

Adobe Connect: 29

Alan Greenberg (ALAC)

Alan Woods (RySG)

Alex Deacon (IPC)

Amr Elsadr (NCSG)

Ashley Heineman (GAC)

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG)

Ayden Férdeline - NCSG

Ben Butler (SSAC)

Benedict Addis (SSAC)

Chris Disspain (ICANN Board Liaison)

Chris Lewis-Evans [GAC]

Collin Kurre (NCSG)

Diane Plaut (IPC)

Emily Taylor (RrSG)

Esteban Lescano (ISPCP)

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC)

James Bladel (RrSG)

Julf Helsingius (NCSG)

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC)

Kristina Rosette (RySG)

Kurt Pritz (Chair)

Leon Sanchez (ICANN Board Liaison)

Marc Anderson (RySG)

Margie Milam (BC)

Mark Svancarek (BC)

Matt Serlin (RrSG)

Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison)

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG)

Tatiana Tropina (NCSG)

On audio only:

none

Apologies:

Georgios Tselentis (GAC)

Farzaneh Badiei(NCSG)

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP)

Milton Mueller (NCSG)

Audio Cast (FOR ALTERNATES AND OBSERVERS)

Peak: 30 joined

Staff:

Marika Konings

Caitline Tubergen

Trang Nguyen (ICANN Org Liaison - GDD)

Daniel Halloran (ICANN Org Liaison -Legal)

Berry Cobb

Mike Brennan

Andrea Glandon

Nathalie Peregrine

Terri Agnew

Marika Konings:Welcome to EPDP Team Meeting #3 on Thursday 9 August 2018

Terri Agnew:agenda wiki page (with slides): https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_nAtpBQ&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=SDBu_FVMqs9TSsqGV9IfZfdXtre-2Z9ND8E0282xHDM&s=1R42Bc1-2c2EstK092Q2jjTfXlgOoqyYCeMPViQs_k&e=

Kavouss Arasteh:Good moring, Good afternoon, Good evening to all hosts

Kavouss Arasteh:hi KURT,i SEE THAT YOU ARE WORKING VERY HARD

Kavouss Arasteh - GAC:Sorry for CAP.Please delete and replace it by,Hi Kurt I see that you are working very hard

Kurt Pritz:I didn't realise this was "work," Kavouss

Kavouss Arasteh - GAC:GAC has reviewed Part 2 yesterday on the first round and further review that on the tsecond round tomorrow Friday,10 August with a view to endeavour to be submitted to Kurt Friday Afternoon

Kavouss Arasteh - GAC:Yes it was more than work in fact it is leadership and guidance

Ayden Férdeline - NCSG:Hi all

Leon Sanchez:Hello everyone

Tatiana Tropina - NCSG:Hello everyone

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:Hi all

Amr Elsadr - NCSG:Hi all.

Amr Elsadr - NCSG:Hearing an echo. Will drop off, and dial back in.

Terri Agnew:@Amr, let us know if a dial out would be helpful

Amr Elsadr - NCSG:Thanks, Terri. All good now.

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:the sound is lost

Emily Taylor (RrSG):Just getting weird mouse noises

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:back again

Alan Greenberg - ALAC:Still sound here.

Emily Taylor (RrSG):OK now

Ashley Heineman (GAC):I assume we can travel on our own dime.

Nathalie Peregrine:My audio is fine, if you are using AC audio, Chrome works better. Alternatively please dial into the audio bridge.

Kavouss Arasteh - GAC:Pls kindly consider my comment relating to the venue of the meeting due to general ban/restriction imposed to the nationals of some country

Ayden Férdeline - NCSG:@Kavouss the NCSG has some members who cannot leave the United States because of the same ban, so a meeting in Los Angeles would allow them to participate in this, whereas they cannot travel, say, to Spaion

James Bladel - RrSG:Agree with Emily. If the contacts are the same/duplicate, then it is not minimized data. If tehy are different, then how do we track consent between Registrant and the other (Admin/Tech) contacts?

Matt Serlin - RrSG:I think Emily correctly summarized the RrSG position based on feedback we received

Alex Deacon - IPC:@Emily - so to be clear you are objecting to the required collection of tech/admin data, not the voluntary collection based on Consent?

