ICANN
Transcription ICANN64 Kobe
Joint Meeting: GNSO – CPH & NCSG
Wednesday, 13 March 2019 at 17:00 JST
Note: 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.
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

((Crosstalk))

Woman: All right, guys, sorry. I'm only doing this because (Graham)'s mic doesn't seem to be working but shall we kick this thing off, get this party started?

Graeme Bunton: Hey, it's your party. Yes, it's your party. This one – oh, no, it's working again. Oh, yes. Okay. I think it's your party but here we are. So, thank you for having us, NCSG.

It's always nice to see your faces at ICANN meetings. We've got a little bit of an agenda that I think came from you guys and we can dig into that in a sec. But let me first say, on behalf of, I think, the CPH, that you know, that first phase of the EPDP was bananas.

But I was really impressed with the way that all of our members were able to coordinate and work together. Even where we diverged, I thought the ability for all of us to have some positive discourse and come to some conclusions and work together was really excellent.

And I'm both hopeful and optimistic that we can keep doing that in phase two and let's make sure we keep those lines of communication open and keep doing that because it's really nice to see where our interests all overlap. Thanks.

Stephanie Perrin: Hello. I know, they're always trying to shut me up. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I totally agree. I think that is we really, even though we disagreed, we had a frank and open discussion and we supported each other as much as we could.

And I'd like to continue that as we move forward. I do apologize for those who are not on the EPDP because I tend to forget that it isn't all EPDP that we're talking about for this meeting.

So I just sent out the suggestions for what we need to talk about to our EPDP support list and thank you for capturing it in the agenda.

Then I think if we can just have a little free exchange and how we think things are going, if there's anything else but EPDP, I guess it goes under any other business.

But we have lots of things that we have questions about. So, Shelley kickoff item one?

Graeme Bunton: Can I just get a real brief thing in first, maybe on a lighthearted note.

Stephanie Perrin: Sure.

Graeme Bunton: I think we need to standardize on either EPDP or EPDP. But the - hearing them both makes me nuts. So I'm an EPDP kind of guy.

Graeme Bunton: I call it a EPDP.

Stephanie Perrin: I like EPDP. It rhymes. You know, it has cadence to it.

Graeme Bunton: But it's an expedited PDP not a - all right.

Stephanie Perrin: You're being nerdy, (Graham).

Graeme Bunton: So it sounds like the EPDPs are winning.

Woman: (Graham), until you can differentiate between process and process, I think EPDP and EPDP have to coexist.

Graeme Bunton: How about just calling it hell?

Graeme Bunton: That's what I get for interjecting that way. All right, all yours, Stephanie. Thank you.

Stephanie Perrin: The other thing is that, for those of us who are kind of privacy nuts, is so darn close to the data protection board. So, EPDP works for me and then just for reference purposes, it's the board, okay?

That's the only board, the data protection board, okay? Staffing the IRT, we had a - well, it was - how can I put this, somewhat confusing meeting this morning on the IRT.

We'd like to know how you folks are approaching the IRT. I understand that that is largely a staff function, figuring out of legal language for your contracts.

Nevertheless, given the number of things that we've booted to the next phase, I'm deeply concerned about how we're actually going to do this. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Right. This is (Graham). I don't think we know not quite yet about how the IRT is going to work. I don't think anyone came out of this morning's meeting super optimistic about how it looks like it's being set up.

So, we're really only just beginning to think about the resources we need to put in there. And I kind of assume there's going to be some sort of shape to it. Like, I assume not the whole world again can participate in the IRT.

But I will say for registrars, I can't seek I'm behalf of registries, but you know, there is stuff coming out of the phase one that's going to require not a huge number, but actual some, like, co-changes.

And so, we need to be really carefully dialed in there because we need to turn that stuff into things that a bunch of nerds in dark rooms make happen. And so we'll be following it very closely and engaged as much as we can.

But I think it's almost too early to tell how many people we're going to put in there. I also don't have any spare registrars. I have everybody doing like three jobs right now. And so that's a real problem for us.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Stephanie Perrin: It is a conspiracy okay, Stephanie Perrin again. It's a safe assumption we need to put a decent number of people on that IRT. If you come up with a number, let me know, okay?

Speaking of numbers, that's my other question, is what actually is the estimated dates for completion of the IRT?

