

**ICANN Transcription – Abu Dhabi
GNSO Registrar Stakeholder Group (RrSG) / Registries Stakeholder Group
(RySG) TechOps Meeting
Monday, 30 October 2017 15:15 GST**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

On page: <https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Marc Anderson: Okay. Thank you and welcome everyone. This is the Joint Registry Registrar TechOps meeting at ICANN60. So again, hopefully everybody's in the right room and welcome. I'm Marc Anderson. I'm from Verisign. I'm the registry lead to the Joint Registry Registrar TechOps Group. And this is my colleague.

Tobias Sattler: Hi. I'm Tobias Sattler, the Vice Chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group and yes. We would like to jump in directly and our agenda for today and do a little bit of round call to see who's actually going to attend. So I would just say, we could start right here, right next to me. Peter?

Peter Larsen: I'm Peter Larsen from Larsen Data.

Kristian Ørmen: Kristian Ørmen, Larsen Data.

Alex Schwertner: Alex Schwertner, Tucows.

Tom Keller: Tom Keller, 1&1.

Neil McPherson: Neil McPherson, 1&1.

Kal Feher: Kal Feher, Neustar.

Jothan Frakes: Jothan Frakes, PLISK.com

Roger Carney: Roger Carney with GoDaddy.

Zoe Bonython: I'm Zoe Bonython, the Registrar Secretariat.

Sue Schuler: I'm Sue Schuler on the Registry Secretariat.

Vlad Dinculescu: Vlad Dinculescu, ILICIT Africa.

Marc Anderson: And we'll - if anybody in the back, we won't twist arms and make you come to the mic. But if anybody in the back of the room would like to come introduce themselves, we'd like to know who you are and say hi.

Robbie Birkner: Sure. Robbie Birkner from 1API.

Jacob Williams: Jacob Williams from Interlink.

Ayako: Ayako from Interlink.

David Peall: David Peall from DNS Africa.

Ashley Henning: Hey, Ashley Henning, Web.com.

Paul Rufus: Paul Rufus, Web.com.

Karla Hakansson: Hi. Karla Hakansson, ICANN staff.

Dietmar Lenden: Dietmar Lenden, Valideus.

James Galvin: James Galvin, Afilius.

Marc Anderson: Thank you. Thank you everyone for introducing yourselves. I think this is a great turnaround. Tobias and I are both impressed by the number of people who showed up. I know RPMs is going on at the same time. So that might be - was afraid we were going to lose some people to that but, you know, again thank you everybody who showed up.

Tobias Sattler: Great. So we would like to jump directly down to the summary of our calls. So far we had two call as far as I remember. There was two things going on regarding - the question regarding RSEP. The Registry brought up the question if an RSEP is needed. And also we had discussion going on regarding how comfortable the registries would be in regards to a non-IETF versus IETF implementation.

As for my understanding and our calls was that IETF implementation would be preferable for the registries. And regarding RSEP, we wanted to reach out to ICANN and then know if we always add that.

Marc Anderson: Yes. We still have the afternoon to talk to ICANN staff about that. Just for anybody that might not have been on the previous conversations, there were - there are some concerns that the Registrar proposal for standardizing maintenance notifications would require an RCEP for registries to implement.

And I think that's something that we want to approach ICANN staff with and see if they can engage on this, let them know what we're working on, what we we're thinking of and get their take. We do have Karla from ICANN staff in the room. I promise we won't put you on the spot, but maybe that's something we can follow up with you later and get your take and fill you in on what we're thinking and looking to do with that. Questions?

James Galvin: So James Galvin from Afilias. And I apologize for missing the early part of the discussion in all this. But I wonder if you could say a few words about why there was the impression that there needs to be an RSEP for that.

Marc Anderson: I think it was just a question of if it would. And I'm sorry if I said RSTEP. I meant RSEP. But I don't think we're saying it does or doesn't. But some people raised the possibility of does it. And, you know, I think it's a fair question. I think some people are concerned that it would require an RSEP for registries to implement and it's something we discussed following with ICANN staff on. Does that help?

James Galvin: I'm just wondering why they think it does. There must be a reason for wanting to even ask the question, because - and I ask only because it's not obvious to me. I mean from my point of view, I don't think it does and I might be overlooking something or forgetting something, you know, I mean. So I'm just asking what the motivation is. It's not obvious.

