

**Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP WG
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 4 February 2014 at 1500 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the PPSAI PDP WG meeting on Tuesday 21 February 2014 at 1500 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ppsa-20140204-en.mp3>

On page:<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#feb>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:

Don Blumenthal - RySG
Marie-Laure Lemineur - NPOC
Michele Neylon - RrSG
Volker Greimann - RrSG
Justin Macy – CBUC
Kathy Kleiman – RySG
Jim Bikoff – IPC
Graeme Bunton – RrSG
Tatiana Khramstova - RrSG
David Heasley - IPC
James Bladel - RrSG
Todd Williams – IPC
Valeriya Sherman – IPC
Alex Deacon – IPC
Steve Metalitz - IPC
Amr Elsadr - NCUC
Kristina Rosette - IPC
Gema Campillos – GAC
Carlton Samuels – ALAC
Paul McGrady – IPC
Darcy Southwell – RrSG
Billy Watenpaugh – RrSG
Emily Emanuel - BC
Holly Raiche – ALAC
Osvaldo Novoa - ISPCP
Roy Balleste – NCUC
Stephanie Perrin – NCUC
Ben Anderson – RrSG
Phil Marano – IPC

Sarah Wyld – RrSG
Theo Geurts – RrSG
Keith Kupferschmid – IPC
Maria Farrell - NCUC
Jennifer Standiford – RrSG
Tim Ruiz - RrSG

Apologies:

Statton Hammock – RySG
Luc Seufer - RrSG
Susan Prosser – RrSG

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings
Mary Wong
Amy Bivins
Margie Milam
Joe Catapano
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Pardon me, everyone. This is the Operator. I just need to inform all participants that today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect your line at this time. And you may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Laurie). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody. This is the PPSCAI Working Group call on the 4th of February, 2014.

On the call today we have (Valerie Sherman), Tatiana Khramtsova, Volker Greimann, Steve Metalitz, Holly Raiche, Graeme Bunton, Amr Elsadr, James Bladel, (Emily Manuel), Todd Williams, (unintelligible), (Darcy Southwell), (Sara Wilde), Carlton Samuels, (unintelligible), Paul McGrady, Kristina Rosette, (unintelligible), Alex Deacon, Kathy Kleiman, Justin Lacy, Don Blumenthal, Marie-Laure Lemineur, Keith Kupferschmid, Roy Balleste, Jim Bikoff, Michele Neylon, Marie Farrell, David Heasley, Jennifer Stanford, Tim Ruiz and Osvaldo Novoa.

Susan Prosser has emailed saying that she might be able to join the audio bridge but she will not be in the Adobe Connect room. And we have an apology from Luc Seufer and Statton Hammock.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Mary Wong, Amy Bivins and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes.

Thank you very much and over to you, Don.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. I appreciate it. Let me find the Adobe Connect - okay, the Adobe window again. Well today we're going to focus on how we're going to go forward and basically do that in two steps although they're rolled up into one step in the agenda.

I'd really like to finalize the charter groupings document and then at least spend a little bit of time looking at the draft work plan that Marika sent out. It's a framework, a preliminary plan, but I think is a good starting point for figuring out how we are going to finally start getting the work done.

So why don't we bring up a copy of the last version of the questions that went out? Okay.

Marika Konings: So this is Marika. What is on the screen - I'm actually sharing my screen so that allows me to make any changes or updates as we discuss. But if there's a preference to actually have the document on the screen that you can scroll yourself we can switch back to that as well.

Don Blumenthal: Yeah, everybody should have received a copy of this document if you want to bring it up on the side. I'm just looking at the chat here and I don't know why there should have been a change this morning, Carlton. We'll look into that.

Part of the work plan is going to be - obviously is a time table and that's going to depend largely on how we tackle the different sections. So right now I'd like to jump all the way to the end and look at Publication and Termination because a core issue, as you see in that - one of the remaining comments there - is whether we should add those two sections or whether anything that might go in them could be put into other sub sections easily enough.

Jim suggested the sections and then there were some recommendations for sub items that could go in them. I through a few in because they came in at the last minute and it was just kind of arbitrary although one of Hector's - these were the three questions Hector sent at the end. One definitely fit there but there others arguably didn't. There's some questions that could fit in Publication, as Steve suggested, but could stay in Reveal.