(Matt):   Well, this is (Matt). Are we recording this? Is there a transcript? Anyway, it's not for the transcript. I think what we had said was to work backwards means August 29 is fun we would have to have language to give contracted parties a six-month notice period to get us the February 29 effective date.

Donna Austin: Stephanie, it's Donna Austin. So we had a discussion about this today and I think we understand that we need to do a little bit of a plotting exercise

because, you know, there's a number of cases that we need to understand how they will fit together.

And then that will help the scope and, you know, identify timelines. So I think, from our perspective they're still a little bit of the unknown and the best way of doing it at the moment is getting.

So we need a little bit more information so that we can map out what's required and get some reasonable idea of what we're talking about and what timelines we can put to it.

Stephanie Perrin: So, that's all there is on that topic, then the next one is really remarkably similar. Where are we on this?

Graeme Bunton: Right. Thanks, Stephanie. It's (Graham). (Staffing and time) of the (new) EPDP phase two, are you asking about, like, the people that we're putting it in there? I think at the moment, I have (James) and (Matt) from registrars continuing in their roles and phase two.

Emily Taylor stepped down as a primary. And her resignation email, if people have arrived it, is worth a read. I think it went out on the GNSO list.

I then have my three alternates of (Tio), (Volker) and (Sarah), one of whom will probably carry on our step up as an alternate. And then I need to find some other sucker to join and as a new alternate.

I don't think any of those people are super enthusiastic about that job but understand the importance and so will carry on. I'm there, I also need to find some people to participate in the IRT as we were just saying.

So, yes, again, it's thin resources but I think you can expect most of the same faces again.

(Kim): It's very - sorry, this is (Kim). It's a very similar situation on the registry side. (Mark) and (Allen) are going to stay on. (Christina) is going to be back, from what we understand, around the end of this month, this month being March.

So she'll come back in to the full number role. (Beth) will continue to be an alternate. The registries did have two other alternates that I think we may be looking to maybe backfill in that.

And I think our understanding right now is, based on what she said, (Beth) will also be pretty involved in the IRT. I don't know that mean she'll be like a quote, unquote, "member," of that or if it will just be, you know, in a support role.

But we're kind of in the same position where we are also considering resourcing for that as well. But in terms of, like, the main membership, it'll be the same faces from the registries in phase two as well.

Stephanie Perrin: What about us? I don't think we know who's going on the IRT it. We're a little short of volunteers for that and it won't be me because I'm the for one that's been on the PPSAI for the last two years and I haven't been participating.

So I know how long and tedious that can be. So - but we'll find some people. We have to.

On the main EPDP group, I think we've only lost (Collin), our alternate. The character beside me is hedging his bets and not admitting that whether he's on but I think he's on.

And so that shouldn't be too difficult. We'll find another alternate. And, you know, we've had a pretty consistent representation. (Milton) and Farsi are staying on. I thought (Milton) was saying never again but I guess he was just teasing.

So, we're in good shape on that. I should let you know that we have had a conversation with (Lorene) on the subject of the alternates having access to the Adobe room.

You might remember that we felt very strongly, largely because we didn't want to be swamped with people at the face-to-face swarming the room and having to deal with the giant crowd of people that were not part of the formal process and, you know, basically we were worried about a repeat of the RDS happening if we didn't control.

It has proven to be a pain in the neck, as you know, getting people briefed and trying to read all the stuff in stay up to that.

So I think – (Aiden) can correct me if I'm wrong here, but we're perfectly happy with her proposed compromise of them have access and if they misbehave, boot them out. Am I right? Any objections to that?

Graeme Bunton: That's correct, Stephanie, and but we also agreed with us that they current system, the sort of prison version of an Adobe Connect room would still exist so that if someone, an alternate, that is not acting as a member this happened to start intervening, they can be directed to that room. And (Lorene) has said that she will ensure that it's strictly enforced.

Woman: Sorry. I think that sounds fine to us on the Adobe room.

(Rubens Kuhl): (Ruben Kuhl), registry stakeholder group. Just to mention that there is one other staffing issue in face two which is the chair. So not only are members. So if anyone has a willingness to do it, you should apply soon.

Elsa Saade: Yes, this might be changing the subject of this. Elsa Saade for the record. I know that not all of us were on EPDP so - it's getting confusing here, but I personally am very curious in terms of what worked out for both of us in terms of our work on that PDP and what did not.