Tobias Sattler: Yes. I would want to second in on that because I don't think you had an RSEP for the maintenance notifications you were sending today. And it is - I think the conversation is just about standardizing those notices. It's not something new and that is more a general comment.

I would like us to be careful to not use things like that to slow down progress where we could make progress easily. And if we don't need to follow those like additional circles, and if there's a way to avoid that, maybe we should do that.

Vlad Dinculescu: I want to echo - sorry, Vlad Dinculescu. I want to echo on the previous two points here also made. Look at the previous RSEP list that were reviewed for ICANN. I mean even for us a registry, we didn't go through the notion of going to an RSEP for additional extension for fees and so forth.

So if this is going to become a poll message for example, then I don't see the need for ICANN to go to a whole RSEP for every single registry out there to just add this because one additional said there's anything of that nature. And if ICANN does turn around to the ExCom over here and say that you do need to go to an RSEP, there are (unintelligible) point out to them that based on previous historical information, this has not been done and they should actually move forward on that, say no, there's no need for an RSEP on this. Thank you.

Zoe Bonython: Just a very quick note. This is Zoe. To please say your name before you speak. Thanks, because this is being recorded. Thanks.

Marc Anderson: If memory serves, it was Maxim that brought it up, since I'm not. So I don't really feel comfortable speaking for, you know, why he thinks that's possible. But maybe that's something we could follow up more offline and figure out where to go on that one. But I appreciate everybody's feedback and points on that one.

I'm definitely not comfortable saying yes or no on that, but I think everybody's comments are appreciated.

Tobias Sattler: Good. So we're going to follow up on the RSEP thing. Regarding the non-IETF and IETF implementation, so thus far we're interested in the call voice that IETF implementation would be preferred over a non-IETF one. Therefore we put forward our proposal to an RC draft that we already published and we sent the link over with the mailing list.

So and regarding IETF and the process, I would like to ask Roger to give us some insights on IETF and how that actually is going to work.

Roger Carney: Hi. This is Roger. Yes, for the IETF, it's interesting. You're going through it now. I saw that you posted this last week. So it's one of the things where I

think everybody thinks it's scary to do. It's really easy and quick to start. I think you're using the text method or I know that there's several templates out on the IETF website on how to create an Internet draft.

An internet draft is an idea that you may or may not want to take all the way to standards. There's different paths. You can have a standard path or an informational path. And I don't know Jim, is there another one or is it just the two? Yes.

So in informational, there's quite a few of them out there and it's really just something to point at so people can look and say okay, this has been discussed and here it is. One of the best parts of the IETF is just the document management and the conversation of a draft. So.

Kal Feher: I just want to clarify. Oh, Kal Feher, Neustar for the record. I just want to ask whether it's an individual submission or is it going through (REGEX) or something like that?

Roger Carney: Yes. That's another option as there is working groups at IETF that you can actually get work done through. Usually those are set up with a charter with specific goals in mind. The REGEX is a little unique I think in the IETF in that it's a little more open ended, as in what it's milestones are going to be.

And the REGEX is responsible for basically anything that hits the registration system. So it encompasses registrars and registries work, I mean EPP but it also goes out into even the WHOIS and things like that, but could go through that group.

The other option is an individual submission that you can actually publish anywhere. You just have to get the support of an area director at some point to actually do it. But if you get it into a working group, it's probably the easiest because then you get better feedback and quicker responses. I don't know if Jim wants to add anything to that.

James Galvin: Yes, if I can. So James Galvin for the record. Just to add on to a little bit of that. I think for this group, there are only two streams that you're interested in. It's either standards track or informational. There are other streams that the IETF supports, but we'll set those aside for right now.

In individual submissions, there are ways to get individual submissions published. And if you're only seeking it to be an informational document, so you're looking for the archival history that one gets out of the IETF, and that's all you're interested in and that's useful enough for the purpose, then an individual submission is fine.

And the IETF Has processes for dealing with that. It ends up being subject to a four week IETF last call before it can actually be published. And, you know, you still have to garner support and have some discussion about it and that kind of thing.

The bit about a working group, I'm actually co-chair of the REGEXs working group. And that working group has a specific purpose and a role. General documents for - on the part of registries and registrars, I mean I actually agree with Roger. I think in general you have an ideal home in a working group. It's good to be able to bring things there.