So, again, the question is do we want to spend a few weeks, which is what it might turn out to be, on these two sub heads or should we try to just consolidate the bid? Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, thanks. This is Steve. I think these should stay in but I'd like to talk a little bit about what I think they cover. Because I think certainly with regard to termination there's a lot of unclarity but also with regard to publication.

I think we've talked before - I went back and looked at the transcript of our meeting in Buenos Aires and this was a significant topic of discussion that we've talked about relay and reveal but reveal means revealing to the - to someone who's complaining about how - about a particular registration. It's revealing the contact data of the true registrant to that party.

There's another remedy that could come in here and which I know some existing services use and that's just basically kicking the registrant out of the proxy service system for violation of its terms and conditions and putting the contact information into Whois so in other words converting a proxy registration, if you will, into a non proxy registration.

So I think just as we will talk about what are the conditions under which the registrant's information would be revealed to a complainant, you know, what are the safeguards, what are the circumstances, what proof would there have to be, etcetera, you could really ask the same set of questions basically with regard to publication or if you want to say so with regard to taking somebody out of the proxy system or some registration out of the proxy system.

Then when we get to - so I think that for Publication we could have very similar sets of questions that we would have under Reveal. Then as far as Publication is - excuse me - Termination is concerned I think we're really talking about three different things here and we probably need to unpack that.

One would be termination of the registrant's proxy status. That's really the same thing as Publication so maybe that's covered by Publication. You know, in other words you're being kicked out of the proxy program because of something that you did, some violation that occurred, and therefore your contact data will be in Whois just as if you were not a proxy registrant to begin with. That's number one.

Number two is termination of accreditation of the privacy proxy service. And this, I think, goes to Hector's questions that are listed now under Termination which is, you know, is there some due process here? Who decides whether someone loses accreditation or not - some service loses accreditation or not and what are the consequences of that?

Then the third one, which has come in here and it's gotten a number of objections on the list is there's been some discussion about should there be termination of registrations or an involuntary takedown of registrations. And I tend to agree that's outside our scope.

A privacy proxy service, accredited or not accredited, doesn't really have the power to cancel or suspend a registration. I'm leaving aside here a

circumstance in which the registrar is in fact the service provider. But leaving that one aside in the role of proxy service provider you can't cancel a registration, you can't make a registration, you're just providing a service to a registrant who's already registered a domain name with some other entity.

So I think the termination of registration is outside our scope but - and I think termination of eligibility for the program might be covered by Publication. But that leaves termination of accreditation, which is the questions that Hector Manoff raised on the list and that are now listed under Termination.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: Oh yeah. Okay.

Don Blumenthal: I'd love to know what's going on in the background there but I'm not going to push for any reveal here. James.

James Bladel: Thanks, David and sorry for interrupting the sonar scan that we had going on there. But I just wanted to - and this is James Bladel speaking for the record. I just wanted to weigh in with some support for Steve's comments regarding the different scenarios and the different flavors of reveal and termination of service versus termination of the domain name.

I would even throw a new one out there which is, you know, the possibility that a privacy or proxy service is not affiliated with a registrar but is in fact affiliated with a Web host and could maybe not terminate the privacy proxy service or the registration but could cancel the hosting services or email services or any other content-related services that are associated with a domain name.

So there's a lot of different, I think, iterations of flavors. And that was one of the reasons why I thought perhaps it might be best if we pull back from this a little bit. I'm concerned that if we get too granular and too prescriptive in some

of these - some of these questions that it's going to result in - and I'm looking down the road here and it's going to take this group into a very prescriptive - I want to say, you know, place where we're making recommendations that are very, very tightly tying the hands of service providers.