Matt Serlin - RrSG:As James states, it's challenging to track consent for those other contacts when generally it is the registrant who is processing the domain registration

Emily Taylor (RrSG):@Alex - thank you for this question. I can give you a sense of my personal opinion, and others from the RrSG can chime in too. Consent has become a highly problematic and complex issue under GDPR, as it has to be as easily withdrawn as given, and requirements to present users with clear language as the basis for consent

Mark Svancarek - BC:old hand

Ayden Férdeline - NCSG:Good point from James in the chat; the practicality of obtaining consent from someone who is not the registrant themselves has to be difficult

Ashley Heineman (GAC):Not to complicate, but in the cases that this information is collected, since there is more to processing that just collection, it is still important to have this language here, no?

Kristina Rosette (RySG):Just because an ICANN policy distinguishes among the contacts doesn't mean that registrants are aware of and understand those distinctions.

Emily Taylor (RrSG):@Ashley - absolutely there would be more to it than collection, but if you can't justify collection for any legit reason then it's problematic. The EPAG decision is pretty clear on this point I think

Kavouss Arasteh - GAC:On the first reaction on TEch. Spec., it seems there are many items that registry and registrar have major problems as they replies are almost opposition

Alex Deacon - IPC:One last comment regarding tech/admin is that SAC044 specifies: Maintaining administrative and technical contacts plays a role in reducing single points of failure or attack.

Ayden Férdeline - NCSG:Yes we can

Collin Kurre - NCSG:we can hear you

Kavouss Arasteh - GAC:SChris reflected GAC views then pls clarify the matter enabling GAC to further submit its position

Kavouss Arasteh - GAC:Sorry for misspelling, pls correct SChris to read Chris , apology for that

James Bladel - RrSG:Kurt - I think our concerns mirror those of the NCSG/Amr

Amr Elsadr - NCSG:Here's the text we were suggesting: Enabling verified and authorized third parties (if any) to request relevant data from registrars and registries in a secure manner to address issues involving domain name registrations

Ashley Heineman (GAC):As noted by my colleagues (quoting here) "Article 2 of GDPR clearly states that several categories/types of processing fall outside its scope and thus are NOT subject to the balancing test of Article 6(1)(f). This includes processing for criminal law enforcement and by competent authorities for safeguarding against and the prevention of threats to public security, which falls outside the scope of the GDPR and instead is subject to Directive (EU) 2016/680. Moreover, Article 6 of the GDPR provides for lawful processing in a number of circumstances as set forth in Article 6(1)(a) - (e), such as processing necessary for the performance of a task carried out in the public interest, that also are NOT subject to the balancing test of "overridden by the interest or fundamental rights" in (f). Finally, Article 6(1) also states that (f) "shall not apply to processing carried out by public authorities in the performance of their tasks."

Alex Deacon - IPC:+1 Ashley

Kavouss Arasteh - GAC:Kurt; Since the Author of this Temp. Spec ,based on 7using GPDR is ICANN, there may be the need to ask ICANN the rationale on the way it is drafted rather than someone else begins to comments .However, further comments may be provided by the Cair or EPDP Members

Amr Elsadr - NCSG:@Margie: I wasn't claiming that IP concerns are outside ICANN's remit.

Margie Milam - BC:@Amr - that's good to know :)

Emily Taylor (RrSG):@Margie - What Amr said :)

Amr Elsadr - NCSG:Just that there is a logical order in which to become more specific on what is or isn't within ICANN's remit. The level of specificity in 4.4.8 at this point is not helpful, and IP concerns are conflated with a number of others. Also not helpful.

Kavouss Arasteh - GAC:Ashley +1

Kurt Pritz:@ Kavouss - we are compiling a list of questions for the "drafter" of the temporary specifications and will capture your question

Collin Kurre - NCSG:link Benedict referenced - https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_resources_pages_framework-2Dregistry-2Doperator-2Drespond-2Dsecurity-2Dthreats-2D2017-2D10-2D20-2Den&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0A1gn-H4xR2EBk&m=SDBu_FVMqs9TSqoGV9lfZfdXtre-2Z9ND8E0282xHDM&s=pg9u7N-N9jGHRozsECjDCU7cijMSbzf7ejRO310i1qs&e=

Benedict Addis -SSAC:Thanks Collin, you're faster than me!

Margie Milam - BC:Ashley +1

Collin Kurre - NCSG:;)

Ayden Férdeline - NCSG:Can anyone not live with the language that Amr proposed? If so, what are your concerns? (He proposed: "Enabling verified and authorized third parties (if any) to request relevant data from registrars and registries in a secure manner to address issues involving domain name registrations)

James Bladel - RrSG:The content hook in UDRP/URS is very specific to those processes, and I caution against applying it broadly as content regulation being within ICANN's remit.