We are seeking to get the REGEX working group to be a little more open from the IETF point of view so it can take in other documents than just things related to EPP and RDAP. So we want to do that. So it will become a home for these things. There's not otherwise a home for them.

And that's useful because then you actually have a focus group of people who understand the problem space. And as Roger, said you get much better comments and feedback, to the extent you get them. The problem with going to the IETF and leaving that as the discussion list, and the IETF discussion list is you just never know what's going to happen there.

And so it's good to have a working group behind you. Besides, you also automatically get AD support for things, you know what I mean. There's a whole bit of the process that works a little better when you're working with a working group, but it's absolutely not required. It's important to keep that in mind too so we can make that choice separately. So thanks.

Vlad Dinculescu: Vlad Dinculescu for the transcript. To come back to a previous notion of time, I think what you mentioned was four weeks to get to an individual application. Do you have any, I suppose knowledge around how long this might take if it is a working group application proposal? I know this is kind of like just shooting in the dark, but just maybe do you have any sort of prospects on it.

Roger Carney: This is Roger. And Jim mentioned four weeks. Now is on individual submission, right?

James Galvin: So if you want, I'll give a more complete answer and add to that. Let me phrase it in the following way. there is a minimum four week last call period, if you will, on the IETF main list before you can actually be eligible for publication, okay? But it's a multi-step process, just like ICANN is a multistep process, even for a policy, right>

I mean working group develop it. You know, you go through a public comment period. You've got to review the comments. You might do another public comment period, another review by the working group. I mean there's all kinds of steps here.

So you submit the document. You do the request for the last call. It has to go to the ISG. It's subject to review by them. It might come back and get changes. Then it goes to the RFC editor and gets an editorial exercise, and that takes a period of time, and then it finally gets published.

So, you know, just like ICANN is - what I think some of these, it's like a minimum four to six months if you're on the happy path and everything is working, right, to get anything out the door, and the IETF is no different, you know. But you can easily imagine, just for completely random reasons, something could take a year or two years or whatever, just as it does at ICANN.

So a lot of what it takes is driven by the people who are involved. You can move things along much more quickly if all of the right people are engaged and actively participating and pushing something along. You can manage that process to be fairly simple. But yes, the four weeks is better interpreted as the minimum last call period, and there's a lot of process around the rest of that. Thanks.

Roger Carney: This is Roger. And just to add on to something Jim always brings up, and he hasn't yet, but he keeps talking about participation in this process. And at IETF right now, there's - it's a limited group of registries and registrars that actually participate. And it would be good to get more from this group involved.

It's one of the things you don't have to travel. It's very open. It's done on mailing list. It's - everything's decisions is online and published. So you don't actually have to go to the meetings that they have just one week usually after every ICANN meeting. So it requires a little bit of dedication in that sense.

But going along with that and talking about the time period. One of the things I think and I tell people this quite a bit is, it may take some time. We've been working on this registration fee document for multiple years now. It's finally coming closer, but it has taken a while.

And the good part about that was there was a lot of good discussion that went on, and it's a very clean document finally that's come out. But the key

to me is, Tobias actually just posted one this weekend, and now he can refer it to everybody. So everybody can look at an Internet draft now and actually start referencing it.

Every registry system I think today has draft implementations done in their systems. And it's just a great place to start the conversation and move it forward and it doesn't take any time. A few hours to get the document prepped and pushed out. So it's the closure of that document that may take some time, so.

Tobias Sattler: I don't think I have - unless there's questions. Jim?

James Galvin: So Jim Galvin again. Since you called me up for participation, I'll add my little comment about that to the group. I mean I understand that the standard reaction to most people you talk about oh, I have yet another meeting to go to, you know, another standards body I have to deal with.

But what - if you don't mind taking just a couple of minutes to talk about this. There's two kinds of participation that one can engage in in the IETF. And, you know, there's - there are people for whom, you know, the IETF, like ICANN, if you will, is an integral part of your company's strategic positioning.

And there are multiple things that you do when you have a very broad activity that goes on there. and that kind of participation does generally require that you go to meetings, you know, because you're active in multiple things, not just one thing, you know, multiple people that you're working on things with. And so you're going to want to go to the meetings.