And I think what we should be doing and ought to be doing is trying to determine where those minimum baselines of a service performance should be and then allowing the service providers to have some flexibility above and beyond that to cancel other services, terminate domain names if it's within their terms of service or if it's something that's specific to their jurisdiction or whatever that they want to do. But I want to be careful that we don't paint them into too small of a box with the results from these questions. Thanks.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. Thanks. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Hi, good afternoon. Michele Neylon for the record. You know, just backing up what Steve was saying which I find it's kind of strange for me to be doing, I tend to agree with him. I mean, one of the issues - I can understand why Kathy might like to have some way of, you know, offering a level of protection in certain circumstances but a privacy proxy provider does - is not an ICANN-accredited registrar so therefore cannot terminate a domain name.

I mean, the only entity that can create or terminate a domain name, as most of you know, is going to be either the registry or the registrar. So one of the things that we have been looking at in the EWG, and it's something that's in both our initial report and in the update that we published subsequently was the idea of recognizing that there might be - there could be a requirement for a highly protected level of registration which would be a very different beast entirely.

But again, I mean, I think, you know, the focus on this working group primarily should be in dealing with filling a void. The void at present is that there is no accreditation process for proxy privacy providers. There is a temporary set of

specifications that exist in proxy privacy providers affiliated with ICANN-accredited registrars must comply with but this needs to be replaced.

And I think we have to be very careful we don't expand the scope of this too far because if we do we're going to crash and burn. Thanks.

Don Blumenthal: Thanks, Michele. Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Hi, Don. Can you hear me?

Don Blumenthal: Yeah. Twice. There's an echo.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay the echo should be off. Well thanks and hello to everyone. And just wanted to say that I agree with James about a minimum baseline here, and of course Michele, that we shouldn't be expanding our scope too much which is why I find it very odd that we're creating whole new categories. Our hands have been tied so tightly as we've been looking at these charter questions we've been able to add bullet points but, you know, it took a whole session last time to add a new questions yet we're adding entire new categories.

And so I would recommend against it. I'd recommend, you know, once we add a category then we're going to have a sub group and it's going to wind up with a whole life of its own if we add a new title, if we add two new sections here.

So I think that these sections weren't part of our original discussions and I think we should consolidate, keep things tight. And I think we should talk about, at some point, the issue of takedown of a domain name versus disclosure of the underlying participant. This is an issue that was raised many years ago. It goes back in time to a number of the other issues that we're discussing here.

And the whole issue of accreditation because, again, we're dealing with proxy privacy service providers that have a relationship with the registry registrar. So this is an issue we can explore. And I can't imagine it taking place very often but let's not just discount it or delete it here.

But again these two new titles I think are going to wind up creating areas of massive new amounts of work. I think they're outside our scope. I'd consolidate. Thank you.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. Appreciate it. I guess at Steve and I both pointed out in some emails, takedown is still in here. We've moved things around. And, again, the last version that went out we deliberately, and maybe this wasn't - we indicated clearly enough - we removed some substantive discussions in the interest of just trying to focus on the process.

The substantive items are still quite live and will go back in, you know, later once we get into the work. Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Yes thank you. This is Steve. I guess I have two questions for Kathy. One is on the - excuse me, the takedown point, I think what - this is a terminology problem. I think when people see "takedown" they think cancellation of a registration in an involuntary manner in other words.

And I think what you were referring to, the option you were referring to, was that someone has a proxy registration, a complaint comes in that would meet whatever criteria there are for a reveal. And I think you're talking about having the registrant have the option of saying no I don't want to be revealed, instead I will consent to having the domain name canceled.

I guess I would just ask is that what you - that bullet point about takedown was referring to or have I misunderstood?

Kathy Kleiman: Yes, exactly - Steve, that's exactly right. And whether it takes place afterwards or beforehand, whether it's an option. But the idea that the use of the - not the use of the domain name - that the domain name itself stopped operating instead of revealing who the registrant is or subject to some additional legal process for revealing that registrant.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, that's what I thought it was. And I think that that's captured - if you look at - maybe not well but I think the attempt was to capture it under Roman Numeral 6, Reveal, Point 1, on the third bullet there where, again, this is - this comes into play when there's a reveal situation, however we define that.

And it says, "Consider a cancellation of the domain name registration as an option." So I think the intent was to get your proposal in there rather than up front as a general matter. Because it doesn't really apply except when there's a reveal situation, I think. I mean, as far as relay and so forth presumably that wouldn't necessarily be the option. But...

