

Adobe Connect: 29

Alan Greenberg (ALAC)
Alan Woods (RySG)
Alex Deacon (IPC)
Amr Elsadr (NCSG)
Ashley Heineman (GAC)
Ayden Férdeline (NCSG)
Ben Butler (SSAC)
Benedict Addis (SSAC)
Beth Bacon (RySG)
Chris Disspain (ICANN Board Liaison)
Diane Plaut (IPC)
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG)
Fiona Asonga (ISPCP)
Georgios Tslentis (GAC)
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC)
James Bladel (RrSG-partial call)
Julf Helsingius (NCSG)
Kurt Pritz (Chair)
Leon Sanchez (ICANN Board Liaison)
Marc Anderson (RySG)
Margie Milam (BC)
Mark Svancarek (BC)
Matt Serlin (RrSG)
Milton Mueller (NCSG)
Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison)
Sarah Wyld (RrSG Alternate-partial call)
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG)
Theo Geurts (RrSG Alternate)
Thomas Rickert (ISPCP)

Audio Only:

None

Apologies:

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC)
Emily Taylor (RrSG)

Audio Cast (FOR ALTERNATES AND OBSERVERS)

Peak: 12 joined

View Only Adobe Connect:

36 joined

Staff:

Berry Cobb
Caitlin Tubergen
Daniel Halloran (ICANN Org Liaison-Legal)
Marika Konings
Trang Nguyen (ICANN Org Liaison-GDD)
Terri Agnew
Andrea Glandon

AC Chat:

Andrea Glandon: (2/20/2019 07:29) Welcome to the EPDP Team Call #47 held on Wednesday, 20 February 2019 at 14:00 UTC.

Andrea Glandon: (07:29) Wiki Agenda Page: <https://community.icann.org/x/FoU2Bg>

Rafik Dammak: (07:52) hi all

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (07:56) hello all
James Bladel (RrSG): (07:57) Morning!
James Bladel (RrSG): (07:57) Andrea, I see on my Nest cam that it snowed again last night. :(Glad to be in Arizona this week
Andrea Glandon: (07:58) @James, it did! And a little ice as well. Very jealous of AZ!
Ashley Heineman (GAC): (07:58) Morning from a snowy DC.
James Bladel (RrSG): (07:58) It's 45 degrees here and everyone is complaining.
Andrea Glandon: (07:58) HA! That would be heaven right now!
Andrea Glandon: (07:58) Although cold for AZ
Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (07:59) My sentiments exactly
James Bladel (RrSG): (07:59) Yawner, Please mute.
Matt Serlin (RrSG): (07:59) Snow in Boise too...though sadly not enough for a snow day off from school so my children are not pleased this am!
Ashley Heineman (GAC): (07:59) I'd rather have my kid in school rather than sitting right next to me looking bored. :-)
Andrea Glandon: (07:59) @Matt, I think we have had around 10 snow days this year.
James Bladel (RrSG): (07:59) Yes, it's been bad. Kids will be in school thru June.
Matt Serlin (RrSG): (08:00) Not a one for us!
Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:01) Hi all!
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (08:02) Hello all
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (08:02) Thank you kurt
Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:02) Kurt, thanks for your tireless work herding us.
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:03) Ditto. Frost bite warnings and I have to clear snow up to my waist to let the propane guy fill the tanks....
Matt Serlin (RrSG): (08:03) Thanks to Kurt, Marika, Caitlin, Terri, Berry, Andrea...and I'm sure others I didn't name but everyone who has supported this monumental effort!
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:04) And yes Kurt, many thanks for taking on this thankless task, and for your good humour throughout. It was indeed hard work, thanks a lot.
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:05) +1 Matt, staff have been fabulous
Diane Plaut (IPC): (08:05) Yes, thank you, Kurt and staff
Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (08:07) does anyone OTHER than the BC have an issue with the 30 day language? we spent so much time discussing this yesterday... surely we have a consensus already here
Margie Milam (BC): (08:08) A substantially shorter timeline will apply for "urgent disclosure requests",
....
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (08:08) I am fine with Margie's suggestion
Mark Svancarek (BC): (08:08) We must revisit if volumes are excessive
Theo Geurts RrSG: (08:08) But by then we are too late.
James Bladel (RrSG): (08:09) And to Margie's point: Every request (no matter how many) will be "urgent"
Mark Svancarek (BC): (08:09) And that was the impetus for an percentage target
Marika Konings: (08:09) Note that this is already included in relation to "urgent" requests: "• A separate timeline of [less than X business days] will considered for the response to 'Urgent' Reasonable Disclosure Requests, those Requests for which evidence is supplied to show an immediate need for disclosure [time frame to be finalized and criteria set for Urgent requests during implementation]."
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:09) It is just an outside limit
Margie Milam (BC): (08:09) We proposed: The suggested response time for disclosure requests could be revisited if disclosure request volumes are excessive.