Unlike ICANN that meets three times a year, they meet all over the world. And so all the dynamics that go with that come to bear. If you have a singular agenda, and I think that for this group to a large extent, you know what I mean, when you have individual documents and you have one thing that you want, you know, most of the IETF does - the IETF does its work on individual

documents that are going to be published, are by definition done on mailing lists.

The IETF is very big about advertising that. That's really how it wants to get work done in that sense. So if you have a singular activity that you're interested in, the only real requirement is to participate on the mailing list and you just have to be there talking about your document.

And by the way being there includes saying plus one, even if that's all that you say, all right? It matters to the consensus process that you indicate that you support it. I mean that can be your only comment and your only mode of participating, except that you read everything, you know, but that's what you do.

And so when we have individual things that we're trying to move along, you just have to be there to do that. The IETF does a different technology than ICANN does. ICANN uses Adobe Connect. IETF uses Meetecho. But it's the same kind of thing. It's, you know, it's pretty reasonable.

You know, it actually works. You can do video, so you can hear and there's jabber. So there's a chat backchannel for everything. So you can actually maintain a kind of a very minimum level of participation if you have a singular agenda item and a single document you want to go forward.

And I'd like to make a plea. This is my plea. I think this is what Roger was talking about. Really would like more people to participate, okay? I mean there are just so few people who participate in registration stuff in the IETF and really need more people to be those plus ones. Could use a lot more.

Would love to see more people come to meetings and maybe some people will, especially if it turns out to be local to you. Good to have you just drop in that one day, you know. Please do. Come for the one day and come for the REGEX meeting. But in any case, please join us and be part of that.

And I think we'll be saying more of that in this group as we go along. I think more things are going to come up. We're going to want to put them there. So this won't be the first or last time that you'll hear that. Thank you. Sorry for going on so long.

Marc Anderson: No need to apologize. Thank you. And I think, you know, when we first started - this is our third meeting. So we're just getting started. But when we first met, we talked about the fact that many of us are not overly familiar with the IETF process at all. We know what IETF is, but haven't been involved.

And so, speaking on behalf of at least myself and a number of other people, you know, we appreciate the overview and, you know, what was discussed on previous calls. You know, just to echo what Jim says. You know, if we're going to be a viable group and be able to put forth some proposals that gain adoption and traction, we need participation.

And so just to echo the call there to participate. If we're going to be effective, we need participation. Roger?

Roger Carney: Yes. And I was just going to add one thing. I know there's the concern of going through the standards bodies, the slowness. The REGEX group this year actually took another step I think in the right direction and has implemented interim meetings. They are virtual meetings. So, you know, basically ICANN calls on Tuesdays or whatever.

But it's more ad hoc So if someone wants to push a document or something, they can request an interim meeting and not wait until - or if they're not getting enough discussion on the mailing list, they can request an interim meeting and just schedule it a couple of weeks out so that everybody can get prepared for it. And it actually has made things progress a lot faster so.

Marc Anderson: Again, thank you. Jim and Roger, appreciate the overview and the background and the plea for participation. Well noted. Thank you.

Tobias Sattler: Okay. Thank you very much. So we would like to then go further to the future topics. The Registrar TechOps Group did some work on that. We identified potential topics, what we would like to look into. Currently we did the work on maintenance. Another things that's coming up are things regarding premium names, regarding harmonization, handling of fee extensions and the premium name lists at all.

We all would like to look into the possibility of part transfers, look at billing cycles, finance stuff and so on and so on. This is a long list with about 15, 16 topics so far. Currently our approach was to say okay, we are now currently at the maintenance thing. We wrote down a proposal. Now the proposal got published on IETF.

And the Registrars are currently looking into premium names first and see what - if there is something we want to change, or if they're in the recommendation or whatever. So there's an open discussion going on at the Registrars. And if we come to some sort of conclusion, we will be then reach out to the registries and the CPH TechOps Group because I think that's easier to discuss within the registrars first before making too many noise out there.

Nevertheless, there are some interesting things on our potential topic list. And therefore we - on our last call we talked to the registries and said this should be by direct channel. So if there is something that the registry really wants to see, then they should reach out to us as well.

And I don't know if the registry have some topics on their list, so.

Marc Anderson: That's a pretty answer - pretty easy answer. We don't right now. I did bring it up with the registries. I don't know if Jim, you haven't been involved in that.