So I would be very thankful if you guys would share with us what you thought were points of success versus point of failure. And that's related to substance, so if you want to finish the technicalities first, I would be happy to wait.

Graeme Bunton: Yes. No, I actually thought that was a very good question and I'm going to stare at (Sarah) and (Matt) to think about that from the registrars. But maybe we should wrap up that chair conversation first and then come back to that. Although, again, it's your meeting. I'm not trying to run it.

There is no one from the registrars that I know of wanting to throw their hat in the ring to chair that thing. We don't have any brilliant ideas of people that would love to do it. So we're kind of a loss.

I had lunch with Bruce Tonkin last week as he is someone that we all respect and has been around a long time and people thought he might be interested but he lives in Australia and trying to make those hours I don't think makes any sense so he's not interested.

Yes, so we're hoping someone else has a genius idea about who would be an excellent leader for that thing but we don't have anyone in mind at the moment.

(Mikali): (Mikali) on the registrar side here. I had suggested within the GNSO council meeting with the CCNSO that maybe somebody from the CCNSO might be interested.

Obviously thousands died in the rush to submit applications. Work on such kind of informal conversations I've had with members of the CSG, they really like that idea. So they find the idea very attractive.

So there's that, but of course, the problem is trying to find anybody who would be willing to give up an unknown amount of time which I think is back to the (unintelligible) around the members.

Since nobody knows what the time commitment is, it's very hard for anybody to get their employers to give them the time since they don't know what the hell it is.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin for the record. We haven't really discussed this or arrived at a common position on that suggestion.

I worry about it a wee bit just because I find that the CCTLDs are too close to the governments that they are representing and that - yes, I know, and no aspersions on (Byron) or particular (unintelligible).

But, yes, I - well, first of all, we can't even get them to join review teams, so I they likely to stand up for this one? I doubt it, but.

(Mikali): Just on that, Stephanie, quite a few of the CCTLDs are completely private companies with absolutely nothing to do with government. I mean, while the Canadian CCTLD might have a direct link, same with the French and a couple of the others, not all of them are. A lot of private companies.

Stephanie Perrin: I'm only worried about those instances where there might be a direct link stepping forward. That's what worries me. The private ones would be too smart. Sorry. I didn't say that on the record.

We have heard that Chris LaHatte volunteered for the job. He would be neutral. So we like that idea more than some of the other offers that we've heard. But, you know.

When does it close? Anybody - so I guess we should be out trying to find somebody, right?

Woman: Anything else on the chair stuff?

(Mike Smalzoba): (Mike Smalzoba). The suggestion, I think if we don't see many faces eager to sacrifice their lives to be chairs, or a chair, can I suggest we change wording of paid chair to, like, chair with compensation so it sounds better.

I meant that neutral paid chair was one of the ideas were the EPDP and it should be, like, neutral share with compensation. It sounds better.

Woman: I think we go down that route, we owe someone at the end of the table some compensation of his own for the sacrifice in phase one. (Unintelligible).

Graeme Bunton: Yes, and if we go too far, most probably the members will have to be compensated by hours. That's it.

Woman: All right, anything also in the chair side? Donna?

Donna Austin: Donna Austin. So one of the other things that we discussed earlier today is are not too keen on the idea of compensation because that opens up, you know, lots of precedents that we don't necessarily want to (say).

But I think is a question of what the leadership team look like? So you would have a chair and maybe you changed to two vice chairs. You think about what other tools will be available to the continuation of, you know, CBI, is that the requirement.

So I think there is a, you know, there's a number of other ways you can think about this. Yes, there was one chair and vice chair and who was also a liaison to the Council. But is there a different combination that, you know, might be helpful? And if that's the case, maybe that's something to - a discussion with the chair.

I mean, that's an important consideration if there's a chair and maybe two vice chairs, but if the vice chairs come from within the group, then that creates a problem of back fill. So, you know, maybe to - can you find two vice chairs out there somewhere that could be part of the team as well?

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin for the record. I must say, I think I would personally be more comfortable as we go out seeking a chair, if we had already done a postmortem on lessons learned on the first exercise.

Because if we repeat some of the things that happened the first time around, if not a very attractive proposition. If, on the other hand, you know, we work together and talk to (Kurt) and get sort of a summary.