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (08:09) 30 days is a maximum... contracted parties can voluntarily fulfil them sooner!

Mark Svancarek (BC): (08:10) If "without undue delay" is a strong legal term, then the outside limit makes sense

James Bladel (RrSG): (08:10) Agree with Kurt: Any number we pick now, without knowing the volume, will be wrong (too long or too short)

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:10) if 30 days not accepted, there should be a cap on the number of request that should be responded to. Especially requests from one entity.

Mark Svancarek (BC): (08:10) I've gotten opposing opinion on that...

Theo Geurts RrSG: (08:10) That is why you usually use a best effort clause if you can quantify the future.

Theo Geurts RrSG: (08:10) cannot

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:11) without undue delay, max 30 days unless extraordinary circumstances plus collection of stats on the overall volume of requests would seem reasonable to me

Ben Butler (SSAC): (08:12) To repeat from yesterday, I think we can use language already in the contracts. (RAA) Reasonable and prompt. It allows scaling (up and down) based on volumes, complexities, etc.

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:12) Kurt, no one is objecting to 30 days timelimit except BC. you can just note their objection. Why are we changing the consensus because of 1/3 of a stakeholder group?

Theo Geurts RrSG: (08:12) How do we distinguish between normal requests and urgency requests??

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:13) Yes, Ben. I think our positions do not contradict each other

Ben Butler (SSAC): (08:14) @Thomas Agree

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:15) most of access recommendation is about implementation. we compromised to have some criteria. But seems like some want more ..

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (08:16) I endorse Milton's comments wholeheartedly

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:16) +1 Milton

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (08:16) I can live with the 30 days in this policy (and even make it soft) with the understanding that longer term we have something that allows compliance action for "unreasonable" behaviour.

Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (08:16) +1 Milton and Farzaneh

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (08:17) Tracking such responses times would allow that.

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:17) I am fine with no specific limit either, with the "reasonable" standard

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:17) but there's no reason to get stuck on this

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:18) that is fine too Milton. we accepted 30 days limit as a compromise to move on. not to get stuck in this again.

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (08:18) +1 Mark

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:18) thanks Mark

James Bladel (RrSG): (08:18) What is Thomas' language? SSAC language?

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:18) Thank you Mark

Diane Plaut (IPC): (08:18) +1Mark

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:19) I suggested: without undue delay, max 30 days unless extraordinary circumstances plus collection of stats on the overall volume of requests would seem reasonable to me

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (08:19) thanks . Mark, I canlive . with Thomas' language

Alex Deacon - IPC: (08:19) The language from Thomas was "without undue delay, max 30 days unless extraordinary circumstances plus collection of stats on the overall volume of requests" . IPC supports this.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:20) As I said yesterday, until we sort the terms and conditions of what needs to be in the request (includes priority setting in my humble opinion) you cannot really set a time period. Also do not know yet how well anonymization techniques are going to reduce volume and risk

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (08:20) +1 Thomas

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:21) However if Thomas' language gets us moving on, I am fine with it.

James Bladel (RrSG): (08:22) Guess I'm ok with Thomas' approach.

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:23) lets get moving.

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:28) Related to the timelimit of 30 days: From this chat and the conversation it is obvious that only Margie - not even BC objects to the 30 days limit . IPC supported Thomas's language as well. We need to wrap up . I feel like the conversation is still hanging

Marika Konings: (08:30) The footnote says: "To clarify, the data elements listed here are the aggregate of data elements that ICANN Compliance may request. As noted in the Summary of ICANN Organization's Contractual Compliance Team Data Processing Activities "If the Contractual Compliance Team is unable to validate the issue(s) outlined in a complaint because the publicly available WHOIS data is redacted/masked, it will request the redacted/masked registration data directly from the contracted party (or its representative). In these instances, the Contractual Compliance Team will only request the redacted/masked data elements that are needed to validate the issue(s) outlined in the complaint".

Margie Milam (BC): (08:33) +1 Alan G

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (08:33) +1 alan

Marika Konings: (08:33) Alan G. can you please restate what should replace the table?

