

Michelle DeSmyter:Dear All, Welcome to the RPM Working Group Sub Team for Additional Marketplace call on Friday, 18 August 2017 16:00 UTC.

Michelle DeSmyter:Agenda wiki page:
https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_DBghB&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrw113mSVz_gfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe_5iHWG1BLwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=mi3UGfEJAht4P-xokcLhBbfgMq0npo3meUezNWKJP9Y&s=CQzLKneqTjwse6Rg2RQAGoGjtB3kpi37k_TUK5bRNZg&e=

David McAuley:dialing in

Michelle DeSmyter:thanks David

J. Scott:I am joining. I am in open space, so muting.

J. Scott:Super. thanks Greg.

Philip Corwin:Hello all

David McAuley:poor connection

J. Scott:I disagree. I think we should know whether there is or is not an approval process. that is just information

Kathy Kleiman:Online now. +1 David, Phil, J. Scott

Kathy Kleiman:No :-) Survived the driving lesson :-)

J. Scott:We could make a recommendation that an approval process should be put in place

Rebecca L Tushnet:+1 J. Scott, given the interaction with the required RPMs

Mary Wong:In this context (DPML and other services using the TMCH services), is J. Scott's last comment also related to Question 8 (which also has been proposed for deletion).

Philip Corwin:I have to think about it, and this is a personal view, but I'm not sure that the WG has any authority (beyond noting the existence) to look into private protections that don't use the mandatory RPMs

J. Scott: I am sorry. I am not sure I understand the question.

J. Scott:Thanks Mary.

J. Scott:There is judgment in making a statement that all additional RPMs that registries want to put in place need to go through some sort of formal approval process

J. Scott:That should read "no judgment."

J. Scott:I am stepping away for two minutes.

Mary Wong:Staff clarification, just in case - we're not opining on the WG charter scope or the advisability of these questions, was just noting a possible relationship between Q6 & Q8 for the Sub Team's consideration.

David McAuley:Thanks Mary and I agree w/Jon that we need to keep charter in view

David McAuley:But information gathering seems ok as we stated before

J. Scott:I am back
David McAuley:good summary Greg
Kathy Kleiman:+1
Mary Wong:Noted, Greg
Brian Cimbolic:sure
Mary Wong:SP is Susan Payne, I believe.
Rebecca L Tushnet:One question that may be part of this is
whether there is a more public aspect
Kathy Kleiman:good connection
J. Scott:Loud and clear, rebecca
Kathy Kleiman:Should we define "proprietary data"?
David McAuley:probably a good idea @Kathy
Kathy Kleiman:How would you phrase that, Greg?
Rebecca L Tushnet:Data that are kept confidential as between TM
owner & provider?
Kathy Kleiman:@RT makes sense
David McAuley:That makes sense Greg, agree with that
David McAuley:i.e. data from TMCH
David McAuley:rather than proprietary data from TMCH
Kathy Kleiman:agreed!
Mary Wong:Noted, Greg
Kathy Kleiman:precisely!
David McAuley:yes
J. Scott:I am going to have to leave early.
Mary Wong:We're taking notes :)
Kathy Kleiman:Tx for chairing, Greg.
David McAuley:Good luck with that Greg
Kathy Kleiman:Still here
David McAuley:nice phrase kathy - "possibilty for significant
rephrasing"
David McAuley:Kathy, that is
Griffin Barnett:need to drop, bye all
David McAuley:Thanks for filling in Greg, thanks all, good bye