Okay, moving forward, here's some of the things that work and we are committed to them such as, for instance, having - I think most people agree that the legal counsel was a good idea and the legal subcommittee was a good idea.

And having the facilitators and we got more progress at the face-to-face meetings. You know, we've got - that stuff is really within grasp but I would hate to have it slip away.

Woman: (Kurt), do you want to speak to that at all? I think you have started to put something together, right, about lessons learned from the first days.

(Kurt): Hi, this is (Kurt). Yes, so I gave a brief presentation to the GNSO that went over about six of the factors that I won't repeat here but I'm happy to share in writing.

(Sam): All right, so coming back to Elsa's question which I agree was a great one, as we get this discussion going, I do want to clarify, when you talk about the things that went well.

And, you know, what we are happy with, what we are not happy with, are you talking about the outcomes of the report itself or about the process and working relationships between the groups? I think both are valid but just to know what you want to get it.

Woman: Thanks, (Sam). Yes, sorry for not having detailed it, but yes, I think, since we're having a joint meeting here, I think all of us know what went well in terms of the final report and what did not. But I'm more interested in the aspect of our collaboration a CPA and CSG.

(Sam): Great. And so I know the registrar reps are here. Any – (Mark), come to the table. Get up here because I would like to handed over to the reps to have this one.

(Mark Anderson): Thanks. (Mark Anderson) for the transcript that may or may not exist. For - from my perspective, great question, and I think from my perspective, the biggest thing for our success I thought was opening up lines of communication.

We were a little slow to do that, even registries and registrars. I think we were, you know, something like six weeks in before we had our first meeting, joint meeting, and then it was shortly after that we had an outreach with the NCSG reps.

But that, for me, was really a game changer for us, opening up to communications. We established a Skype back channel allowing us to talk more (freely), coordinator positions.

And, you know, and I really think that was a game changer between, you know, sort of the start of the EPDP and where we finished. As was already mentioned, you know, we don't always agree that there were positions where we do and we were able to support each other.

And also just know, you know, just being able to talk on that channel and, you know, and point out places where, you know, we were or weren't going to be able to support each other, that I thought really was the difference maker especially as a grain of the EPDP wore on, you know, that helps a lot. That was the main thing.

(Matt): Yes, this is (Matt). I agree with that totally. I don't know what more I can add to that although, you know, I guess maybe one thing that we can think about going forward is a lot of that interaction I think came during the calls, right.

So to the extent possible, we can try some of the coordination ahead of time and I know it just got so challenging to find any spare minutes between, you know, all the calls we ended up having toward the end.

But, yes, you know, as much as I don't like waking up to 175 Skype notifications, it still proved to be, you know, the best vehicle. But maybe as we go forward, you know, we can look for opportunities to try some of that at ahead of time so that when we are in the calls, you know, we rarely had a chance to sort of prep, you know, and discuss ahead of time to the extent possible. And I think (Sarah) had some stuff too.

(Sarah): My stuff was all much more general, not specific to our interest.

Amr Elsadr: Hey, it's Amr. I thought this was really refreshing sort of, you know, precedent for us working together. I thought it was great. Like (Mark) said, we're aligned on a super majority of the issues.

And even the ones where we aren't, I think we did a good job talking them through together and, you know, maybe agreed to disagree on some points, but I think it was largely civil, wasn't it? Wasn't it? I hope so.

But it's more than that. I think it was really helpful and not just in terms of us coordinating our positions in our work, but practically speaking, we recognize that we are a significant block on the GNSO when it comes to the Council.

And helping our counselors get their work done starts on policy development within the working group and the EPDP team. And I don't know if you've all noticed but we are facing a significant block on that front.

So being able to unify our positions together, our collaborate and coordinate, at that stage of the work I think was something really helpful and I think I - I certainly hope we continue to do so moving forward. Thanks.

Stephanie Perrin: If I could just add to that - Stephanie Perrin for the record. I must say I felt that the Skype channel was the fastest way to find out about things. We went into this with the best intentions.

You know, we were going to do notes and, you know, keep some kind of a record to keep track, but the pace was so insane, we couldn't keep up, plus little things like, oh, things would pop up on the correspondence page that we haven't seen and we found out about it from the Skype channel because we just couldn't keep up.