Marika Konings: (08:34) got it

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (08:34) yes the intent is clear

Diane Plaut (IPC): (08:37) +1 Alan G

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (08:37) AND that shortens the report by one page!

James Bladel (RrSG): (08:38) ?

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:43) Thick has to be revisited in the context of GDPR

Theo Geurts RrSG: (08:54) I agree Margie, that makes sense

Margie Milam (BC): (08:55) +1 Alan G

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (08:56) Silence?

Diane Plaut (IPC): (08:56) +1 Alan G

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (08:56) I agree with Margie/Theo but not sure we've thought all the way through the implications of that

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:57) Apologies for being late. Had a bit of an accident.

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (08:57) And don't want to rush into including something we haven't fully flushed out

James Bladel: (08:57) Hey folks, my connection (hotel) keeps dropping. I'd like to tap Sarah Wyld as an alternate for the last hour (She's been monitoring the call).

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:58) I am happy to say that.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:58) Ditto. People have clearly not been listening.

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:58) If thick registries are illegal according to data protection law so be it

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:59) I have been saying Thick cannot be justified for years

Theo Geurts RrSG: (08:59) Agreed Alan

Margie Milam (BC): (08:59) I agree with being more precise

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:59) We need to say that it is a new regime. No thick, no thin. Just cute and compliant :-)

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:59) very cute

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:59) +1 Beth

James Bladel: (09:00) The ECO playbook called it "thick-less"

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:00) LOL

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:00) be careful how you pronounce that James

Diane Plaut (IPC): (09:01) Yes, clarity is essential

Beth Bacon (RySG): (09:01) Totally understand Alan. Agree it's important to state it but just wanted to be clear with our language.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:01) Agreed wrt communicating this clearly

Theo Geurts RrSG: (09:01) Due to many recommendations this is the net effect, unless we want to change all the recommendations.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:01) If we use "precise" words and no one understands the implication, we are implicitly being deceptive.

Sarah Wyld - Tucows: (09:03) We're OK with adding the note that this is a registrar obligation. Transferring consent is an unclear concept and I'm hesitant to put that in the Report

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (09:03) +1 Marc...I do worry that we are making changes on the fly at this late stage...

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:04) I don't like changes at the last moment, but what we are writing here is about to be cast in reinforced concrete, so we need to make sure it is right.

Kurt Pritz: (09:04) This is a Registrar obligation. For a Registry to publish is optional, until such time a way has been found that allows for the transfer of consent from Registrar to Registry.

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (09:04) Kurt's language is OK. Transferring consent status is going to be Very Difficult

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (09:05) but that will be a fun problem to tackle

Margie Milam (BC): (09:05) Kurt's language is ok

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:05) @Sarah, we cannot be the first people who have to do this!

Diane Plaut (IPC): (09:06) +1 Kurt

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (09:06) Alan, it's something we've worked on a lot already and I don't see a lot of good models out there for carrying a consent choice between providers, it's a complex issue

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (09:08) +1 Matt

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:16) Absent a strong reason to do it...it is an expensive option to provide, given global mobility and the requirement to provide a range of decision reversal options. Why do it?

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:17) =1 kurt

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:17) +1 kurt

Margie Milam (BC): (09:18) RY language is ok

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (09:18) The proposed language is clearer

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:18) @Stephanie is your comment in regard to Rec #17?

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:19) no I am back on the transfer of consent issue.

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (09:22) @Ben makes sense

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:23) Now however I am on rec 17. as I have said many many many times: 1) distinction is difficult to make for small business people 2) names can be held personally for financial reasons 3) many orgs we represent are legal persons but have risks related to human rights and free speech that we will continue to fight for....they would have to be redacted on the basis of protection of employees, difficult for contracted parties and their resellers

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:23) Add bullet on impact on the Internet/DNS ecosystem of not making the distinction.

Margie Milam (BC): (09:24) +1 Alan G

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:24) @Sarah: +1

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:24) @Sarah, no we decided to defer.

Margie Milam (BC): (09:25) then why are we doing the research?

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:25) I thought there was no agreement on doing the research?

Beth Bacon (RySG): (09:25) Sarah- Much agree.

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:25) we shouldn't do research

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (09:25) I was not referring ot the study in my comment

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (09:25) I was referring to differentiation itself

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (09:25) we agreed on a study and that we carry this to phase 2

Margie Milam (BC): (09:26) +1

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (09:26) I have objections to the study but I did not raise them as now is not the time for substantive changes and I respect that the full group agreed to do a study

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:26) Alan G - the impact is pure speculation at this stage.

