Adobe Connect: 27

Alan Greenberg (ALAC)	Kavouss Arasteh (GAC)
Alan Woods (RySG)	Kristina Rosette (RySG)
Alex Deacon - IPC	Kurt Pritz (Chair)
Amr Elsadr (NCSG)	Leon Sanchez (ICANN Board Liaison)
Ashley Heineman (GAC)	Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alternate)
Ben Butler (SSAC)	Marc Anderson (RySG)
Benedict Addis (SSAC)	Margie Milam (BC)
Diane Plaut (IPC)	Mark Svancarek (BC)
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG)	Matt Serlin (RrSG)
Georgios Tselentis (GAC)	Milton Mueller (NCSG)
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC)	Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison)
James Bladel (RrSG)	Stephanie Perrin (NCSG)
Julf Helsingius (NCSG)	Tatiana Tropina (NCSG Alternate)
	Thomas Rickert (ISPCP)

Guests:
David Plumb (CBI)
Gina Bartlett (CBI)

On Audio Only:
None

Apologies:
Ayden Férdeline (NCSG)
Emily Taylor (RrSG)
Chris Disspain (ICANN Board Liaison)

Audio Cast (FOR ALTERNATES AND OBSERVERS)
Peak: 10 joined

View Only Adobe Connect:
46 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:

Marika Konings:Welcome to EPDP Meeting #15 on Thursday 20 September 2018

Andrea Glandon:Wiki Agenda Page: https://community.icann.org/x/3gONBQ

Julf Helsingius (NCSG):Someone clearly has mic open

Kristina Rosette (RySG):Good morning/afternoon/evening

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Hi all!

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):As regards the purpose matrix - I guess we are just saying who is pursuing what purposes. We cannot yet call them legitimate purposes as the legitimacy is yet to be assessed.

Milton Mueller (NCSG):correct Thomas

Alex Deacon - IPC:@thomas - that would be the first step in my view.   - list the purposes for processing and then discuss legal basis and then tease out the RDS data elements needed for each.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):I'm in favor of attempting to answering the Charter questions, as opposed to redlining the temp spec.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Correct, Alex. I just think we should be cautious not to call them legitimate pruposes before we have established that.

Ashley Heineman (GAC):Do we have to call them anything other than purposes anyway?

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):We can just call the purposes. Whether the processing is lawful depends on our test of Art. 5 and 6.

Ashley Heineman (GAC):Thanks, that was my understanding.

Kristina Rosette (RySG):+1 Amr (answering charter questions and not redlining TS)

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC):tHERE IS DISTORTION WHEN GORGEOUS SPEAKING

Milton Mueller (NCSG):Please, let's not redline Temp Spec

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Georgios, I can hardly understand what you are saying

Margie Milam (BC):Agree with the request for discussion on accuracy and up to date data

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC):I CAN NOT HEAR THE SPEAKER

farzaneh badii (NCSG):we are still delivering an initial report for Barcelona?

Terri Agnew:@Georgios, let us know if a dial out on the telephone would be helpful.

Georgios Tselentis (GAC):yes correct the question was about accuracy of data

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):I think the agenda is too broad brush.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC):There is always distortion when Goergios when he use his phone with GAC Small group and with us

Diane Plaut (IPC):Yes, Alex great explanation.

Mark Svancarek (BC):+1

Marc Anderson (RySG):Makes sense, +1 Alex

James Bladel (RrSG):Agree with Margie

Diane Plaut (IPC):IPC supports Margie in the request for Dan's particpation.

Matt Serlin (RrSG):+1 to Margie's request

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:+ Margie

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:+ 1 Margie - thank you for making the request

Daniel Halloran (ICANN Org Liaison - Legal):Hi Kurt :-)

Mark Svancarek (BC):Hi, Dan

Margie Milam (BC):yes COmpliance too

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Yes, Dan in the room and someone with operational experience from compliance would be great.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Plus any written documentation about how ICANN handles compliance cases and what data they use.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):For me, victory would be our group focusing on one discussion at the time :-)

Kristina Rosette (RySG):+1M Thomas

Kristina Rosette (RySG):(the one discussion at a time)

Milton Mueller (NCSG):Yes, indeed, focusing on and _concluding_ discussions before we move on

farzaneh badii (NCSG):victory? Are we conquring anything?