Kavouss Arasteh - GAC:Tks Kurt, Comments including that from Ashley need to be included and duly answered

Stephanie Perrin - NCSG:The only problem with that Alex is that the Bylaws were not crafted with data protection law in mind. Not suggesting massive rewrite is required, but I think a reminder is necessary that ICANN until very recent history has tried its best to ignore relevant data protection law.

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:To be able to tarce bad actors is an important thing for any civilized society - domain names, IP addresses, email addresses are all examples of such identifiers

Alex Deacon - IPC:@james - to be clear I'm not suggesting that ICANN should be a content regulator.

Tatiana Tropina - NCSG:Alex, I do not see how the requests related to IP infringement related to DNS and all other IP infringements are separated

Alex Deacon - IPC:@Stepanie - not suggesting we ignore data protection laws - just that I don't agree with the the blanket statement that "content" is not in scope is ICANN.

Tatiana Tropina - NCSG:(at least from your point of view)

Tatiana Tropina - NCSG:EU work is right now is mere proposal. And not clear if it is going to be adopted and in which form

Ayden Férdeline - NCSG:it is not ICANN's responsibility to fix issues with MLATs and cross jurisdictional challenges

Tatiana Tropina - NCSG:Ayden, +1 -- and not every country's law supports this "voluntary" collaboration...

James Bladel - RrSG:To be clear - the suggestion is that ICANN could contractually compel Registrars/Registries to comply with data disclosure requests from LEA that are outside of their jurisdiction?

Collin Kurre - NCSG:^ second James' clarification question

Benedict Addis -SSAC:Ayden, this is going to happen whether ICANN makes a rule or not. My suggestion is that we find a standard, transparent, regularised way to do it.

Benedict Addis -SSAC:James - absolutely no compulsion.

Amr Elsadr - NCSG:Don't want to waste the team's time with this question by speaking up, but thought I'd put it in the chat. When filling out the survey, we were a little puzzled by 4.4.10. We're not clear on how registration data facilitates provision of zone files of gTLDs to Internet users.

Benedict Addis -SSAC:Simply recognise that RO (or registrar) *may* hand over data to foreign LE. As per thinking in security framework.

Matt Serlin - RrSG:+1 to Amr...the RrSG had the same perspective

Benedict Addis -SSAC:+1 Amr

Stephanie Perrin - NCSG:Benedict, we are trying to hold a workshop in Barcelona to discuss the potential for international standards to be useful in the matter of access to third party data. (research project funded by the Privacy Commissioner of Canada, through the University of Toronto.). This could assist in this problem, and the data commissioners have already indicated that these matters remain voluntary.

Emily Taylor (RrSG):+1 to Amr

Stephanie Perrin - NCSG:(which means that if Michele still insists on only the Garda getting his data, fine)

Stephanie Perrin - NCSG:While it is the case that some civil society actors take a dim view of any access to subscriber data, we are trying to move forward with a more harmonized approach/

Amr Elsadr - NCSG:My understanding is the zone files contains no PII. Am I wrong?

James Bladel - RrSG:Amr - they =could=. If the domain name was also a person (e.g. jamesbladel.com)

Benedict Addis -SSAC:Stephanie - yes that's fine, I meant that LE compelling Michele to produce "subscriber data" was out of scope.

Amr Elsadr - NCSG:@James: Right!! Thanks.

James Bladel - RrSG:But that runs in to the service of the contract. Why name your domain/business after yourself if you don't want it to be found?

Ayden Férdeline - NCSG:Okay, right, so there is personal information in there, but that doesn't mean it can't be used.

Amr Elsadr - NCSG:Yes. Understood. But was really puzzled by the provision, but get it now. Thanks again, James.

James Bladel - RrSG:Kurt - well said. There are other processes to support these use cases.

Benedict Addis -SSAC:What I'm trying to avoid is a registrar in future saying "I can't hand over data on a criminal because ICANN hasn't explicitly permitted it"

Collin Kurre - NCSG:Jumping way back in the chat to Ashley's earlier citation from GDPR Article 2, the provision specifies that processing for criminal law enforcement and competent authorities because it is **instead subject to Directive (EU) 2016/680**. It's worth noting that there could be a higher standard of proof or due process in Europe which doesn't exist elsewhere, which is a compelling reason why this loophole shouldn't be universally applied

Collin Kurre - NCSG:sorry, processing "falls outside of scope and is not subject to balancing test" because...