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (09:26) I asked for this yesterday but is it possible to get a rundown of what we have now pushed into Phase 2?

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:26) So I would not endorse additional language.

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (09:26) My concern is that CP's must be given the ability to determine if differentiation is applicable

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (09:27) +1 Amr

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:27) the full group didn't Sarah. some did.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:27) @Amr, that needs to be taken up with the gdpr AUTHORITIES.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:29) @aMR, THAT IS CORRECT, BUT THAT IS A CAVEAT TO GIVE TO THE REGISTRANT.

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:29) you sound condescending Alan and you have been past couple of sessions. It is not an appropriate behavior and I hope you stop

Diane Plaut (IPC): (09:29) +1 Alan G

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:29) Oops - caps lock again!

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:30) is the risk to domain name registrants also mentioned ?

Kurt Pritz: (09:30) Consider the impact on the Internet/DNS ecosystem of not making the distinction.

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:30) I don't agree

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (09:30) We should consider both the risks of making and of not making this distinction

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (09:30) +1 kurt

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:30) Risk to registrants? Yes it refers to privacy issues

Georgios Tselentis (GAC): (09:31) Isn't Amr's point something for the legal counsel to clarify? and if so to mention at rec17?

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (09:31) There is significant risk if the distinction is made but the data subject is treated incorrectly

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:31) Thomas said it up there.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:31) @Georgios: I don't believe so. The applicability of GDPR on this issue seems very clear to me.

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (09:31) Kurt - sure, as long as it's balanced.

Theo Geurts RrSG: (09:32) We already know the risk, getting wrong carries a max fine.

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:32) you don't want to accept Kurt. You do understand. It is too speculative.

Margie Milam (BC): (09:32) +1 Kurt

Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (09:34) My adobe was hung up for a while

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:34) Far more ticks than crosses. Why not put in new bullet?

Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (09:34) "far more"?

Andrea Glandon: (09:35) Break Time 15 min (there will be silence)

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:35) Alan, we do not vote and there is a lot of objection

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (09:40) ok

Marika Konings: (09:40) Note, new language is in bold, language that is to be removed is stricken
Milton Mueller: (09:41) stricken. very Elizabethan English...;-)
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:48) Proposed language modification: "If thou art Registries or Registrars, thou shalt verily transmit to ICANN org any RDS elements that are requested, or be smitten by Compliance"
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:51) oh come on MM. I read through that ...
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:52) Can Milton's proposed text actually go into the final report? :-)
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:53) To download the doc from the AC room, the doc has to be de-synched.
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:54) sure and everyone should be wearing tudor dresses while attending these meetings
Ben Butler (SSAC): (09:54) I do not consent to wear a tudor dress.
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:54) how about a monk's outfit?
Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:55) Surely Milton, the past tense of "Smite" is "smote"
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (09:55) I downloaded it
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:56) "...will be smitten"
Diane Plaut (IPC): (09:56) Yes 30 calendar days
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:56) Are we looking at the right document in the shared window?
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (09:56) yes milton
Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:57) Milton, I was also confused - you'll need to scroll it back
Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:57) I had synched my proposal as much as possible with the existing language, which was talking about business days.
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:57) got it
Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (09:57) +1 Beth
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:58) Beth is making "reasonable" points.
Ashley Heineman (GAC): (09:59) I'm good
Theo Geurts RrSG: (09:59) 80 days???
Theo Geurts RrSG: (09:59) how does that work?
Margie Milam (BC): (09:59) 30 calendar days works for me
Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:59) me too
Mark Svancarek (BC): (10:00) 30 days
Diane Plaut (IPC): (10:01) Theo - meaning 8 weeks, but fine with days, not business days
Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (10:01) Accredited is difficult - would the Registrar/Registry know that there is an accredited (but unaffiliated) P/P service on the domain, in an automataed manner that allows it to modify the RDS output?
Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (10:02) I'm not sure that setting a date for another IRT to complete their work is in our scope
Theo Geurts RrSG: (10:03) Well the EPDP could also set a few deadlines for RPM right? and perhaps get some deadlines in for some other policy work that has been going on
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:04) @Theo: Best of luck with that!! :-)
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (10:04) How about a deadline for reducing carbon emissions?
Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:04) @Sarah, regarding 1st change, it requires another change later in sentence to put responsibility on P/P service.
Alex Deacon - IPC: (10:04) @sarah -- yes the PP policy and implementation requires an indication in the RDS. I'll find the language.
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (10:04) Words of wisdom from Kurt.
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (10:05) or maybe understatement of the year
Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (10:05) Sounds like some lack of clarity re the 'accredited' p/p provider - suggests to me that we should not put it into the rec at this lage stage