Milton Mueller (NCSG):perhaps

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:Victory for me would be an "initial report" as determined by the charter that is it should tackle everything

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):@Kavouss: We need to provide the GNSO Council with policy recommendations. We can't just tell it to check the Bylaws.

farzaneh badii (NCSG):I agree with Milton we have to talk about victory now and not during the meeting. you dont talk about how to conquer in the battle field!

Alex Deacon - IPC:if we make it thru the new matrix that would be victory for me. it would result in us answering charter questions a1 - a4. It would also set us on the path to answer charter question b).

farzaneh badii (NCSG):Yes Alex

Ashley Heineman (GAC):If we agree to section four in the temp spec, I'll consider it an uber amazing victory.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Hi Kavouss, maybe you can make a concrete proposal as to how we can be more successful instead of pointing out the challenges which we are all aware of.

farzaneh badii (NCSG):Ashley :)

farzaneh badii (NCSG):I think we should think about it holistically holistic victory

Alex Deacon - IPC:if we work hard (and do some homework in advance) hopefully we can even complete and answer charter question b)

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC):Thomas and Farzaneh, where we can find that , is it a new approach?

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:@milton ok so trying to be realistic if we conclude section 4 that would be success

Milton Mueller (NCSG):that's partial success

Alex Deacon - IPC:@milton - its a necessary step towards success.

Milton Mueller (NCSG):our ultimate objective is to replace the temp spec with a real policy, have we forgotten that?

Caitlin Tubergen:@Kavouss, the ICANN Support Team will distribute the updated matrix from Thomas and Farzaneh following this meeting.

farzaneh badii (NCSG):why are we thinking about section by section. lets think about charter questions, the data elements, answer questions and then see which sections of temp specc has to be revised

Milton Mueller (NCSG):exactly, Farzy

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):@Farzi: +1

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:I mean lawfulness and purposes

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Kavouss, we worked on the data matrix and made it more comprehensive so that populating the matrix will give responses to most chartering questions. It will allow us to get results in a structured way.

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:@Farzi so that would be verything

Ashley Heineman (GAC):OK then, Part 1 resolved.

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:everything

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC):The new material prepared by T and F were or are based on what priciple pls ?

Ashley Heineman (GAC):and Part 2 in optimism.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):@Kurt: So we're actually having two public comment periods (including one prior to a Board vote)? This was a question dating back to the early days of the EPDP.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Kavouss, as I said, it is based on the data matrix you already saw, but it has more detail to faciliate working through the various questions we need to answer.

Ashley Heineman (GAC):Take it back... sucess is coming to terms with parts 1 -3.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC):Thomas , pls kindly let us know what you have prepared and on what basis pls ?

Milton Mueller (NCSG):Kavouss could you lower your old hand?

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Kasvouss, I gave you two answers already - do they not appear in your chat box?

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):I guess the question is whether tthe way this is structured is part of a masterplan CBI si pursuing.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC):Thomas, but we have only discussed opart of that matrix then why we should re write it before discussing the other parts?

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC):Why we should follow CBI master Plan ?

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC):What master Plan means?

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):All I am asking is that before we change the agenda, we should understand whether the way the agenda is structured is part of a plan that CBI has to make our meeting successful.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):@Kurt: Exactly. Need to identify the elements, and match them to purposes and processing activities.

Leon Sanchez (ICANN Board Liaison):I lost audio. Will log out and back in

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:@Kavouss if you are not against then that is good

Kristina Rosette (RySG):+1 Alan G - no shrinking violets in this WG.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):Good suggestion, Alan.