Tatiana Tropina - NCSG:@Benedict, I find your concern valid but I don't think it's going to be the case of LEA requests as they do have legitimate demands

Stephanie Perrin - NCSG:It certainly makes it easier to avoid conflation if collection, use, disclosure and retention are separated/

Kavouss Arasteh - GAC:The scope of the collected use resulting from facilitating needs to be clearly defined

Benedict Addis -SSAC:Agree Collin, I think we don't need the loophole precisely because LE has due process *in jurisdiction*

Benedict Addis -SSAC:It is out of jurisdiction access we need to discuss, and there LE has no special status

Benedict Addis -SSAC:Tatiana I don't understand?

Tatiana Tropina - NCSG:I say that LEA will have access to data upon request in one way or another.

Tatiana Tropina - NCSG:I bet that if this was *only* about LEA access we wouldn't have had this battle, but LEA interests are lumped in with IP infringements, etc.

Benedict Addis -SSAC:+1

Alex Deacon - IPC:I've lost kurt...

James Bladel - RrSG:anyone else lose sound?

Matt Serlin - RrSG:Kurt is cutting out

Leon Sanchez - ICANN Board liaison:me too

Stephanie Perrin - NCSG:me too, lost a lot there

Tatiana Tropina - NCSG:I lost sound

Kurt Pritz:go ahead Kavouss

Kurt Pritz:Can I get a call out?

Emily Taylor (RrSG):I don't think the summary of 4.4.11 captures our concern - which is that the response to business/tech failure of a contracted party is handled by a mechanism that is separate from WHOIS

Kurt Pritz:<argie?

Kurt Pritz:Margie?
Leon Sanchez - ICANN Board liaison:We hear you Margie
Matt Serlin - RrSG:can hear Margie now
Matt Serlin - RrSG:and now Kurt again
Benedict Addis -SSAC:And Kurt too
Terri Agnew:@Kurt, having op dial out to you
Terri Agnew:checking in with everyone - if audio is cutting out ,please let me know and we can have the operator dial out via telephone
Emily Taylor (RrSG):In relation to 4.4.13 - I think our question was in relation to how WHOIS data is used in relation to audits
Ashley Heineman (GAC):I get the zone file issue now. Sorry for being slow. Because it isn't a WHOIS issue, it doesn't belong here. GDPR compliance issues around that will need to be dealt with elsewhere in the agreements if necessary. right?
Emily Taylor (RrSG):There was also a query in relation to lawful transfers out of EEA to ICANN - will ICANN be applying for Privacy Shield
Benedict Addis -SSAC:Ashley yes, that's SSAC's understanding too
Alan Woods (RySG):ICANN can't apply for privacy Shield as its a nNot for Profit
Alan Woods (RySG):*not for profit
Benedict Addis -SSAC:Alan srsly?
Alan Woods (RySG):yes. alas
Alan Woods (RySG):(typing not my strong point today)
Ayden Férdeline - NCSG:non-profits are not subject to the FTC
Ayden Férdeline - NCSG:* not subject to the jurisdiction of the FTC
Kristina Rosette (RySG):Dropping from adobe momentarily
Stephanie Perrin - NCSG:A consumer would have a right under the GDPR to access escrow data.
James Bladel - RrSG:@margie - the escrow recovery process doesn't include a step or provision for consumers to check/verify their data.
Ashley Heineman (GAC):I'm more and more under the impression that very thin lines are being put in place between these different terms even though it is the same information.
Mark Svancarek - BC:+1 well said
Ashley Heineman (GAC):Not saying it they are unnecessary thin lines, just trying to understand the different perspectives
Chris Lewis-Evans [GAC]:+1 Marc
Ashley Heineman (GAC):+1 Marc
Matt Serlin - RrSG:To be clear, zone files do not contain whois data...the point the RrSG made was that it is not relevant to a whois spec
Margie Milam - BC:@James - that's why WHOIS is needed to protect the consumer -- if the registrar goes out of business or their site is down, the registry serves up the WHOIS record for the registrant or the consumer
Kavouss Arasteh - GAC:Alan+1, we are going too far about the objective of this sub para.,We need to move on
Amr Elsadr - NCSG:@James: +1
Benedict Addis -SSAC: at
Alex Deacon - IPC:+1 James - I think this is about collection to enable escrow.
Benedict Addis -SSAC:Matt is correct. No personal data in zone file. just list of domains
James Bladel - RrSG:ouch. echo
Diane Plaut - IPC:Agreed with Margie- by saying that information is not needed is incorrect. Consumer protection must be considered.