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (10:05) *late stage
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:08) @Margie: Your audio wasn't very clear on my end. Mic issues?
Theo Geurts RrSG: (10:09) Correct Alan
Margie Milam (BC): (10:09) we are not talking about revealing the underlying customer data - this is just the WHOIS of the privacy/proxy provider
Alex Deacon - IPC: (10:12) thats right margie. we are not asking for underlying customer data in this recommendation.
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:14) I don't know the details of the PPSAI recs, but are accredited P/P services meant to indicate that they are accredited in the registration data they provide to registrars?
Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (10:14) I'm ok with including the accredited P.P provider's info in the RDS in concept, my concern is just around implementation, i'm not sure the Rr or Ry would know in an automated manner that it is an accredited P/p provider
Margie Milam (BC): (10:14) we have a consensus policy that is adopted on P/P - not a future thing
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:15) @Sarah: Exactly. How would that be practically done?
Theo Geurts RrSG: (10:15) @Amr we never really solved it
Theo Geurts RrSG: (10:15) third party privacy providers are a mess.
Alex Deacon - IPC: (10:15) @sarah - i'm quite sure it will be easy to know. If its on the list its accredited. if not its not.
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (10:15) I sense that this is another case of scope expansion
Margie Milam (BC): (10:15) @ Sarah - we could qualify it on identifying how to identify them in implementation
Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (10:15) Alex - then we'd have to check the list every .day or even more often, to confirm if the provider is still on it?
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (10:15) yeah it's about access... again...
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:15) @Alex: But does that require a manual check on whether the registration data belongs to an accredited p/p provider?
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:16) Is there a way to automate this?
Benedict Addis - SSAC: (10:16) Of course! There's
Benedict Addis - SSAC: (10:16) ... always a technical solution
Alex Deacon - IPC: (10:16) @amr - absoltely - we could use some kind of simple lookup technology..
Theo Geurts RrSG: (10:17) yes @benedict, but costs might be an issue
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (10:17) wish there was technical solutions to protect privacy and balance it with security as well. if there is always a "technical solution"
Alan Woods (RYSG): (10:17) rec 27 is for that very purpose though Alan... we can't do everything.
Theo Geurts RrSG: (10:18) registrars are already not happy with the additional annual costs for a privacy service.
Benedict Addis - SSAC: (10:18) @Farzi agree! My "always" was in reference to automation of lookups.
Theo Geurts RrSG: (10:18) proposed annual fees
Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (10:19) proposed annual fees with no backup as to why they are what they are
Theo Geurts RrSG: (10:19) Not to mention such services would have to compete with registrars who can redact for free.
Benedict Addis - SSAC: (10:21) Theo we're here to achieve a larger goal than preservation of revenue streams for registrars ;)
Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (10:21) +1 Alan W
Theo Geurts RrSG: (10:21) Benedict that is the argument, there is no revenue stream anymore, just costs, hence one the deadlocks of the PPSAI
Alex Deacon - IPC: (10:22) +1 Alan G