Kathy Kleiman: Right, that wouldn't...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: ...I think it belongs under Reveal. So that was my first question. And my second one was just to make sure, are we - I think the problem - the reason why we may need an additional section here is because reveal is - although it's defined, is ambiguous as to whether it's simply revealing to the complainant or revealing to the world.

And perhaps there would be - I think very likely there would be different - ought to be different criteria for those two events to take place. And that's why I suggested - I would support having a section that's called Publication. It could be called Termination of Proxy Service but I think that's unnecessarily confusing because it could be - it will be confused with Termination of Accreditation which is a different question obviously.

Kathy Kleiman: Steve, can I respond?

((Crosstalk))

Kathy Kleiman: If it is a spin on reveal then let's put it in Reveal. As you said, if this issue of cancellation or takedown is kind of in a bullet point in Reveal then maybe this discussion as well - if we create a bullet point we're making it a fait accompli.

If we - if there's an ambiguity is that reveal is a publication under what circumstances do we even want to do a publication, you know, where it goes out to everyone. Let's stick it in as a sub point of Reveal which is really the meat of our process anyway. If we create a separate bullet point I think we're making that decision now. If, as you pointed out, there are ambiguities here I would keep it in Reveal.

Don Blumenthal: ...take myself off mute. Move on here. Steve, anything...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: No I think that's worth considering. Yeah, I would be open to that if that's preferable. Just so long as that issue is addressed somewhere in the process.

Don Blumenthal: Great. Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks. And I think my point has been clarified but I'd better just check it out. With respect to Termination there are regular procedures in ICANN for terminating the registration of a domain name so there's no point in repeating that process here is that correct?

So now with the words that have been added to Termination we're only talking about termination of the accreditation of a privacy proxy service provider. Right?

Don Blumenthal: I believe so.

Stephanie Perrin: Okay.

Don Blumenthal: And I agree that...

Stephanie Perrin: I thought with some of the language that was creeping in we were talking about terminating a domain name which is covered somewhere else because it seems to me that ought to be very carefully managed; it's a disruption of trade. It's, you know, let's hope we got a good process for that.

My second thing - and I'm being a grammatical granny here - but - and I realize you probably love the word Reveal as a noun but could we call it Publication or use another noun and not turn reveal into a noun? Like I say, just being a granny granny - or a grammar granny.

Don Blumenthal: I'm the same way sometimes but I think Relay and Reveal are kind of our terms of our - that were put in place long before we had any say in it.

Stephanie Perrin: Well I guess I'll just sigh every time we use it. Thanks.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. Okay. Yes, I'm not going to go there. Volker.

Volker Greimann: Hi. Volker Greimann speaking for the record. I hope you can hear me all right. Just as a - just as a comment for Stephanie and also for Steve, termination would, in my view, actually refer to the termination of the service not of the domain name.

Because in most cases privacy providers don't have that - don't even have that ability to terminate a domain name directly. In some cases where they integrate with the registrar they can request that their services be deactivated permanently or temporarily.

But in most cases there simply is not - isn't any button that a provider can press to delete the domain name. So we want - I think we should keep that in mind because we're not just looking at providers that are affiliated with registrars but also those that are not and those are the ones that we really want to touch.

Don Blumenthal: Thanks. I appreciate - I'm kind of multitasking here. One of the disadvantages of working out of the house. Okay I wanted to make one point and also kind of ask a question because it's been raised by a few people in email and in Chat. Then I'd like to move on from the publication termination issue.

You know, these categories we set up are, you know, arbitrary in a sense, I mean, we added them. They weren't in the - apologize, I've got to take a break here for a second. They certainly weren't in what we received from the GNSO.

So to me any additions or subtractions from the categories, again, are arbitrary, they're up to us. And, you know, adding the categories to the titles isn't necessarily a scope issue. I guess I'm curious about comments that I've seen and - from a few folks that suggest that publication or termination - particularly publication is a scope issue is just a - as opposed to just an organization issue.

Oh Volker, is that an old hand or...

Volker Greimann: Yeah, apologies.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. All right, Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Hi, Don. Thanks. No I think Steve had it when he said that we should put some of the publication issues back under reveal or when he agreed that to my suggestion. Again, once we create that separate category we're going to wind up with a sub group or a sub team and it takes on a life of its own. While it's still, I mean, really it's starting as an ambiguous area related to reveal without scope or boundaries.