But we don't have a list of topics at this time. And I think by nature of the way the registry registrar relationship works, frankly it's more likely that registrars are going to have asks for registries, rather than the other way around, and that's fine.

I don't have a concern with that. But I think we would - you know, once you have a - you've prioritized or vetted this list, I think we would like to be involved in and working on these topics. So I appreciate that registrars really got things kicked off with this maintenance notification proposal.

And most of that - I think the heavy lifting of that was all done by registrars who then came to registries, and I think that's great. But I would like to try and get registries more involved in the next one.

Tobias Sattler: Thank you. Any open questions from the audience regarding topics and stuff like that? I don't know if we really want to jump into specific potential topics here, or if we want to move on. Any thoughts on that? Nope. Okay. We do have GDPR placeholder here because all - everything is about GDPR. I don't know if there is something to discuss on that. Go ahead.

Kristian Ørmen: So Kristian Ørmen. I was just thinking if we end up in a situation where Whois more or less stopped to work in May we might want to consider how we are supposed to registrar transfers.

Marc Anderson Thank you. And this is Marc Anderson for the record. You know, we're - we brought this up on the last call. I think it was actually me that raised the topic. And I think for everybody else in the room that might not have been on that call what we discussed is that for our group it's likely to be more of a reactive move. You know, I don't think we're in a position to come up with a solution to GDPR are. But to the affect or to the extent to which any kind of solution to GDPR is going to require a technical solution then I think there's a little - you know, you're alluding to there's likely to be some level of technical change

that's going to happen and that may very well include touchpoints between registries and registrars.

You know, I think to the extent that that becomes a factor I think we should be monitoring that. And that's a potential opportunity for us. You know, as an already established registry registrar technical discussion group to maybe jump in and, you know, solve what may or may not be a challenge here but, you know, I, you know, this discussion at the previous call wasn't so much a proposal that we try and solve GDPR. That may be a bit ambitious. But, you know, I do think there's likely to be some kind of technical component which may very well impact the registry registrar touchpoint. And there we may have a role to play. So, you know, I think in my proposal or my discussion there was that we just re-monitor this, keep an eye on GDPR and see, you know, if there's something we can react to or there's an opportunity for us to provide technical solutions to the problem.

Roger Carney: This is Roger, just throwing an idea out there since we've talked about it a few times this week already. Is this group interested in I don't know a discussion or a continuation of around the RDAP pilot? I mean it's going to be this teams that's going to be doing all the work. So I'm wondering if that's something that this group should discuss or is anybody interested in that topic or...

Marc Anderson So Marc Anderson. I'm in. You know, I and, you know, a shameless plug 1:30 Wednesday the RDAP pilot discussion or discussion group is meeting so anybody that's available especially from this group I encourage you to attend but to Roger's point yes this groups that's going to have to roll up our sleeves and work on that solution so, you know, it'd be great if we could get involvement here as well and look at, you know, again where, especially where there are touch points between registries and registrars. You know, I think this is a great, you know, place to discuss that. Anybody else want to jump in? I saw some nods, mostly positive nods.

Jim Galvin: So I mean Jim Galvin and, you know, we're in on the pilot too so and I'll be there on Wednesday so, you know, shameless plug and all that but it's maybe the only broader comment that I would make is, you know, RDAP is just a tool so it's nice that we're, you know, this is sort of following on from this GDPR placeholder and people tend to throw GDPR and RDAP into the same conversation. And I think that the only thing that I would observe is those really need to be two different conversations and we should do our part to keep them separate. You know, RDAP is just a tool which provides some features that may or may not help us in solving various GDPR problems. We should focus on RDAP being the replacement for Whois because it just is. You know, Whois has got so many other problems on the technical side that, you know, you want RDAP for that, you know, the internationalization and redirection and, you know, and just all the kind of stuff -- structured data. I mean we need all of those things. The industry needs that and we all want it so let's just trying keep those conversations as two different things.

And sure let's report out on the pilot in here and see how it's going. The pilot's going to have its own discussion group so we don't need this group for the details but we should certainly report out on the progress of the group into here and as you said Marc bring any touch points that matter between the registries and registrars -- whatever comes to that nexus point bring it here for discussion.