So, as a mechanism, it really, really helped. And I don't think it's going to be much better the next time. I would like to be more optimistic but I don't think so. So, I guess we could chalk that up to be a success.

Elsa Saade: If I may also, I would also like to hear – Elsa for the record - the things that could be improved, as well. I mean, I love all the butterflies and rainbows, excellent, but if there's anything that could be improved, that would be also good to mention just in case.

Graeme Bunton: I think that's easy. The positions where we do disagree on, you guys should just agree on them. (It would be all good).

(Sam): This is (Sam) again. Just from, like, a support and coordination perspective, were there ever - I don't know, were there ever instances where there may have been disagreement where you felt like there needed to be more information provided or there needed to be a larger, I don't know - sorry, better representation of like the larger stakeholder groups?

Because, you know, I think the support team and the ex-coms would be more than happy to help backfill some of that of our reps needed, you know. This kind of speaks to what (Matt) was saying about the frenetic pace.

You know, a lot - you guys are on the frontlines of a lot of stuff in may need to make decisions very quickly and, you know, we have all the confidence and trust in you.

But to the extent that there are issues that come up, you know, and if you guys need to tap into the resources a bit more, just, you know, please feel free to reach out and let us know.

I'm hopeful that we will have a little bit more time to get coordinated and, you know, kind of be settled going into a phase two and the pace will allow for that.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you for the offer. (Zoe)'s been helpful.

Woman: Yay. Yay.

Graeme Bunton: So, yes, just keep doing what you're doing. Thanks.

Stephanie Perrin: I don't want to put (Uls) on the spot or anything like that but we can anticipate that the GAC is not going to support a slower pace, correct?

(Uls):   They can live with a reasonable pace as long as there is some guarantee that
                          it won't sort of drag on too long. So, I mean, they were debating a lot about
                          actually putting (this off).

                          I think August 2020 was the one that they suggested as the completion date.
                          But even that should at least be a target date. It doesn't need to be a hard
                          date.

                          And even retracted that and just basically said, no, we just wanted to go
                          (unintelligible). And they spend a lot of time debating whether they could set a
                          reasonable pace or a competitive pace or - yes, but that's kind of the idea. So
                          as long as we can give them a reasonable timeframe, they will be okay.

Stephanie Perrin: Well, that really clarified, didn't it? Sorry, I realize you're just bringing the
                          message, right? Shall we move on to the next item - response to the
                          technical study group? Are we going to agree on a response to this do you
                          think?

Graeme Bunton: Yes, maybe you should - this is (Graham). Maybe you should elaborate on
                          what your thoughts are first and then…

Stephanie Perrin: Is it working? Good. I think in terms of procedurally, it is not clear how this
                          was a part of the multi-stakeholder process. So we have some concerns
                          there which I kind of raised on across community panel the other day.

                          I don't believe we ever agreed on coming up with codes of conduct and
                          getting them certified. So that, again, seems to be outside of the multi-
                          stakeholder process. And that's a policy matter, not a technical matter.

                          But the actual demonstration that (RDAP) can do what - the claim was made
                          in the EWG report, to me, it almost seems like somebody said take the EWG
                          report, prove it can be done and then we'll have that tucked away.

That's what it - for shorthand purposes, that's what I'm reading into it. However, those other sort of policy bits that are buried in there give us some concern.

And although (Rom) met with us the other day and admitted that they know they've got the policy concerns that was a constraint from the beginning, sure, that's fine. But those are pretty key policy concerns, you know, starting with this ICANN, the controller or not. That's pretty basic.

So, we have to - we haven't really even had time to digest the report yet. Hands up, who's got it mastered? I don't think any of us. So, there are going to be some thoughts coming from us about buried policy issues.

I can only really speak for myself on this because we haven't communicated with our membership yet. But as I've said umpteen times, though University of Toronto as a research project.

We did a workshop in Barcelona. The conclusion that we have reached is that nobody wants to work on ISO standards here and ICANN, oddly enough. That is a pain you know I guess.

And, however, the concept of an independent digital data trust has some legs. And that the actual engine that they're building should not be within ICANN.

It should be outsourced in a jurisdiction where there's data protection, where there can be independent oversight and we don't get into the adequacy problem.

So, I'm just giving you the results of our research projects. That'll be published within the month if I ever write it. And we're applying for more funding to do more research on the digital data trust. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: (Unintelligible). I don't see the TSG model as an implementation of the EWG because EWG was strictly centralized and the TSG model was very distributed.

