

**ICANN
Transcription
Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP WG
Tuesday 10 December at 1500 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP WG call on the Tuesday 10 December 2013 at 15:00 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-20131210-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

James Bladel - RrSG
Amr Elsadr - NCUC
Alex Deacon – IPC
David Cake - NCSG
David Hughes -
Don Blumenthal - RySG
Gordon Dick - RrSG
Graeme Bunton - RrSG
Hector Ariel Manoff - IPC
Holly Raiche - ALAC
Kiran Malancharuvil - IPC
Kristina Rosette - IPC
Luc Seufer - RrSG
Maria Farrell - NCUC
Marie-Laure Lemineur - NPOC
Matt Serlin - RrSG
Steve Metalitz - IPC
Michele Neylon - RrSG
Nic Steinbach - RrSG
Paul McGrady
Roy Ballesté - NCUC
Statton Hammock - RrSG
Tim Ruiz - RrSG
Todd Williams - IPC
Volker Greimann - RrSG
Carlton Samuels - At-Large
Val Sherman
Stephanie Perrin
Griffin Barnett - IPC
Marija Zugic

Apologies:

Wendy Seltzer - NCUC
Chris Pelling – RrSG
Jeff Eckhaus – RrSG
Susan Prosser – RrSG
Eric Brunner-Williams - Individual

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings
Mary Wong
Glen de Saint Géry
Julia Charvolen

Coordinator: Please go ahead. This afternoon's conference call is now being recorded.

Mary Wong: Thank you very much. Maria, would you like to begin with a roll call?

Maria Farrell: I will indeed. Actually I'm going to - can - is Nathalie going to do the roll call for us today or do I do that?

Julia Charvolen: Hello. This is Julia from staff on the call. I can do a roll call for you if you wish.

Maria Farrell: Okay that would be great. Thank you.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you. Good morning, good - sorry, good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. And welcome on the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Working Group call on Tuesday 10 December, 2013 at 1500 UTC.

On the call today we have James Bladel, Don Blumenthal, Gordon Dick, Graeme Bunton, Hector Ariel Manoff, Holly Raiche, Carlton Samuels, Stephanie Perrin, Luc Seufer, Griffin Barnett, (Maria Suki), Marie-Laure Lemineur, Steve Metalitz, Michele Neylon, Nic Steinbach, Roy Balleste, Statton Hammock, Todd Williams.

We have apologies from Susan Prosser, Wendy Seltzer, Jeff Eckhaus and Chris Pelling. And from staff we have Marika Konings, Mary Wong, Glen de Saint Géry, and myself, Julia Charvolen.

May I please remind all participants to please state your names before speaking for transcript purposes? Thank you and over to you.

Maria Farrell: Thank you, Julia. Okay, this is Maria Farrell and I'm in the interim chair of this group. So we have a good agenda today. I think this is the day when we finally get down to some business on this working group. So I'm just going to take you briefly through the agenda first and then we can get onto the business of selecting a chair to take this working group forward.

First off we are - let me see, okay, so I'm just going to review the names of some documents which the staff kindly sent to us since last week's call. And those were the definitions documents - definitions of Whois and that had been prepared by the Whois Drafting Team in early 2009 which you'll have received; also the staff report on Whois relay and reveal studies from 2011 and then finally what I hope will be the meat for discussion on this call is the draft mind map of topics in the charter which Marika has very kindly put together.

And so all of those have arrived in our inboxes over the last week. I hope everybody's had a chance to take a look at them. And especially give some thought to the mind map and how we might think of arranging the work of this working group.

Okay item the second - I personally wish to formally withdraw my acceptance of the nomination for chair which was very kindly made by Tim Ruiz amongst others of the Registrars group and the Non Commercial Stakeholders Group.

I think it would be awkward for me to chair a discussion of who should be the chair if I were a candidate. So I want to thank the people who did nominate

me and happily revert to my original position which is of hopefully setting things up to the chair proper can take things over and drive forward. Has anybody got any questions about the agenda before we move on to the selection of the chair?

No, okay. Oh before we go on I just want to say one - so I think part of the - oh there are two very important things. One is regarding the mind map. I hope you've taken a look at it because what we'd like to come out of this call with I think the proper chair, notwithstanding, is using the mind map to think about how this working group is going to plan its work so thinking about the sequencing of issues, what the dependencies might be, even seeing where there are areas of agreement or likely agreement then areas of difference. So that's going to be a really important one.

And the second extremely important thing is that today is Marika's birthday so she's very kindly taken time out from a busy celebration to come and be on this call so thank you, Marika and happy birthday.

Marika Konings: Thank you, Maria.

Maria Farrell: You're welcome. Okay so let's get on to chair selection. We have now got three nominations received and accepted and those are from Steve Metalitz of the Intellectual Property Constituency, Don Blumenthal of the Registry Constituency and Graeme Bunton of the Registrar Constituency.

I suppose before we get into any general discussion of chairmanship I think it would be a good moment to put those three people on the spot and ask them to give us a little - just a little introduction to themselves and perhaps what - how they might see their vision for this group or why we might wish to appoint them as a chair.