Roger Carney: Just to follow up because I like to make this comment all the time because Jim stepped into it for me but this is Roger by the way. Sorry.

But RDAP is really just a communication tool only. And people talk about it replacing Whois. Whois is pretty big when you talk about Whois. And this RDAP is just replacing the Port 43 communication of Whois. So it is just one little piece of the overall Whois system. So I just want to make it clear that RDAP doesn't and like Jim said it's not going to be the savior of everything and it's not the replacement of Whois. It's a replacement of a piece of Whois.

Marc Anderson: Yes good points. Thank you both. Any other thoughts on RDAP? Should we may be add that as a placeholder and make sure we're, you know, I think your suggestion to report out on status I think that's a great place to start and I think we can make that a part of our standing agenda item maybe moving forward. Plus one.

So looking at our agenda we've run through to it's agenda Item Number 5, future calls frequency and set up. And so far, you know, I think as we mentioned, you know, this is our third meeting. And we're a new group just getting our legs underneath us. You know but, you know, a good place to start is talk about, you know, how often we want to meet, what makes sense for us as a group.

I think the previous two calls we had were essentially ad hoc in nature. I think we had – we put out a Doodle poll and sort of pulled these groups together, so a good starting point but, you know, I think in order to keep the momentum going we need to establish a regular meeting time for this group to meet. So I'll just sort I'll leave that hanging, see if anybody has any thoughts or suggestions on how often we should meet or how we want to go about, you know, forming some consistency with the group.

Jim Galvin: Jim Galvin. So I'll just make a concrete suggestion then for a discussion. We don't have a rich agenda at the moment and we don't have a rich set of activities that are moving forward. However I do agree that I think this is an important group. I really do think we're going to get value out of this going forward. And I think the way to help drive our value is to make sure that we get some continuity here. I don't think any more frequently than monthly is appropriate at the moment. I'd like to suggest less than that but it's hard to suggest less than that and make it regular.

You know, but if we can find one day a month and do it for now and then we'll increase it if we need it. And getting an opportunity to get some face time at an ICANN meeting is a good thing too. So maybe during the month when we

have an ICANN meeting we might not have the call that month or something I mean we can sort of go down that path depending on how close things are. That kind of thing would be useful so...

Marc Anderson: Thank you. (Cal)?

(Cal Fire): (Cal Fire). With regards to the cadence if we could consider rotating or accommodating for APEC reps that would be fantastic. The last two calls have been at 2 o'clock in my morning so I haven't attended.

Marc Anderson: Fair point. I'm sure we can come up with a way to accommodate that. I'm I am inclined to agree with Jim that, you know, I more often than monthly at this point I think we would be, you know, talking for about five minutes and, you know, getting back to our days. But less than monthly I think is difficult to establish any kind of cadence. And, you know, you - we'll spend all of our time sort of recapping. And so I would personally be supportive of starting things off on some kind of monthly meeting basis with a time rotation perhaps as (Cal) points out so we can try and be, you know, cognizant of people in other time zones. So I think that would be a good place to start. Do you want to stand up here?

Jim Galvin: Yes so sorry to press a little bit on logistics here but we're such a - for the moment seems a relatively small group. And I'll just react to the idea of a rotating time and ask the following looking for or nod I guess at the moment. Are you a morning person from Asia by any chance or would you be willing to do meetings in the morning like early morning so 4:00 to 6:00 am timeframe?

(Cal Fire): We'll just see. Initially when you asked that question I was thinking 6:00. That's why, yes I'm more than happy to get up early. That's fine.

Jim Galvin: Because what I - I'm the one who wins the most in this particular option but it does seem to work in my experience with meetings if you want to just move into a fixed time. If you make them on the East Coast sort of, you know, late

in the afternoon so the five – four, five, six or seven, you know, PN time and you get sort of the same time window and Asia-Pacific and that it becomes an evening thing in Europe that often works. I don't really looking around. I don't really know everybody's from here but if we can find a fixed time in sort of that window I prefer fixed times than rotating.

I don't mind rotating if you don't have to because I'm on other ICANN groups so they rotate the time. And that makes more sense when you've got broad participation and, you know, a fair number of people from all regions it's the only fair way to do it. But I would ask and encourage us to try to find a fixed time. And it is only monthly, once a month if we could do that. Thanks.