Benedict Addis - SSAC: (10:22) Ok
Diane Plaut (IPC): (10:22) +1 Alan G
Theo Geurts RrSG: (10:23) So I am somewhat wondering why we are going into weeds here about a dead business model called privacy/proxy :)
Margie Milam (BC): (10:23) that works for me
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (10:23) add an abacus to the implementation criteria. goes in line with Alan G suggestions
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:23) + 1kurt
Diane Plaut (IPC): (10:23) That is a great suggestion Kurt
Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (10:23) Could you put that in the chat please Kurt
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (10:24) Amen to Theo's comment about dead business model.
Benedict Addis - SSAC: (10:24) Hallelujah!
Kurt Pritz: (10:25) *Provided that the PPSAI implementation provides a mechanism so that registrars and return in response full non-personal RDDS data
Theo Geurts RrSG: (10:25) That was a personal opinion, we are phasing out our privacy service.
Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:25) If the P/P business is dead, it will be REALLY easy to implement this change.
Theo Geurts RrSG: (10:26) Agreed Sarah, +1 let us see how it worked once sorted out.
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (10:26) I don't think you have any real world experience to actually say that Alan. and it is not about whether it is easy to implement. It is about whether it's the efficient and fair way of doing it.
Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (10:27) Whether or not the business model is dead will hugely depend on how easy and at what scale data will be disclosed in the UAM
Theo Geurts RrSG: (10:27) Once the accreditation is place we will know more.
Marika Konings: (10:27) FYI from PPSAI: PP registrations (a) must be clearly labeled as such in WHOIS. (b) PP providers must publish their contact info on their websites; and (c) ICANN must maintain a list of PP providers and their info
Theo Geurts RrSG: (10:27) phase 2 becomes pretty loaded this way.
Mark Svancarek (BC): (10:28) i could agree to that;
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (10:28) YES Beth!
Alan Woods (RYSG): (10:28) ha this was resolved until it wasn't
Alan Woods (RYSG): (10:28) *wasn't
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (10:28) This whole trip was unnecessary
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:28) you are correct alan those are unnecessary steps for everyone including registrars
Alex Deacon - IPC: (10:30) +1 Kurt (and support staff) - the "functionality" we need exists in the PPSAI policy.
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (10:30) But haven't we already figured it out? What is the difference between "phase 2" and pointing to other policy processes?
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (10:31) We do not support that,
Benedict Addis - SSAC: (10:31) por que?
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (10:32) Certain people have shown repeatedly that they can expand scope and prolong discussions
Benedict Addis - SSAC: (10:32) Let's assume good faith ;)
Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (10:32) had we not settled on 15 months plus 3 months for deletion
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (10:33) That assumption has been killed, murdered shall we say?
Alan Woods (RYSG): (10:33) i though we agreed this yesterday.... I'm OK with that. As long as we have reasoning such as that ... fine.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (10:33) I thought so, too
Marika Konings: (10:33) it is currently 12 months plus 6
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:33) yes we agreed to that yesterday
Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (10:34) we agreed to 15 months plus 3 months to implement deletion
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:34) it was 15 + 3
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:34) we agreed yesterday to 15+3
Theo Geurts RrSG: (10:34) okay agreed, move on?
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:34) instead of 12 +6
Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:36) How much time can we spend talking about something we all seem to have agreed on.
Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (10:39) Great, Kurt.- Sorry for the crosstalk.
Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (10:46) +1 Marc
Berry Cobb: (10:46) From Annex D of Temp Spec on URS: Registry Operator Requirement: The Registry Operator (or appointed BERO) MUST provide the URS provider with the full Registration Data for each of the specified domain names, upon the URS provider notifying the Registry Operator (or appointed BERO) of the existence of a complaint, or participate in another mechanism to provide the full Registration Data to the Provider as specified by ICANN. If the gTLD operates as a "thin" registry, the Registry Operator MUST provide the available Registration Data to the URS Provider.
Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (10:47) I like Marc's proposed solution
Margie Milam (BC): (10:48) works since we dont have thick
Theo Geurts RrSG: (10:48) Agreed
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (10:52) Agreed with Marc
Marika Konings: (10:53) URS is captured in rec 27
Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (11:01) well said, Alan W
Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (11:02) Thanks to Berry for all your hard work with the small team
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (11:07) I am in the queue
Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (11:08) 55% of members (6 NCSG + 3, 3 RySG/RrSG who are the entire CPH) oppose Rec 2, so there is certainly Significant Opposition there
Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (11:11) The ISPCP has not objected against any of the recommendations
Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (11:11) We have put concerns on the record. though
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (11:12) Exactly the same as those who support Rec 2
Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (11:14) this is a GNSO chartered working group.....
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (11:14) it's nothing to do with ACs
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (11:16) it's in the charter of this group Margie.
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (11:17) What Margie is saying is contrary to the epDP charter. This is not a normal WG
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (11:17) Representation in this EPDP was deliberately structured along lines reflecting SGs and ACs
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (11:18) oh the whole report was not approved by BC?
Marika Konings: (11:19) FWIW, note that consensus designations are associated with recommendations in the Final Report - the PDP Manual does not foresee a requirement for a consensus designation for the whole report
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (11:20) Still, Marika, even without 2.3 of the CSG, the whole report would qualify as Consensus
Margie Milam (BC): (11:20) Marika- there is no prohibition of that either - so it should be noted
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (11:20) 2/3 not 2.3
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (11:20) so IPC BC in effect objects to all the recommendations

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (11:20) We could be a little creative by holding a consensus call on the report as a whole, along with each of the recommendations. This isn't prohibited in the PDP manual, and would afford the BC/IPC the opportunity to provide a minority statement on the report as a whole.