So I would, again, recommend that it stayed within Reveal so that it doesn't unintentionally or inadvertently take on a life of its own. You know, Reveal is really where the meat of the question is here. If it has other aspects, if it pushes on the boundaries a little bit then let's put those bullets there in the Reveal section, that's going to be a big area.

Don Blumenthal: Okay.

Kathy Kleiman: Thanks.

Don Blumenthal: So at this point the concern is just more organizational and focus or lack of focus in a scope issue for you? And I'm asking specifically because you're the first person who - remember an email last week suggested there might be a scope creep problem going on.

Anybody else there? Because if - okay - oh Gema.

Gema Campillos: Thank you, Steve. If you move the questions and the publication to the Reveal section you might need to go through the previous questions since there may be some questions that have repeated. I am thinking of the one, "Should registrant be notified prior to publication." Maybe there are some questions before that address the same concerns. Just that - thank you.

Don Blumenthal: You - I see your point. Yeah, and we've whacked at this and chopped it enough and I'm sure we're going to have to go back at some point and just

revisit everything to make sure that the language is clear and that we're not -
ad that we're not repeating ourselves. Good point.

Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Sorry, Don. Old hand, thank you.

Don Blumenthal: Oh okay. Let's move off Publication and Termination and see if there are any
issues, concerns, whatever about anything in the first - well main and then
the different specific topic areas. Todd? Welcome. First time I think you've
spoken.

Todd Williams: Yeah, no that's right. This is the Todd Williams for the record. Thanks, Don. A
quick question on main issues - and I was just, I think, a little confused and
hoping somebody in the group could help out. In Item 6 under that first
section the second question says, "Should registrars be permitted to
knowingly accept registrations where the registrant is using unaccredited
service providers that are bound to the same standards as accredited service
providers?"

And my question would be, if they are unaccredited how would they be bound
and to whom?

Don Blumenthal: Anybody want to address that?

Mary Wong: Don, this is Mary.

((Crosstalk))

Don Blumenthal: Yeah, go ahead, sure.

Mary Wong: And, Todd, I apologize. I think we've moved things around so much that I don't recall where this started and where it ended. Could you repeat the section please?

Todd Williams: Sure. Thank you, Mary. It's Section 1 Question 6. And it may be that this is just a substantive issue that we're going to get into as we're discussing main issues. I just was curious.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. I think he's referring to the second - in the circulated version, what's up on the screen, he's referring to the second question in Item 5 I think.

Todd Williams: Oh I'm sorry, yes, it's now Question 5 not 6. Thank you.

Mary Wong: And apology for the slight delay...

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim. Can I get in on that or...

Mary Wong: Go ahead, Tim. I'm just trying to look back to the history of the document so please go ahead.

Tim Ruiz: Yeah, I mean, I think that's a good question and something we should definitely cover when we get there. I don't know if we can change the question - I don't recall right offhand if that was something actually posed by the GNSO Council.

If so maybe we don't want to change the question per se. But certainly something to address there because that would be - it's kind of a strange question and I think the only way that they would be bound, at least in my mind right now, outside of being accredited would be if the registrar bound

them, in other words the registrar in some agreement with them said, you know, you had to follow the same procedures.

But that begs the question then why are we having this - why would we have an accreditation program? So I think - I think when we get there the answer to that might be fairly simple. But I agree, I think that there's an issue there and it would beg the question why are we going through all of this if registrars could use non accredited service providers?

Don Blumenthal: James. Well, James, is that on this point or another one?

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: I'm sorry, go ahead, Don.

Don Blumenthal: Is that on - were you going to speak to this point or...

James Bladel: I am indeed.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Okay. So thanks. This is James speaking for the record and I wanted...

((Crosstalk))

Don Blumenthal: ...speak to this one or do you have another issue to raise?

James Bladel: To this issue. Don, to this issue.

Don Blumenthal: Okay.