Diane Plaut (IPC):Thank you, Kurt for all the efforts being made to get the LA agenda solidified in advance so we can make the most of our time together and have the greatest output.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):Referring to last Thursday's meeting?

Mark Svancarek (BC):Yes = AppA / No = 4.4

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):Agree with Farzi. If we work diligently to finalize the gating questions, it'll make work on other Charter questions far more straight forward.

Milton Mueller (NCSG):OK I think I understand what is happening now. We should stick with 4.4

Milton Mueller (NCSG):No more jumping around,

Milton Mueller (NCSG):finish what we are in the middle of

Mark Svancarek (BC):I was thinking there would be so much work to do on 4.4 in the f2f it would be nice to work on AppA now

Mark Svancarek (BC):But I will not object to 4.4

Marika Konings:Note that this document was also shared with the agenda so please open it on your own computer for better viewing.

Milton Mueller (NCSG):@Mark I think this start-stop, jump around stuff is really hampering our work

farzaneh badii (NCSG):charter tells us . not NCSG opinion

Mark Svancarek (BC):hmm

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Kavouss, we cannot change the charter. We have to work through that.

Alan Woods (RySG):This is in the charter . It is set out by the GNSO.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):@Kavouss: Whether you share this view or not, and to get a clearer understanding of which questions are the gating ones we are referring to, please familiarize yourself with the Charter.

farzaneh badii (NCSG):Ashley and I are doing great actually. we just have some disagreements which we resolve.

Ashley Heineman (GAC):Just an FYI in case there is any confusion, the charter specifically says that "reasonable access" as inlcuded in Appendix a IS within the gating questions.

Ashley Heineman (GAC):I don't want to belabor that point, but folks keep saying it is outside the gating questions and that is not correct. Just sayin.

farzaneh badii (NCSG):if it is then we should include it. but as far as I know it's section J which is after the gating questions

Milton Mueller (NCSG):An access method is outside the gating question.

Mark Svancarek (BC):I prefer to work vertically in the f2f

Diane Plaut (IPC):Agree, Ashley

Ashley Heineman (GAC):I agree Milton

farzaneh badii (NCSG):so it's not access model but lets answer section J questions Ashley when it comes to it. as I said when working on master doc you might want to add in points on that considering section J questions

Ashley Heineman (GAC):Agree Farzaneh. Not proposing to discuss now. Just getting on the record. :-)

farzaneh badii (NCSG):sure :)

Matt Serlin (RrSG):Kurt I was just going to comment on 4.4.11 and reiterate that our view was this was covered by escrow requirements and not a purpose that needed artciulated here

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC):If Farzaneh and Ashley speak the same language, that is not bad

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):@Ashley: Could you please point me to the section of the Charter that includes "reasonable access" within the gating questions? I can't seem to find it.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):I am in support of being more specific and listing all dispute resolution policies that ICANN has.

Ashley Heineman (GAC):See section J, which substantively starts at the top of page 6

Benedict Addis - SSAC:@Matt escrow is one mechanism for safeguarding registrant's registration data. It seems sensible to have a broad statement covering alternative or future mechanisms to achieve safeguarding.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC):Coordination may include bring the different elements of (a complex activity or organization) into a harmonious or efficient relationship.

Kristina Rosette (RySG):Coordinating comes from the TempSpec.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Do we need to mention PDDRP, RRDRP and PICDRP? Not sure all of these concern individual domain name registrations. I would need to check.

Marika Konings:The current language for 4.4.12 (in red) comes from the Registrar proposed wording. I believe Thomas had a more general description.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):I have lowered my hand, Kurt. I support the narrower language and adding the other policies to it.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC):The term " Coordination " is used at various clause in the Bylaw

Mark Svancarek (BC):+1 Kurt

Kristina Rosette (RySG):Thanks, Margie. In that case, "facilitating" may be a better word, but we'll take a look, too.