Georgios Tselentis (GAC): (11:20) Apologies for not being able to follow that: can somebody clarify what are we doing now? Are we trying building consensus through argumentations or try to count votes at this and subsequent procedures?

Marika Konings: (11:21) Note that the deadline for statements was yesterday. Can IPC/BC confirm that the statement provided over the weekend is to be included in the annex?

Marika Konings: (11:21) @Georgios - the objective is to ensure that the table on the screen is correct, especially when it comes to the groups identified in the last column of not agreeing.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (11:23) Apologies, but could Alan please repeat his comment?

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (11:23) It hasn't been stated before????

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (11:23) Or suggestion?

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (11:23) I'd appreciate to see Alan G's suggestion in writing please

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (11:23) @Sarah: +1

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (11:24) I didn't understand what he said.

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (11:24) HI Marika. If this chart is intended to capture where we all stand/stood on the consensus calls, this accurately reflects the GAC as we did not object to anything in the consensus calls. That being said, we noted concerns in our statement .

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (11:25) Recommendation 2 is Divergent.

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (11:26) email field is listed as redacted under rec 10 now

Marika Konings: (11:26) This is how the consent rec currently reads: "The EPDP Team recommends that, as soon as commercially reasonable, Registrar must provide the opportunity for the Registered Name Holder to provide its Consent to publish redacted contact information, as well as the email address, in the RDS for the sponsoring registrar"

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (11:27) I'm having a hard time following, Alan G, I process better when things are written down, but I think I agree with you

Marika Konings: (11:27) so does removing 'contact' do the trick?

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (11:27) I would be OK with that change marika

Marika Konings: (11:27) email address is separately called out

Marika Konings: (11:28) 'as well as the email address'

Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (11:28) Unfortunately I have to leave

Margie Milam (BC): (11:28) I am confused - what are we talking about?

Marika Konings: (11:28) @Alan - email address is already called out specifically in the recommendation as it is considered redacted.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (11:30) Yes, that would do it!

Marika Konings: (11:30) so you are good with the recommendation as stands?

Marika Konings: (11:30) no changes, that is?

Marika Konings: (11:31) BC/IPC reps, can you please confirm whether the IPC/BC input that was provided over the weekend is to be included in the annex? Thank you.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (11:31) Sorry, my AC died!

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (11:32) why do you need an airconditioner in Feb in Canada, Alan ? <lame joke>

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (11:32) <adjective> charter

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (11:32) As long as there is a clear understanding that a registrant can request that ALL of their original data be published, I am ok. Preferably the report says that somewhere. I think that removing the word CONTACT makes it better.

Ben Butler (SSAC): (11:33) Since the dissentions on 2 and 17 are being brought up, Please note per my earlier email that SSAC had previously been marked as opposing 2, but we are actually supporting 2 with comments provided.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (11:33) @Milton, just installed a new very effective fireplace, so maybe!

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (11:34) I realize this is all very important to resolve, but any idea when this call is going to wrap up? I need to know whether or not to postpone a 1:00 meeting (in 30 minutes).

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (11:34) this call will never end, Ashley, run for your life

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (11:34) It is up to the CSG to make that determination, in my view, @Mark S

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (11:34) I guess we should have reserved the entire day for this meeting.

Ben Butler (SSAC): (11:35) Have to drop. Thanks all.

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (11:35) In response to Mark Sv, supposed NCSG members were divided on a Rec ? Of course we would note that it was divided

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (11:35) As a minority statement, not an annex, correct?

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (11:35) +1 Ammr

Marika Konings: (11:35) The annex has statements from all groups, including where they object

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (11:35) sorry for the misspelling Amr, my keyboard has some keys that are becoming stuck

Mark Svancarek (BC): (11:37) Perhaps is a minority statement is the correct term

Margie Milam (BC): (11:38) Marika - we need to update the statement to reflect the issues we resolved today

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (11:38) Thanks Diane.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (11:38) And Mark.

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (11:38) Yes - the GAC will be sending a slightly revised version shortly (nowish?) to clarify our concerns on the organization field.

Diane Plaut (IPC): (11:39) And to confirm that the statement will need to be updated according to recent updated discussed

Diane Plaut (IPC): (11:39) issues

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (11:39) Is this the same as what you showed during the break ?