Zoe Bonython: Yes this is Zoe. Do you want me to send out a Doodle poll sort of starting a little bit later in the day so not bothering to offer a morning sort of UTC? So it's UTC because we're normally asking UTC. So we're asking for it would be evening UTC?

Jim Galvin: Yes it would be in the 1600 to 1700 well I guess up to 18 – 16 through 20 those hours, 1600 through 2000 UTC.

Zoe Bonython: UTC yes, because that's 10:00 pm I think correct and they kind of Central European Time. Is that right?

Marc Anderson: Would – if I could do this in a second to what it makes sense to start with a Doodle poll of what time zone people are in who are likely to participate?

Zoe Bonython: As you like.

Marc Anderson: So you see some nods.

Jim Galvin: Yes. Are we expecting others that are in this room I mean honestly?

Marc Anderson: I think that's a good question. If – there's a lot of people who are not here who we think need to contribute to it otherwise in looking around do we have consensus that's a reasonable window? Let's just do the Doodle poll the window and see what happens. I mean if it fails then we have to take a step back and maybe do a time zone survey to see what's - what our options could be.

Sue Schuler: Yes Sue Schuler with the registries. I'm looking back at the calendar, the last two meetings that you had the teleconference calls were on Thursdays which I will also say is probably not a bad day to stay on. There's not as many meetings happening as there are at the beginning of the week.

Roger Carney: I just want to Jim's point I think there's a lot of people here but I know the RPM sessions going on now so there may be quite a few people in there that weren't able to make this meeting so...

Tobias Sattler: We still have to consider that there are a lot of people just being on the mailing list anyway because they are not unintelligible meeting so they can't be here Zoe. So I think though it's a good idea to just do a Doodle on when we actually wanted to do it and then see what's going to happen.

Zoe Bonython: Okay so Zoe again. What I'll do I'll start with initial call of just times starting earlier than what we're seeing so maybe starting from 3UTC and then going up.

((Crosstalk))

Man: I mean we're not in a rush right so we can figure it out online. We don't need to spend another half an hour debating with everyone. We have a fixed date on that. You know, so let's have a Doodle poll and see what comes out of it.

Marc Anderson: Fair point. So I think yes I think we're not nodding for you to go ahead with that.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Marc Anderson: Yes I think we're at AOB so we'll leave that to everybody in the room. Is there any other topics that we'd like to discuss, any ideas or considerations for this group?

Neil McPherson: I mean I was just going to suggest we've still got another three quarters of an hour so maybe we can go through the current topics that we've got at least for the registrars and kind of a quick couple minute update as to where we are, a discussion what needs to happen for those topics to move forward because there's two currently that are currently on going.

Tobias Sattler: Thank you Neil. So the thing as we actually discussed within the registrar only the maintenance thing. And as far as I know we started to discuss things on the premium names. As far as I know we - there was some (Holly) and then - therefore it didn't move on. But I think that we were on the point that we were looking through and the EPP extension for premium names and there was a discussion on the mailing list, the registrar mailing list going on between the fee extension, the IETF fee extension versus the Donuts Rightside implementation. I don't want to put Roger on the spot but actually I think he wanted to look through both of them. As far as I remember this wasn't back then.

Roger Carney: This is Roger. Yes I was going to look at both of those and I've got one of them down because I - got one of the authors on that one so that was easy enough for me. But I haven't gotten through the Donuts one so I still need to do that.

Tobias Sattler: Okay thank you. So I don't know Neil, do we want to go through all topics here or...

Neil McPherson: Maybe not all but so what would be on the coming up next? Will you kind of do like a rough what's the word, the agenda I guess at least that the topics should be working on in order from A to Z? What would be next?

Tobias Sattler: Well we have – need to finish the discussion on premium names. And the next one was on the topic list of best practice for a registry operator transitions. And after that we wanted to look into the possibility of file transfers. And the next one would be standard design handling of block names following-up with standard design billing behaviors specifically when an auto renew is billed and on stuff like that. Then it was going to standard design format of billing of transaction reporting. And another thing was easier and more efficient way to do domain transfers will be quite an interesting thing especially if we think about the GDPR discussions. Yes well there are a couple of the things as well there like discussions and idea on how we can improve domain, the domain process at all. So this was quite open discussion here.