Kristina Rosette (RySG):Agree, Kurt. Let's put a pin in it and move on.

Milton Mueller (NCSG):Would "enabling" be a better term than "coordinating"?

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):@Ashley: I see section J to include Charter questions that certainly need to be answered before we move on to an access model, but not gating questions. So we need to go through the gating questions before dealing with section J.

Margie Milam (BC):im ok with facilitating or enabling

Milton Mueller (NCSG):anyway, the key distinction here is more specific vs general. I think we want to name the DRPs

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):@Hadia: Specificity?

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Coordination might not cover everything. I would cover ICANN's role, but not the transfer to the DRPs. Why not say that the purpose is to coordinate and carry out processes according to ICANN's dispute resolution polices (which shall be named)

farzaneh badii (NCSG):because we have to be specific

Marika Konings:@Amr - the gating questions relate to work starting on standardized access model, they are not gating for dealing with question j, as far as I understand.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG):+1 Thomas. These are processing activities, ICANN manages that contract

Alex Deacon - IPC:@milton - specificity is important.   It kinda indicates that we may need a mechanism to add things if/when needed in the future.

Mark Svancarek (BC):+1 milton

Kristina Rosette (RySG):What about that combines both - list the acronyms of the relevant dispute process and add language that would cover additional dispute processes developed in the future that are the subject of ICANN consensus polic?

Kristina Rosette (RySG):policy

Mark Svancarek (BC):lol

farzaneh badii (NCSG):we can't predict the future. !! just add it when it exists

Alan Woods (RySG):then we do a DPIA first

Milton Mueller (NCSG):Simple - as i just said, we change the policy

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):We need to change the language if and when there are changes or new policies.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG):New process requires consent or other authorization...

Milton Mueller (NCSG):Of course there are Kurt! You are not being overly simplistic

Kristina Rosette (RySG):Good point, Alan (w)

Kristina Rosette (RySG):So, the resulting policy recommendations are going to need a super active Implementation Review Team

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:+ 1 Margie

Leon Sanchez (ICANN Board Liaison):My apologies for not staying till the end but I have an overlapping call that I have to attend. See you all soon in LA!

Diane Plaut (IPC):I agree with both Kurt and Margie - no policy is created in a vacuum; a clause would be needed that updates would be made as needed in compliance with future laws and procedures.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):@Alan: +1. And as you pointed out, we need to perform a DPIA prior to sending it for assessment by DPAs.

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:@Milton we are surely going to gather the data that is currently required for URS or UDPR - but yet we could be specific by linking it to dispute resolution mechanisms indicated by ICANN

Milton Mueller (NCSG):consent means you could refuse to register a domain name

Milton Mueller (NCSG):Both Alan and Hadia are raising extremely hypothetical questions and I just don't think GDPR allows us to be that vague

farzaneh badii (NCSG):invent and discover a new valid use of WHOIS data? you mean personal information of registrants.

farzaneh badii (NCSG):we can't hear you

James Bladel (RrSG):can't hear mar

farzaneh badii (NCSG):if you want to come up with another mechanism in the future or use the data you have to change the policy through a PDP. you cannot be prospective here. there is no crystal ball and I bet it's not GDPR compliant

Alan Woods (RySG):I hate to say it ... i doubt it will ever be easy where Personal data is involved.

farzaneh badii (NCSG):*use the personal info of domain name registrants for future purposes I meant.

Ashley Heineman (GAC):Good points Mark

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Change of purpose is a challenging thing to do.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Do we have to discuss this now?

farzaneh badii (NCSG):no we don't. we don't even have the current purposes. talking about future purposes is pointless

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Can we not just list the existing policies (to be specific) and worry about changes later?

Ashley Heineman (GAC):There is specificity and there is SPECIFICITY. I think specificity is needed here. How is that for an unclear comment.

Mark Svancarek (BC):Well, I already got to speak, so I think we can move on ;-)

farzaneh badii (NCSG):haha sure Mark I am happy with that

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):...and you spoke well, Mark!