Ayden Férdeline - NCSG:@Benedict - but a domain name can contain personal information
Benedict Addis -SSAC: Ayden, that way lies madness!
Ayden Férdeline - NCSG: it is just factual
Kavouss Arasteh - GAC: The discussion so far going on goes beyond the scope and purpose of this sub paragraph
Ashley Heineman (GAC): Matt - as Alan just noted, there is some information in the zone file that is the same. Servers, correct?
James Bladel - RrSG: Disagree with Alan. Different data, different purposes, altho there is significant overlap.
Emily Taylor (RrSG): +1 to what James said
Alan Greenberg - ALAC:@James, my concern is that in some cases, it is the SAME data although it is used for various purposes, some RDS, some not.
Ashley Heineman (GAC): I guess the gating question is.. is all WHOIs information collected (and all other processing) done seperate and apart from how that information is used elsewhere?
Kavouss Arasteh - GAC: Kurt, we need to warp up the discussion as it is going round and round
Alan Greenberg - ALAC: Can we claim we are collecting the DNS servers for publication and collecting the same data under a different name for inclusion in the zone file or escrow?
Kurt Pritz:@ Kavouss - understand
Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: Different purposes yes, but how different is the data? here we are talking about registration data why do we insist on saying whois
Alan Greenberg - ALAC: Sorry, I haven't fully retrained myself to say RDS instead of WHOIS...
Kavouss Arasteh - GAC: Support the Chair to put the comments together and move on
Stephanie Perrin - NCSG: Escrow is a form of processing. Many companies (especially regulated ones) are required to have some kind of escrow.
Ayden Férdeline - NCSG: I can't hear you Amr
Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: amr we can't hear you
Leon Sanchez - ICANN Board liaison: I just hear some heavy breathing
Amr Elsadr - NCSG: Is my audio not coming through
Matt Serlin - RrSG: no Amr...
Amr Elsadr - NCSG: ?
Amr Elsadr - NCSG: Sorry. Will try again in a minute.
Nathalie Peregrine: Amr, you need to enable your mic. It's activated but not enabled. Click on the phone icon at the top of the AC room
Amr Elsadr - NCSG: Was on the audio bridge, but have switched the AC room audio.
Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:@Amr good the AC room audio is good
Ashley Heineman (GAC): VERY IMPORTANT
Alex Deacon - IPC:@marc - question - does the Registry agreement require this functionality or just allow it.
Stephanie Perrin - NCSG: Bearing in mind that a hashed ID that is persistent across domains is an identifier....but yes
Kristina Rosette (RySG): New gTLD RA allows it, but if applicant said in application that it would offer searchable Whois, the applicant was required to include it in the RA.
Kristina Rosette (RySG): However, it is possible through RSEP to remove searchable Whois. google has done it.
Benedict Addis -SSAC: Stephanie - shy
Trang Nguyen - ICANN Org Liaison (GDD):@Kurt, you are correct. Applicants could obtain an extra point if they offer searchability in their applications.
Benedict Addis -SSAC: argh - why is it an identifier?

Kristina Rosette (RySG):Your recollection is correct, Kurt. 1 extra point in that question for offering searchable whois.

Alex Deacon - IPC:Agree with Margie that search is important for investigations..

Mark Svancarek - BC:@Benedict, if you are doing correlation analysis, you could correlate the hashes rather than the inputs to the hashes, then use the correlations thus identified to justify deeper data request

Diane Plaut - IPC:Yes, Margie, it is important for consumer protection and enforcement purposes.

Stephanie Perrin - NCSG:Benedict, because you can link it to the individual. Bit like a social insurance number in US and Canada....or a telephone number

Benedict Addis -SSAC:Thank you Mark and Stephanie. be

Mark Svancarek - BC:Hashes can be truncated which reduce ability to link back to an ID while still allowing for correlation

Stephanie Perrin - NCSG:This is why standards would be useful to you folks here....sets out the parameters of that hash, and how to manage requests for real ID

Benedict Addis -SSAC:It's been years since I studied cryptography. Seen some interesting thoughts on secure hashing in IETF drafts that might address the problem whilst still permitting pivot.