James Bladel: Okay. So then I just wanted to support what Tim was saying and note that my understanding was that at least from the RAA that registrars would not be

able to knowingly accept registrations from an unaccredited proxy service - privacy or proxy service provider. So, I mean, I don't have the RAA tattooed on the inside of my eyeballs the way I did this time last year but we should have to go back and perhaps make sure that that is in fact the case.

And then secondly I think that...

Don Blumenthal: Okay.

James Bladel: ...this question raises perhaps another point which is that if a registrar were to become aware that one of its registrants was in fact registering domain names as a privacy or proxy service what are the obligations of the registrar if they were to later determine that, you know, one of their - who they thought was just a general customer, general registrant, was in fact operating an unaccredited proxy service.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. Yeah, that scenario hadn't occurred to me. Does that clarify, Todd?

Todd Williams: Yeah, no I think that helped. And like I said, I think - I understand this may be an issue that we get into when we get into the substantive discussion. I just was kind of confused as a preliminary matter. But, no, that helps. Thank you.

Don Blumenthal: Excellent. Any other? Okay we'll kind of collate what's been percolating in the chat and then put out a final...

James Bladel: Sorry, Don?

Don Blumenthal: ...version in the next few days.

James Bladel: I'm sorry, Don? This is James. Can I jump in?

((Crosstalk))

Don Blumenthal: Yeah.

James Bladel: I apologize for the interruption. This is James speaking.

Don Blumenthal: Yeah.

James Bladel: Marika or Mary or whoever is holding...

((Crosstalk))

Don Blumenthal: Oh sure, I didn't see that your hand was...

James Bladel: That's okay. There's a slight - I think we want to make sure that that new bullet point is captured correctly. It's not when the registrant is using an unaccredited service provider but where the registrant is operating as an unaccredited service provider. I think that's an important distinction and sorry if I wasn't clear. Thanks.

Don Blumenthal: Okay I lost the - no I understand your point. I lost the train of the document as I was looking over into the Chat and vice versa. Okay now I see Marika's question. Okay. Caught up.

Okay if we've finished with this why don't we move to - why don't we move over to the draft work plan?

Marika Konings: Don, this is Marika. Just to make sure that - because I think there's still a lot of comments in the Chat going on just to make sure that, you know, people - I don't know if you wanted me to circulate the document after the call and make sure that people have a chance to review the new layout and changes we've made?

I think there were some suggestions that we need to look at, the Reveal section to make sure there's no duplication now that we've moved the

Publication section into there and maybe additionally encourage if there are indeed additional questions just like the one that James has just raised that people still circulate those on the list as well?

Don Blumenthal: Oh yeah, no we'll take what we've got here. We'll - or at least I'll have to go back through the Chat to see what I might have missed and then distribute a copy of where we think we are after the call then ask to make sure we got everybody's points. Yeah, this is a close to final but we will kick it back out to make sure we got everything right.

Just wanted to - just want to just respond to something Maria just posted. Yeah, we didn't fashion these, I mean, they were suggested by the same person who suggested the original groupings. So, yeah, we may pull back on them and it sounds like we put back on Publish but it's, you know, adding these new sections hasn't been something we invented; it's been - again, it's been suggested by members of the group - or a member of the group.

And until today there were - no, I'll take that back - suggested by a member of the group and this is the first time we've really dived in to discuss whether they should be added or not.

Well we've got a draft work plan on the screen. And appreciate Marika and Mary jumping in and putting something together for us to work from. As you probably have seen this just flows on the basis of committees of a whole.

There are pros and cons, as we saw in the discussions, to breaking the sub teams or doing committee as a whole. I raised the issue of - and both can work; I've been on work groups that do both. Committee as a whole has the advantage that everybody gets to be involved and nobody feels like they're missing something.

And nobody feels compelled to wonder whether - which groups to sign up for and feel that - I want to sign up for three different sub groups and I don't have

time and then drop out of participating in the full group discussions. On the other hand sub teams do let people really concentrate on issues that are in their wheelhouses. That's kind of the considerations.

Practical side, sub teams do create a resource issue. And unfortunately sub teams introduce - can introduce more points of failure. And again I've seen this where some folks who agreed to manage sub teams or people who agreed to participate in sub teams just didn't follow through. And then working group leadership and staff winds up doing all the work.