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP)::-)

Milton Mueller (NCSG):Sorry to say this, but if someone doesn't see the necessarity of specifying actual duspute resolution procedures then they don't understand the GDPR

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:The current language is specific

Milton Mueller (NCSG):No it isn't

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:it speaks about ICANNs disoute resolution mechanisms

Alan Greenberg (ALAC):Registrars provided specificity foR THEIR needs. We all need to try to do that.

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:dispute

Milton Mueller (NCSG):"certainn disputes concerning domain names" is about as non-specific as it gets

Milton Mueller (NCSG):There are thousands of disputes every week that are none of ICANN's business

Ashley Heineman (GAC):Can we stop saying that people "don't understand GDPR?" Snark is getting in the way of constructive dialogue.

farzaneh badii (NCSG):we need drafting teams. we have too many google docs ... don't know who is working on what. I think we can use T&F matrix and form drafting teams

Georgios Tselentis (GAC):Specify does not necessarily means to name them (and restrict them somehow). I would go for specifying the actors for resolution and leave it there

Milton Mueller (NCSG):No, we have to say that when it's true, Ashely. And it's not snark. It's incomprehensible to me how anyone can see the current language as GDPR compliant

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Coordinating and operationalizing ICANN's dispute resolution policies, namely URS, UDRP, RDDRP, PDDRP and PICDRP. Question: Is the list conclusive and correct?

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG ALT):+1 Alan

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG):I believe we discussed the specific poicies in the small group that worked on the Charter, if memory serves. We do not have time to get into all the specific policies that engage other types of processing. WE can only list them. We are at meeting 15, folks.

Margie Milam (BC):I like Thomas's language

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:@Thomas So if you say " Coordinating and operationalizing ICANN's dispute resolution policies" why do you need tp spell them out?

farzaneh badii (NCSG):so all these dispute resolution policies need WHOIS redacted data?

Georgios Tselentis (GAC):That is the question Thomas: don;t we make ourselves bond to the list?

Milton Mueller (NCSG):lucky 13

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Hadia, let me think about whether can do without the list. However, I think we need to be specific enough to make processing of personal data predictable. Future policies cannot be covered now.

Milton Mueller (NCSG):"Future policies cannot be covered now." Well said. Can we make that a basic premise we all agree on?

Kristina Rosette (RySG):@Thomas: I like it, but I'd add "facilitating". As for additional DRP, I don't think there are any - unless you're including the processes for TLD application disputes and I'm not immediately seeing a personal data nexus there.

Alan Woods (RySG):they will not need to tell us who the complainant is though? I'm confused

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:@Thomas if we link it to ICANN dispute resolution policies we are being specific

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG):There is a list of policies on the WHOIS page Thomas, can we ask staff to ensure it is complete and just cross reference it in? LOoks to me that you have missed a couple of the weird ones

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Kristina, we can use a different verb here. I will follow your native speaker suggestion.

James Bladel (RrSG):Maybe if two contracted parties file a compliance complaint against each other?

James Bladel (RrSG):But efen then, the contract (and enforcement of it) is between ICANN and the other contracted party

Kristina Rosette (RySG):@James: Not necessary disagreeing, but not seeing the connection to registration data.

Terri Agnew:finding the line

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Stephanie - I like the idea. Would be great to make this an AI for staff.

farzaneh badii (NCSG):Kurt mic is open

Diane Plaut (IPC):I support Thomas's language and to Stephanie's point we can add the link to the ICANN list of dispute resolution page and then the add language that "in line with the dispute resolution listed at the following link, and as updated."