Stephanie Perrin - NCSG:I would describe it as a privacy enhancing technology (aka privacy by design) but it does not qualify as an anonymization technique.

Stephanie Perrin - NCSG:(and despite my years at Zero Knowledge systems, I need to study up every time I talk about crypto. To many of us, it is not intuitive.....)

Kavouss Arasteh - GAC:Whatever is decided on search capability, it should not result in surveillance in any form

Benedict Addis -SSAC:;)

Alan Greenberg - ALAC:It IS an argument why the temp spec should allow bulk access with certain limitations.

James Bladel - RrSG:Pleaes mute

Collin Kurre - NCSG:They can't, they're asleep :)

James Bladel - RrSG:someone is snoring

Amr Elsadr - NCSG:Snoring? Or yawning?

Emily Taylor (RrSG):LOL!

Terri Agnew:please remember to mute

Amr Elsadr - NCSG:Yeah. Snoring!! :D

Tatiana Tropina - NCSG:Darth Vader breathing

Alan Greenberg - ALAC:@Benedict, I think hashed data would satisfy the need. The question is whether under GDPR, we can require it. I would like to think yes, but it is not fully obvious.

Amr Elsadr - NCSG:@Terri: I don't think whoever is snoring read your msg in the chat!! :-)

Terri Agnew:the line is found and muted

Tatiana Tropina - NCSG:Terri, :-)

Benedict Addis -SSAC:We cannot did lose the person snoring due to ...

James Bladel - RrSG:NAME NAMES, TERRI. :)

Benedict Addis -SSAC:^ disclose

Alan Greenberg - ALAC:Kurt, past the 90 minute mark, we start to fade

Leon Sanchez - ICANN Board liaison:LOL

Leon Sanchez - ICANN Board liaison:That would be against GDPR I guess James :P

Emily Taylor (RrSG):Kurt - I think the summary captures the comments well

Mark Svancarek - BC:Ha

Benedict Addis -SSAC:The anonymised email solution is so fugly

Ashley Heineman (GAC):When is survey 3 due?

Alan Greenberg - ALAC:Anonymizd with a unique version for each registration is really bad!
Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:ok :)
Benedict Addis -SSAC:Ashley Wednesday 19h UTC
James Bladel - RrSG:hah...like I dont know what snoring sounds like
Margie Milam - BC:it was snoring!
Matt Serlin - RrSG:we have consensus on something!!!
Amr Elsadr - NCSG:Ha!
Marika Konings:@Ashley - Part 3 Temp Spec Survey submissions due by Wednesday 15 August (19.00 UTC)
Amr Elsadr - NCSG:@Marc: +1
James Bladel - RrSG:+1 Marc
Matt Serlin - RrSG:Agree with Marc
Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:+1 marc
Collin Kurre - NCSG:I appreciated Ayden's attempt to rally around a suggested rewording for 4.4.8 earlier. It could be useful for all of us to continue trying to pinpoint new elements of agreement on the fly like that
Collin Kurre - NCSG:Either during the calls or on the list
Stephanie Perrin - NCSG:Indeed it would be very helpful to capture that..//
Collin Kurre - NCSG:Suggestion: "Enabling verified and authorized third parties (if any) to request relevant data from registrars and registries in a secure manner to address issues involving domain name registrations"
Terri Agnew:The fourth meeting of the GNSO Temp Spec gTLD RD EPDP is scheduled on Tuesday, 14 August 2018 at 13:00 UTC for 2 hours. Please note, will plan for 90 minute discussion with 30 minutes to run over if needed.
Marika Konings:Second survey is due tomorrow, as a reminder :-)
Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:Thank you all - bye
Ayden Férdeline - NCSG:thanks all
Mark Svancarek - BC:thx
James Bladel - RrSG:Thx Kurt & team.
Amr Elsadr - NCSG:Thanks all. Bye.
Matt Serlin - RrSG:thanks all
Rafik Dammak- GNSO Council Liaison:thanks all
Marc Anderson - RySG:thank you all
Tatiana Tropina - NCSG:thanks all! bye
Julf Helsingius (NCSG):Thanks all
Chris Lewis-Evans [GAC]:thanks all
Collin Kurre - NCSG:thanks!
Leon Sanchez - ICANN Board liaison:thanks everyone
Leon Sanchez - ICANN Board liaison:Kaye
Ashley Heineman (GAC):bye
Benedict Addis -SSAC:Ta!