Neil McPherson: I mean do we want to discuss that I mean the way that you said it was we need to finish the discussion on the premiums and that would make it seem that we have to finish a topic completely first and that it seems like there's about 15 things on there are probably going to be finished with those topics kind of 20, 25 if we do one or after the other. Maybe we could think about having a couple of topics run at the same time? Would - I mean yes this is a kind of question for everyone in the room.

Tobias Sattler: They're flooding so press on on that yes. I mean if right now this - that the draft is going to see with the IETF for review and everything else if we get involved with IETF not a problem but maybe run something else concurrently. I don't see an issue with that.

Neil McPherson: Thank you. Yes well we finished the proposal for the maintenance thing and then we started to the discussion regarding premiums so it's more or less two topics at the same time. I think of course we can do - what we can do or

discuss more internally the registrar tech ops first. The thing is depends on participation. If we just only be two or three people on the mailing list talking back and forth regarding that then it gets quite problematic at some point.

Well nevertheless we are currently in the premium names I understood that Roger will give it an update on that in the upcoming weeks. Then we would be already going to the point best practice for a registry operator transition so what kind - we currently see a lot of transitions going on anyway and how we can improve that from our point of view because there's a lot of issues or potential issues if there's a transition going on. Well do you want to jump on that?

Tobias Sattler: I mean I think that's - and that affects us a lot. I think that if we're going to have that - those discussions it would be interesting to have some of the other registries involved who have been doing the transitions and our affiliates have definitely been involved but nominators also had a few. Probably donuts is going to have a big one coming up soon to have those guys in their room in the discussion as well would be useful.

Marc Anderson: Yes I can't twist arms and promise they'll show up but your point's well taken. You know, I'd certainly like to see their involvement so we can reach out to them and ask that they participate. You know, I would ask, you know, when we first met, you know, the first meeting on the standard maintenance notification topic what I found extremely useful was, you know, I think when you guys took the time to go through with us sort of what the pain point was, what is the problem that you - that we're trying to solve for and then also what the desired outcome was, so sort of what's - when we get through it what's, you know, what is the happy state that we want to achieve.

And you know when I first looked at the document that you sent out, you know, that doesn't always come through in a document, you know, and that's fine. But what I found really useful was sort of this discussion we had we had on those points. And so, you know, keeping that in mind as we sort of tackle

other items on the list, you know, I'll certainly be asking for that kind of context with it so just something to keep in mind.

(Alan Woods): Just say (Alan Woods) from Donuts registry. Now I'm complaints I'm not tech so I'm just here taking notes from people but I'm sure very happy to reach out to me. I'll get the card to whoever needs it and I'll put you in contact with the right person who will be more than happy to deal you on those topics as I've heard the name once or twice so thanks.

Marc Anderson: Thanks. So (Alan) does - (Alan)'s going to twist arms and get Donut participation so thank you.

Tobias Sattler: Okay regarding participation the thing that we definitely need to look into more participation from the registrar as well because well I guess for about 50 persons signed up for the registrar tech ops thing but currently that's more observers than participation. And we need to figure out how to we actually get more tech people and operational people behind the scenes getting involved in this group because we can't handle all these things just by our own. And if it comes down to the IETF thing we need definitely more participation. And I know there was a discussion going on regarding Reg X that there is too few participation by the registrars. And therefore some were just rather not always quite happy what's coming out at that. But if no one's willing to do that on our side then we definitely not going to move forward.

Marc Anderson: We'll put out another call for any new business and again any thoughts, ideas suggestions for future meetings or future topics. It's not a one time call. You know, if you're not already involved in the discussion group online please make sure you join. You know, I think (Sue) and Zoe can help make that happen. If you are not already signed up please reach out to them and participate. The more people that participate the more effective this group will be. So again we'd love to hear ideas, suggestions now but not a one time offer. Please, you know, take advantage of the email discussion group that we do have.

Tobias Sattler: Great. So then I guess we are already done so everybody gets back 30 minutes of your life. You can actually do something different. Thank you very much for attending and thank you very much for the people on the Adobe channel. So and we'll see how the Doodle is going on and when we will actually do our next call. But I assume that we will have another face to face meeting in Puerto Rico and then we should probably also think about the GDD upcoming summit where we can actually discuss that more then into details there and have some working group sessions or something like that. Thank you.

END