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (11:39) (the pre-break ones have no changed?)

Marika Konings: (11:40) pre-break we changed 30 business days to 30 days

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (11:40) SO.... ARE WE ABLE TO END AT 1:00?

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (11:40) Thank you

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (11:40) I'M USING ALL CAPS!! :-)

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (11:40) 14 and 15 included in this title

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (11:41) Is this downloadable?

Terri Agnew: (11:41) 5 minute break (silence during this time)

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (11:41) Thanks so much Marika

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (11:41) PLEASE, FOR THE LOVE OF ALL THAT IS HOLY. NO OR YES?

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (11:42) THANKS!!!

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (11:42) thanks....relief

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (11:42) Only question is which hour!

Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison): (11:42) happy hour :)

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (11:43) @Ashley: Hahahaha!!

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (11:43) still reviewing please

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (11:43) there is typo - rec 18 - last bullet - "will be" instead of will

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (11:43) a typo

Marika Konings: (11:44) Maybe the footnote should move to the end of part 1?

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (11:44) I agree with Marc's concern there - I think the idea is that the footnote modifies the new sentence, but it could be more clear

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (11:45) maybe footnote goes into body

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (11:45) I assume there will be a general review on grammar and other nits.

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (11:45) Kurt - it's not about if it's just RDS or also other info, it's about that not all RDS elements are necessarily required

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (11:46) @Ashley +1

Marika Konings: (11:46) that is addressed in the last part of the footnote (bold language) - ICANN Org question

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (11:48) I am unclear as to what we are trying to achieve here. We have purpose 5. I do not mind a clarification, but we seem to add confusion

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (11:48) My suggestoin: move the footnote into the body of the rec, thus clarifying the new sentence

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (11:50) that's a good point

Alan Woods (RYSG): (11:51) add "where justified under the contracts". at the very end/ PS i'm not too worried about it as Purpose 5 itself is limited to them anyway.

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (11:52) I've got a statement full of issues. :-)

Margie Milam (BC): (11:52) we had issues and they were objected to because of the late request

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (11:54) The task is to note that the transmission of data to ICANN, which was never a contractual requirement because it was public MAY need a contract change.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (11:54) There is the IF NEEDED clause.

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (11:55) I want to say a giant thank you ot Kurt, Marika, Caitlin and Terri

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (11:55) you've all been fantastic through all this hard work

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (11:55) Word!

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (11:56) You earned it Marika!

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (11:56) We need SOME time to decide if there is a minority report needed and to submit.

Alan Woods (RYSG): (11:56) Alan, ICANN can request the data under the contract..its in there ... simple ... also we need to enter into agreements too (updates) we are kinda recommending it!

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (11:58) Yes, thanks to Kurt, Marika, Caitlin and Terri. I hope you get a vacation after all of this. That being said, I guess it aint over 'til its over. :-)

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (11:58) thank you kurt

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (11:59) really dumb question, are we meeting in kobe?

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (12:00) Ashley - the schedule just came out, there are a few EPDP meetitngs :)

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (12:00) Congratulations all !! we have done it

Marika Konings: (12:00) Leadership will need to review the schedule of meetings at Kobe and determine if/how these can be used.

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (12:01) thanks all.....

Beth Bacon (RySG): (12:01) HUGE thanks to staff. You have been wonderful.

Margie Milam (BC): (12:01) yay!!! I can sleep in :)

Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison): (12:01) thanks all

Beth Bacon (RySG): (12:01) Marika, Berry, Caitlin, and Terri you're rock starts

Sarah Wyld - Tucows (RrSG alt): (12:01) Thanks, all

Georgios Tselentis (GAC): (12:01) thank you all

Leon Sanchez (ICANN Board Liaison): (12:01) Thanks everyone!

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (12:01) Thanks all. That was easy :-)

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (12:01) Thank you all bye

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (12:01) oh last call! we should have celebrated!

Theo Geurts RrSG: (12:01) to be continued ;)

Leon Sanchez (ICANN Board Liaison): (12:01) Great job!

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (12:02) that was a quick bye

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (12:02) I am heart broken!

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (12:02) BYE. I'll miss you all. Kidding not kidding.

Daniel Halloran (ICANN Org Liaison -Legal): (12:02) Thank you Kurt and team!

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (12:02) I like how Marc's hand is still up.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (12:02) Thanks all. Really..., thanks. Bye. :-)

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (12:02) Big thank you to kurt and staff