Perhaps too much distributed, but the point of order here is that that is a growing sensation that TSG will die a lonely death anyway. So, we might onto postpone a decision on - and hence which of that and see if there is something real to answer to and perhaps just let it die alone.

Woman: Okay, I've got a little bit of the queue happening. (Sarah) had wanted to jump in and I see (David) and (Volker).

(Sarah): Yes, so I do agree that the TSG stands outside multi-stakeholder policy development process which is a problem.

I went through the report and I just found some interesting things are discrepancies that I wanted to bring up. And really there's no clarity for how the conclusions that they come to will be operational and how does it turn into real life?

Who is building it? Nobody, right. They said they are not building this thing, so they're making a model. Like, I can build it. I've already got my tiered access system. I don't need them to do it for me.

Also, they're saying they are the only group is going to authorize access or disclosure of non-public registration data. So, what happens if I get a warrant and I'm supposed to respond to from my government saying to give them data.

Do I have to tell them go ask ICANN? It doesn't work. And what happens if I disagree with ICANN's request to disclose the data? Do I tell them no? What if the data subject dispute that? And then they go to the DPA and it's found to be improper? This comes back to liability, right?

So I just see a lot of issues. But I will say, I read the report and I was surprised. They don't seem to be getting super into policy. They really do seem to be sticking to what their charter says, taking the policy that we are going to put out and just operationalize it except for they're not actually building it.

Woman: Yes, before I jump over to the queue - and I see you, (Maxim), too, I think one of the phrases I heard you guys batting around earlier this week was that it essentially become, a proof of concept, right?

That like the technology can support or what the policies will build. So I think, you know, that's the way I am these have been thinking about it, so.

Woman: Can I just add to that?

Woman: Yes.

(Sarah):   So, I agree with you. Yes, it is just a proof of concept. It just bothers me because they're spending a lot of money on it and it's not part of how we're supposed to do things.

Graeme Bunton: Yes, In talking to the team, that there were a lot of things that seems like policy decisions that they made and then you talk to them and most of them, they were told, it was in their spec.

They were told by ICANN, you will assume that ICANN will be the one, you know, centralized provider or you will - you know, and there are couple of other big policy assumptions as there.

There were clearly, well, massive policy assumptions that ICANN did not really seem to realize they were giving massive policy things. So I think,

clearly the way the whole process got started with a little, you know, confused.

I mean, I think it's interesting. It really shows the potential of the sort of complex models we can build with, you know, the flexibility of the way - not so much (RDAP), but the way (RDAP) builds on, you know, so many other Web standards that we could just run in there and do complicated authentication models without having to go and build any new standards ourselves.

It's great and it's very interesting to see. But it's such that it - they went into way more detail than it should have had something that has so many, you know, assumptions - policy assumptions and it.

And they, you know, have spent all this effort is something that you sort of go but why did you build that if then - you know, why did you put that much effort into something that is so speculative from our point of view?

So, it's really - it was interesting to read and it was great, but I mean, I think that this is just go, oh, cool, you can do a lot of things with (RDAP) and then just move on and build the policy model that pretty much ignores their model and the assumptions behind it.

And until I believe such point as we've actually discussed them and decided where they want to go with any of them, I personally think that ICANN is the central - one central point is going to be really problematic for exactly the same reasons (Sarah) just mentioned, for example.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, (David), before we get to (Volker) - sorry, this is (Graham). This is also your reminder to say your name. Please and thank you.

Graeme Bunton: (Unintelligible) speaking for the record. I think I need to disagree with my colleague, (Rubens) here. Just because there is no community support for

anything that is developed by ICANN, we should not expect it must develop legs and start running or even rocket insert flying off into the stratosphere.

This could be (Yuren)'s strawman and we all remember how that was supported by the community and how that stuff. So, we should be very careful about thinking that something is going to die in the crib.

We should - bad example. Bad example. Forget the example, but we should kill it.

Woman: Maxim, go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the transfer. First of all, it an assumption that system designed by taking a couple of guys with the understanding of legal issues of technical guys, is a bit weird.

And it might be girls, too. Not necessary. Anyway, so, the second thing is, they were building system with assumption that they are building on a conclusion to which EPDP will come.