James Bladel (RrSG):@Kristina - yes, I'm also missing the connection, but trying to consider edge case scenarios

Alan Woods (RySG):please mute when you are not speaking folks

Terri Agnew:working on finding the line

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):Echo, noise..., and something that sounds like moaning!!

farzaneh badii (NCSG):we don't have agreement on this. better to discuss on the mailing list

Terri Agnew:found the line

farzaneh badii (NCSG):we don't agree Margie and seems like we are not understanding you well, please discuss on the mailing list

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG ALT):Agreed Farzaneh.

farzaneh badii (NCSG):what questions are these? section J question?

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC):Discussing issues like this on mailing list would not result to any conclusion. we need to disciudd it live . there have been many issues we left to mailing list but there is not any follow up actions on those. It seems whenever someone does like like a structured discussion just sends it to inconclusive mailing list.

Marika Konings:Here is the link to the google doc: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__docs.google.com_document_d_1M2XdbXZsvfYfsxdR1xG2qT7XZ07AopJubRH8ZX1Qt3s_edit&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=k7uKdjSb7_ZjItyVqrCYHo_rKms9SFxlmbYEJqG-y9I&m=V0hZVGsDs0D_VMLfs5-GVancQuIXYF2zskml4BTt42s&s=mh6Cq2tc-t_ITX0EHMDc4RHpVPEMTW6lOsMUHRsAzdU&e=

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):If we develop recommendations on reasonable access now, would it be agreeable to do so in the form of principles that guide deliberation on the access model? It'd still require that gating questions be answered first.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG):+1 Milton

farzaneh badii (NCSG):really picking two different topics for each meeting doesn't yield any result

Matt Serlin (RrSG):agree with Milton...

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):@Milton: +1

Matt Serlin (RrSG):can barely hear Mark...

farzaneh badii (NCSG):sounds like Mark is 100 miles away from the computer :)

Mark Svancarek (BC):It's a weird thing with adobe connect - works with all other software - but I will have a better microphone for subsequent meeting, sorry

Matt Serlin (RrSG):I've given up on the Adobe audio...I find the phone is much better fwiw

Marika Konings:This is currently the only google doc that is open for input.

Marika Konings:https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__docs.google.com_document_d_1M2XdbXZsvfYfsxdR1xG2qT7XZ07AopJubRH8ZX1Qt3s_edit&d=DwI

CaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=k7uKdjSb7_ZjItyVqrCYHo_rKms9SFxlmbYE
JqG-y9I&m=V0hZVGsDs0D_VMLfs5-GVancQuIXYF2zskml4BTt42s&s=mh6Cq2tc-
t_ITX0EHMDc4RHpVPEMTW6lOsMUHRsAzdU&e=

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC):I TEND TO AGREE WITH THE COURSE OF ACTION SUGGESTED

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Kurt - I think Milton made an excellent point when he said that you can only have a discussion about redaction once you know what you collect in the first place.

Milton Mueller (NCSG):I am still trying to figureout what course of action was suggested

farzaneh badii (NCSG):One last time, we should not talk about two different topics during a meeting. it's not methodic. we should discuss the charter questions...

Milton Mueller (NCSG):...and what course of action we are following now

Ashley Heineman (GAC):What page?

Marika Konings:the Google Doc: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__docs.google.com_document_d_1M2XdbXZsvfYfsxdR1xG2qT7XZ07AopJubRH8ZX1Qt3s_edit&d=DwI
CaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=k7uKdjSb7_ZjItyVqrCYHo_rKms9SFxlmbYE
JqG-y9I&m=V0hZVGsDs0D_VMLfs5-GVancQuIXYF2zskml4BTt42s&s=mh6Cq2tc-
t_ITX0EHMDc4RHpVPEMTW6lOsMUHRsAzdU&e=

Marika Konings:thanks to BC and IPC for already providing input

Ashley Heineman (GAC):Perhaps BC anad IPC can introduce their inputs? As a starting point?

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:"reasonable access" is access that fulfills the requirements for which the access was granted

Margie Milam (BC):agree with Kavous

farzaneh badii (NCSG):oh

Mark Svancarek (BC)::)

James Bladel (RrSG):Awesome!