So I hope that was a balanced if convoluted description of the thought processes. What we've done here is gone on the basis of committee as a whole to begin with We'll have the option later on as we get into the detailed substance areas to break out into sub teams. There are a number of different ways we can do that. Different work groups have used a lot of different models of sub teams but we can talk about that when the time comes.

At least now particularly when we talk about the main issues, you know, the issues that are why we are here, accreditation, the core accreditation issues we figured will proceed together and adjust as we go along both on the issue of sub teams and on the issue of just how much time we devote, how we conduct the calls and everything else. This is going to be a moving target along way into the process.

So, Marika, Mary, did you want to just go over the approach here?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika..

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I'm happy to do so. So basically what I did is look at the mind map where we started with looking at some of our initial requirements and things we did so those, you know, deadlines come in here.

And then basically I just started mapping out all the working group meetings assuming that we would continue on a weekly basis with weekly meetings building in as well ICANN meetings and the break we typically have the week after the ICANN meeting for working group meetings.

And the idea is that basically the expectation is that the next two meetings we'd probably spend on finalizing the work plan and hopefully as well finalizing the grouping of charter questions and identifying any potential additional questions that need to be added there.

We're also working, as you know, on reviewing information from privacy proxy services that are affiliated with 2013 RAA accredited registrars so we're compiling that information and hope to be able to share with - that with you as well in the next two weeks.

And then of course we have as well the deadline for input - of input we received in response to the request we sent out to stakeholder group and constituencies, supporting organizations and advisory committees and then there's also the deadline for the EWG survey following which hopefully will soon have information to look at as well.

Also factored in in monthly meetings to really make sure that we identify any additional research or data gathering that we think is necessary and then basically the idea would be that from the 4th of March we would really start diving into the substance of the issues and work our way through the different categories and questions that we've identified.

The assumption here is - and, again, this is - it's difficult to assess at this time how much we may need for each category; it may differ largely depending on, you know, the number of questions in there or the time that's needed for discussion around those issues.

But the assumption I've made here is that we would meet on average four meetings where the first one is basically more of a commence and deliberations diving into the issues.

The idea would be as well staff would basically gather all the input received through the working group survey, the input from stakeholder groups, constituencies, the research done on the existing terms and conditions and categorize that all along the lines of, you know, the questions - or the charter questions and their categories so that information would be available at the start of each discussion on each of the categories.

Again one of the things the working group will need to discuss is whether there should be a specific order. At this stage the way I've listed them is just going from Category 1 to Category 2 to Category 3 and so on.

So one of the things you may want to discuss or consider is is that indeed the order in which these questions need to be considered? Is there any, you know, are there any that need to come first? Are there any, you know, is there any point where we actually need to hold and wait for discussions on another category to complete or commence to be able to compare notes?

But at this stage the assumption is that they would just continue in sequence noting that, you know, we estimate that there would be in total like four meetings on each of the categories where in the last one the idea would be that there would be some kind of preliminary conclusions for that category that are, you know, written up, circulated to the whole working group for a review.

Noting that these are preliminary because I said, as we're working through these categories at the end of that process there may be need - a need for changes or updates to those as, you know, we may have learned new things or agreed on certain things in other categories that then would need to be reflected on some of the other items.

It also builds in the different ICANN meetings at this stage up until London where at least the idea is that we provide an update to the community on our progress to date and also use the opportunity to have a face to face meeting, again, to work through the issue that we're looking at.

And as well what we would build in, it's not on here yet, is I think on a regular basis basically a review of the work plan because the idea is really that this is a live document. As said, it's difficult to anticipate at this stage how much time we may spend on some of these categories. Maybe it's sometimes more or maybe it's sometimes less so we need to be able to adjust that accordingly.

So I think at this stage the question for the working group is really do you think, you know, this is the approach we're following? And on the basis of that I can further build out the work plan and probably get us to initial work plan that goes on to the initial report and again, build in regular review periods.

Do people think, you know, are we being too optimistic or too pessimistic on, you know, using the - a standard set of four meetings at this stage or is that just something we'll just review after we've done the first category and just move from there?

