plus one. All right. I'm seeing no other concerns. Sue, are you okay with the 14<sup>th</sup>? How does that fit with the big picture?

SUE SCHULER: No, it's fine.

RICK WILHELM: Okay. That's fine with Sue. We've met with approval from on high. We've got plus ones from Galvin and Mark SV. Okay. We'll take that as carried. So move this to the 14<sup>th</sup>. We'll let everybody recover that first week of January because that'll be busy. Okay. Very good.

We had the kind of a good IRT update yesterday and most of the folks, we're in CPH TechOps. And also we did EPDP and stuff, we're kind of tight on time here. And we also did REGEXT. In the RDAP RA and RAA amendment, one of the things that is coming

---

down the pike is the process by which to modify the RDAP profile. And here's sort of the thing that's been proposed by the CPH and is right now on the docket for ICANN Org to consider, is a process that would have the following process be memorialized somehow between ICANN Org and the CPH.

So RDAP profile is going to need to be memorialized mostly when some consensus policy requires some change to the RDAP profile. For example, right now, coming down the pike is the EPDP IRT. So any IRT that would foresee a change to the RDAP profile, what would happen is the RDAP Working Group, there'd be a commitment to have at least two members from the RDAP Working Group to be attached to the IRT. Then that IRT would delegate the work of modifying the RDAP profile to the RDAP Working Group. The RDAP Working Group would get a set of policy changes that needed to be absorbed by the RDAP profile and that would be given to the RDAP Working Group. RDAP Working Group would get together and make those changes and then deliver those back to the IRT and then they would be approved and put into place as part of the change of consensus policy that the IRT is accomplishing.

Membership in the IRT would be basically—this all has to get formalized in a charter and such, so that's why I'm quite literally waving my hands at it. The membership in the IRT would be largely as it is now mostly comprised of CPH members that are RDAP proficient but with a capability to have invited guests that are RDAP capable, which would include folks from ICANN and folks from other stakeholder groups that are technical experts in the area. So that's the kind of the way that it's envisioned.

---

So that's an update on this. The CPH presented this to ICANN earlier this week. ICANN has not formally responded to this. We're certainly not going to put Karla on the spot right now on this. That's sort of where that process stands right now. But I would just want to give everybody an update on kind of where that kind of stands. It doesn't have the RDAP Working Group being chartered under either the Registry Stakeholder Group or the Registrar Stakeholder Group or the GNSO. It would be chartered under a letter or MoU format between Org and the Registry and Registrar Stakeholder Group, and then be anchored in some contractual hooks related to the amendment. I'm happy to take quick questions on it, although I'm not sure how much more detail I can go into mostly because it hasn't been all written down yet.

Very good. Either staggering in difference or that was a really good explanation or people are hungry for food or both. That's fine with me. Very good. "Both," says Sarah. Very quickly for—I think Karla's here. Karla, any feedback on the NSp? "Nope," she says. Okay. Very good.

One last thing that I want to share, this is a special t-shirt that I think that everybody would get a kick out of here. I'll let you lay eyes on that. I hope you like that one. That is a quote from Jim Gould at IETF REGEXT 109 in the middle of the night. So I hope you like that one. That's a doozy. Very good. My favorite. I'm a big fan of that one. I think that's all I got. I got a ping from Scott on a back channel. "They actually made that shirt?" Yes. There was a link from Jay Daley in the REGEXT chat, and I clicked on it and bought that shirt at 2:00 in the morning. Very good.

---

Any other comments or something like that before we wrap up?  
Very good. Seeing none, everybody have a great holiday. Great  
discussion today. Thanks for all the contributions. Thanks, Jim  
Galvin, for writing that up. And great discussion day. Awesome.  
Everybody, take care. Sue, take us out of here.

SUE SCHULER: Thanks, Rick. Andrea, please end the recording.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**