It's even worse. It's like they do you go that we know where we will eat you, yes, is one (unintelligible), outcome. And the other is we don't care. So I'm not going to choose but I suggest that we need to say something that it was a good example of ICANN being able to spend money on some hypothetical idea.

But we would consider the other approach, that the next iteration of something like this, is going to be based on that with a technical sophistication which are compatible with the outcome of the policy (for us).

So to avoid, like, but they have financial plan of next year, seem like $6 million spent on the further development of it. I would suggest that we don't

keep silenced and I'm not suggesting the that killing it with fire we can choose some other methods.

Woman: Yes, Maxim, I think you this might be a case that where, like, the best defense is a good offense and for the EPDP phase two to develop a pretty robust workplan that says, you know, we're taking this back, like, we're developing the policy that's going to drive this thing.

You know, maybe one way to crack that. So I have (Mikali). Farsi, and you are you in the queue or you're just driving my attention to (Mikali)? And then, okay, I have (Mikali), Farsi and then (Rubens) and then (Kurt).

(Mikali): Thanks. (Mikali) for the record. So, several times over the last couple of days, (Yuren) has, not only said that the TSG was something that the CPH asked for, but has thanked us for asking for it.

So, okay, so for those of you who may not be aware, that and I think it was October thereabouts, there was a lot of pressure on ICANN politically to do something, I mean, anything around this entire universal access, yada, yada, yada, thing, whatever the hell you want to call it.

So we, as the contracting parties, wrote a letter to ICANN, and I am paraphrasing this and if anybody wants the original letter, I have it and I can send you a link to it, basically saying we're more than happy to let you explore options which we include in and there's a list of things that they have said in various (fora) previously.

The way the letter was worded and any of my colleagues from the registrars or registries can jump in, did not, nor was it intended to give ICANN, (Yuren), or anybody else, a green light to go off and build a super-duper anything.

In the set of assumptions that were given to the TSG is pretty clear, came directly from - I'm not really sure but came directly from (unintelligible) were specifically from (Yuren). I'm not clear on that bit.

And (Ram) yesterday wasn't 100% clear. Those other people in the room my people to clarify. The letter which I'll send out to a couple of you again, you can have a look at what we actually said, but it's been interpreted quite differently.

Now I know there has been some conversations on the registrars I, at least, must potentially trying to address that in a public forum. But he did literally comments a GNSO Council meeting today and thanked us for this which left a lot of us feeling rather confused. But he's blaming us for it essentially.

Farzaneh Badii: Thanks. Farsi (Unintelligible) speaking. So I believe that it was a premature effort. They did not - they didn't wait for phase one report, and I don't know why they took the decision to just formulate it.

And I have to disagree that they were strictly working on the technical issues. There were some aspects of it that really related to policy so they considered having a complaint mechanism if the requester to personal information does not get what they need.

So - and that the policy question. So I was premature and I think that - I now don't know what is going to happen next, whether we are going to be told that we should work on the results of the solution and kind of improve it or are we going to start again another technical group to come up with solutions after we actually have the policy recommendations in place?

And I don't know what NCSG position is on this. We haven't discussed it but I would like to know probably soon what they really think, but we want to do.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl. Just to respond to (Volker) that it's not ICANN is going to QPSG because it will be flawed. ICANN has a history of keeping flawed systems alive.

It's not because it doesn't have community support. ICANN really doesn't care about – think about them. But because that model might bring them real trouble, legal issues, liability, operational problems, so they might kill it in their own defense, not in ours.

And the only real thing that they liked about the model, something that they might try to complete somewhere else, is that they could assure law enforcement of the secrecy of law enforcement's request on data disclosure.

So, they might (unintelligible) those request that – ICANN compliance request. They insisted on having a purpose for that. So, that's something we should be on the watch for.

But that's the only real good feature for them of that model, was that assurance, because for – in any other way, this was something that would only bring another point of failure to the problem, where a distributed system wouldn't work even then. \

Graeme Bunton: So, I have two points to make. One is with respect to the TSG work I think we should be creating this policy with sort of blinders on, that, one, there's a risk that if we try to take it into account, we'll tire ourselves into knots, as complicated a problem as it is.

And, second, I think we all agree that, you know, implementation should follow the policy. And my opinion is that ICANN was trying to do some things in parallel in order to save time and the TSG is sort of a gamble.