Are there any things we're overlooking here? Is there anything else we need to build in at this stage? As said, you know, the idea would be that we post this on the working group wiki so everyone can have a look at it and on a regular basis update it and also build it in as a standard agenda item.

Maybe after we finish each - finish a category that we actually go back to the work plan and just assess where we're at, how we need to adjust our next steps and also how that impacts on, you know, potential publication or, you know, updates to the community on the topics where we're discussing. So I think that's it in a nutshell.

Don Blumenthal: Appreciate it. Any comments? Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Yes thank you. This is Steve. First thanks to the staff for pulling this together because I think it's very helpful to have a concrete proposal on the table that we can look at.

I agree with you that we now need to look at the list of groupings that you're going to be sending out in clean form and see whether the order is right. It may or may not be.

And we probably would adjust this accordingly and also because, like now we have a Reveal section with many, many questions in it. You know, that probably will take longer. And then there are some others that probably could be done more quickly. So I think we can adjust the expectations accordingly.

My one additional comment is that I see that we have down - you have down here for the face to face meetings that that's where we would agree on preliminary conclusions for certain sections. And in general I'm not sure that's a good approach.

I think the face to face meetings, first of all, I don't know - we have quite a few people on this call. We probably won't have this many people at any face to face meeting that are on the working group.

And second, we will at, face to face meetings, perhaps, have other people who were not part of the working group but interested and curious about what's going on. So I think that ought to be the focus perhaps of the face to face meetings is to present what we've done so far, what we're working on now rather than trying to, you know, reach a conclusion at a face to face meeting.

So that was my only comment. I know that it may line up with the four, you know, four meetings and so forth but my only comment was I don't think that's

probably the best place to try to reach a conclusion unless it's a pretty noncontroversial item.

But I think it's great to have this list and I think our main task right now will be to figure out what order we want to tackle these issues, assuming we're moving ahead as a committee as a whole at least for now, in what order do we want to tackle these issues? Thank you.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. Thanks. Any other comments? Thoughts? I'm just looking at all that's going on in the Chat instead of people getting on the call. Yeah, the only - yeah, there is the item here for the - for when we, expect, maybe a better term is hope for - responses from the letters that sent out. We'll probably have to devote some time to discussing what staff puts together concerning those responses and discuss the extent to which they change how we might want to proceed.

I suspect right off the top that we might have some thoughts that'll be useful in how we frame the questions, maybe even frame the sub heads. Steve, is that old or new?

Steve Metalitz: I'm sorry, that's old.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Hi, Don. I just thought I'd repeat something that I was saying in the Chat in case people don't have it. And that's that jumping into three sessions of dealing with the main issues may not be the right place to start. I'm looking at some of the main issues and some of them are big overview issues; some of them aren't.

Number 3, for example, says, "What are the contractual obligations, if any, that if unfulfilled would justify termination of customer access by ICANN-accredited proxy privacy service providers?"

That is a question we're going to be dealing with at some point. I'm not sure that's a question we want to deal with the first week. It seems to rely on a lot of background and needs to be informed, I think, by things that are happening in other categories.

So if we're going to start with main issues figuring out what the real kind of big picture main issues are might be our first priority. And then figuring out which ones - which of the questions actually link and work off of categories below and moving them down to the most kind of detailed categories is probably appropriate. Thanks.

Don Blumenthal: Interesting point. Thanks. Well I'll throw in the final word here since at least by my clock we're at 10:59. Is it worth trying to identify questions that are in the main section that explicitly need to be revisited as we get to sub sections or that might even be better just dropped from the main grouping and put into the sub sections?

And I guess that'll be part of - well part of it is just doing the final version of the charter questions document and part of it'll be just a planning issue when we get to a subsection; will we go back and revisit some things we've already discussed and maybe made decisions on? Any other thoughts? Questions? Or should we just declare victory with an on-time ending and move on with the day?

Todd Williams: Thanks, Don.

Steve Metalitz: Right.

Don Blumenthal: Seeing no hands let's move on to next week.

Steve Metalitz: Thanks, Don.

Don Blumenthal: Thanks for your time.

Mary Wong: Thank you, everybody.

Marika Konings: Bye.

((Crosstalk))

END