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):@mark: Much better. Really good actually. :-)

farzaneh badii (NCSG):Mark is not talking from the basement of his castle anymore. it was perfect

Benedict Addis - SSAC:It was the dungeon, Farzi

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Sorry, I might be too slow, but can anyone explain what we are trying to achieve now?

Margie Milam (BC):Sorry Milton - we disagree

Ashley Heineman (GAC):AGreed Thomas.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG ALT):Agreed Milton - why are we discussing access now?

Ashley Heineman (GAC):I'm slow too.

Matt Serlin (RrSG):+1 Milton

Alan Woods (RySG):+1 thomas and Milton ? I'm a tad confused.

James Bladel (RrSG):We seem to be unable to resist tying -any- issue to access, which will be the undoing of this PDP.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Thanks, Ashley. We have 15 mins left on the call and I see several questions. Are we focusing on one of these or just collecting instant feedback on all of the questions?

Kristina Rosette (RySG):I'd like to repeat Amr's suggestion at the top of the meeting. Can we please go back to teh charter questions and move through them methodically? Once we're done with that, we'll be able to identify what portions of the TempSpec (if any) we haven't covered through that exercise and then circle back.

Ashley Heineman (GAC):Agree. I think the charter questions provide a good framework for our discussions.

Benedict Addis - SSAC:+1 Mark

James Bladel (RrSG): Kristina X 100

Alan Greenberg (ALAC):I think that we should use the last 15 minutes continuing to talk about what we will talk about instead of substance.

Milton Mueller (NCSG):I am going to leave the call

Marika Konings:Note that the related charter questions are included in the previous slides and are aligned with the issues identified in these questions.

Kristina Rosette (RySG):I don't think phrases like "inferior approach" are helpful.

Diane Plaut (IPC):+1 Mark

Milton Mueller (NCSG):this is a waste of time

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:+1 Mark Totally Agree

farzaneh badii (NCSG):sure but lets talk about data first !!

Alan Greenberg (ALAC):(And that was NOT meant to be a serious recommendation!)

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG ALT):I completely disagree Mark - access is a separate issue.

Ashley Heineman (GAC):Can we knock out purposes and go from there?

Alan Woods (RySG):TBH we have to consider the impact of each data element, its not a clear cut Data Set A vs Data Set B. + agree with James on this.

farzaneh badii (NCSG):agreed Ashley

farzaneh badii (NCSG):step by step

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):@Ashley: I'm game.

Georgios Tselentis (GAC):+1 Ashley

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Mark, we can have discussion about what sequence is appropriate honoring the charter. I think we are all trying our best to give this group a working method that promises that we get through our work pgoramme. Today, I am quite frustrated because we do not seem to be making any progress at all.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC):yES TO FLAG IT BUT not being NOTED IT IS MORE THAN TO BENOTED .tHE MINIMUM ACTION IS WE HAVE CONSIDRED BUT NOT IN A POSITION TO DECIDE ON THAT AT THIS STAGE OF WORK AND JUST FLAG IT

Marc Anderson (RySG):+1 Ashley - agreement on purposes would help move us forward

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC):sorry for cap

Alan Woods (RySG):to help: recommendation of the EPDP for inclusion of DPIA process inbuilt in all future PDPs (in my mind)

Caitlin Tubergen:yes, we will follow up with an email and include UTC time

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):Safe travels, folks.

Matt Serlin (RrSG):look forward to seeing everyone in LA

Alex Deacon - IPC:thanks!

Julf Helsingius (NCSG):See you in LA

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG ALT):Bye all

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):Thanks all. Bye.

Diane Plaut (IPC):Thank you

James Bladel (RrSG):Thanks, safe travels folks.

Caitlin Tubergen:https://community.icann.org/display/EOTSFGRD/2018-09-24+through+2018-09-26+EPDP+Team+LA+F2F+meetings

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:Thank you all bye

Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison):bye all

Georgios Tselentis (GAC):thank you bye