You know, to say, you know, if it works out in – you know, works in lockstep with the policy that is developed, then it's a timesaver. But the more important

issue I think is about how we, for the GNSO so should get involved in ICANN communications with the data protection board.

I heard, as part of this discussion, that the TSG work might be communicated to the data protection board. And I'm concerned that that communication between ICANN and the data protection board can sort of work around the policy and create certain expectations about how ICANN outcomes are going to be.

I remember in the EPDP, if I said that right, I crafted this letter to the data protection board and said this is like think I should send an everybody said, well, that's crap. They said, you know, we should - we'll embarrass ourselves if we send that.

And it turns out three days after we made a decision, ICANN send their own letter to the data protection board about the progress they were making on this issue. In many of our team felt that the ICANN communication was not even as meaningful as the one we intended to send.

So somehow, I think, and it's not easy, but somehow I think that there should be some effort with ICANN org to coordinate communication with the EDP, the data protection board and limit them in some way so that we, as an organization, come out coherent and that any communications to not interfere with our policy outcomes.

Woman: All right, it's (David) and then Stephanie.

(David): Yes, and you can sort of - you can very much see with the organization and the board are all very keen to get, you know, the whole thing to a point where it's sort of operational as quickly as possible.

But the urge to do things in parallel is there but really the process here was - there was no communication with the EPDP.

And that's the question I would sort of be interested - we heard absolutely nothing whatsoever from them about - from the TSG because we - but there were some contracted parties numbers in the group I wondered if you got any communication at all about what was going on.

Was it as much a mystery to you, even though you had some of your people there, I guess? In this idea just trying to come up with a solution independently and push forward in parallel clearly doesn't work and we really got to make that very clear to the board this.

And this includes our board liaison. He should be, you know, helping, you know, deal with things like poor communication and so on, on the issue, that this does not help.

The parallel processes with no interaction whatsoever are not really going to speed anything up. In fact, they're probably going to slow things down as they have tended to in the past.

And, yes, you know, that will be I think a good message from at least everyone up here but maybe even other EPDP people just go parallel processes with no communication will not help. Parallel processes that have active communication and coordination, maybe.

Stephanie Parrin: Yes, Stephanie Parrin for the record, and maybe just add a little nuance to what (David) is saying, I mean, there were - you folks that people on that group staffing it, so obviously we didn't.

And we promised that we would send to (Ram) comments on it from a privacy by design perspective and from a policy issues that we see embedded, policy questions that haven't been answered.

I'm kind of echoing what (Sarah) said a few minutes ago. I think we share a lot of those concerns and, like I said, we haven't had time to really go through it.

But procedurally, it doesn't contribute to trust when this kind of thing is - I mean, did my best to follow the list. I pestered the folks that I happen to know to try to get answers, but the working stuff was password-protected so it was not something I could examine, nor could I comment on.

So, that's one thing. Second thing, I would love it if you guys happen to know who they've been consulting in terms of data protection commissioners. I'm so curious. It's just going to eat me up.

I, on the other hand, part of the reason that I am so transparent about what we're doing around our privacy commissioner funded research projects so that you're well aware.

I'm going to send then on to the data commissioners with comments on it and if you got any concerns, let me know.

Elsa Saade: So, Elsa for the record. I'm not sure TSG is going to - anytime soon or I'm not sure it's going to leave. And so I kind of agree that there should be an and offense and I'm not sure if the offense would lie in the IRT and in close coordination with the TSG really IRT.

I'm not sure if that's a choice that we can make for going forward, but since TSG - I don't see TSG going anywhere. Maybe we can create the offense strategy which (Sam) mentioned earlier. And, yes, I thought of the IRT. That's it.

Woman: Just to address a question that you raise, Stephanie, about if we know who ICANN org is consulting with at the DPA level, the answer is no and we all wish we did.

All right, do we have anyone else you want to jump in on this topic? All right, before (I go onto number four), any other business? Anyone got anything great? Going once.

All right, well, it's 6:00 pm by my clock. We have 30 minutes left. I'd be happy to give you guys 30 minutes of your evening because I can make those decisions, I guess, for this whole group.

All right, thanks all for joining. Thanks for the great conversation. Let's keep the lines of communication open as we go into phase two and have a great rest of the meeting.

END