Who would like to go first? Let's take it alphabetically. Don Blumenthal, would you mind - Don, would you mind just giving us a few words? I know you've

been nominated almost ahead of your will but perhaps you might just give us an idea of how you would see this group going forward?

Don Blumenthal: Thanks, Maria. Always cursed by having that low letter in the alphabet. Yeah, I'm not sure I was drafted against my will, it was more a progression of some things that went on.

I didn't get a chance to introduce myself last week because I was delayed. But I'm with the Public Interest Registry. I do policy work primarily in security, privacy and the DNS abuse law enforcement issues.

I've been at the - in the Whois space, believe it or not, since 1998 with a policy paper concerning accuracy of Whois data. Kind of unfortunate to see how far we haven't come in 15 years.

Yeah, I've been involved directly in Whois projects since I joined PIR a few years ago - three years ago to be specific. And I just have gradually (dived) in more and more deeply. Was chair of the sub team of the Thick Whois project. I think there are a lot of similar issues that we're going to face in privacy proxy but also a lot of other very interesting ones. And it just would like to be involved in them.

I think my biggest strength is - so back in the restaurant business I was known as an expediter which kind of meant just jumping in and managing and kind of keep things going through team efforts.

That pretty well sums it up just on how I would - my interest and how I would see this going forward.

Maria Farrell: Terrific. Thank you very much, Don. Next up Graeme, Graeme Bunton, could you just give us a few words about yourself please?

Graeme Bunton: Sure. Hey all. So I got my start in the Internet about 10 years ago working for a research lab at the University of Toronto called the Citizen Lab which specializes in Internet censorship and surveillance research.

And that's where I actually ended up meeting Elliot Noss, the CEO of Tucows. I've been working now for Tucows just shy of three years. Now most of my job is not policy; most of what I do is running our business intelligence here and that tends to be the perspective that I bring to most projects which is what I like to look at the data, I like to look at - and analyze what's actually going on. And that tends to be the sort of rigorous analytical approach I bring to things.

But then I also get to scratch that policy itch. So I have not been doing ICANN things for a particularly long period of time especially compared to many here so I'm a relative neophyte to Whois issues which I don't think is necessarily a bad thing. It certainly sounds like a very contentious issue and people have been working on this for an awful long time and it's been very difficult to get it right. I'd like to think that I bring a sort of new and more open perspective to how we might approach this. There we go.

Maria Farrell: Thank you very much, Graeme. And, Steve, Steve Metalitz, would you mind just introducing yourself to those who don't know you and your vision for the working group?

Steve Metalitz: Hello?

Maria Farrell: Hi, Steve, yes we can hear you; go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Okay I'm sorry. I'm having a little trouble managing my mute button. Well I've been involved with the Whois issue just almost as long as Don I guess, certainly as long as I've been involved in ICANN.

I'm a lawyer and I represent a coalition of groups that - of companies and associations and membership organizations that have a strong interest in copyright protection. And I've been active in the Intellectual Property Constituency since it was - since it was started. I'm currently serving as vice president of that constituency.

So I've been engaged in ICANN and the policy development process and particularly with regard to Whois for quite some time. I think that we're at an important juncture here with the changes that have already been made on Whois in the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and the clear direction from the leadership of ICANN to work toward - to address the situation with the privacy and proxy domain name registration. So I think we have an important job to do.

And as I mentioned in my posting when I nominated Don for the chairmanship of this group, we have - obviously we have some diverging interests here. There also are some overlaps in the interests that are represented here. And our challenge really is to work together to prepare as quickly as we can a consensus document or one that has as much support as possible to set out what the standards ought to be for privacy and proxy service accreditation.

So I think that's a challenge but one that we've got some experienced and - experienced people on this group as well as, as Graeme said, people with a more fresh perspective. And I hope that we can all work together to achieve that. Thank you.

Maria Farrell: Thank you, Steve. That's terrific. Okay so I'm going to throw it open to - to the working group as a whole. And does - I'm sure there are people who got questions. It might be an idea to - let's see, let's take a queue and people can ask questions either of individual candidates or of all three nominees as a whole.

James Bladel, I've got you with your hand up so please go ahead.

James Bladel: Thanks, Maria and appreciate everyone weighing in on that. James Bladel for the transcript. So just a thought here. And it seems like there was significant support - or at least I didn't hear too much objection to Steve's idea that was posted to the list. But having participated in a number of these working groups and chaired more than a few I know that there just an incredible amount of work that's involved. It's not necessarily bringing the right experience or background to the leadership position itself but just managing the workload.

So one thought might be to - if we could consider the idea of a chair, you know, for example, I know Don's has been thrown out as a candidate for that position but then one or more vice chairs or co-chairs or whatever we're going to call those other roles and then indicate that some of those other folks might be balanced across the different interests or different stakeholder sections of the community.

And I was wondering if folks were currently nominated and seconded for chair would be interested in serving as a vice chair if that were an acceptable structure.

Maria Farrell: Thanks, James. Let's put that question to the nominees. Don, maybe - let's go in the same order again, Don, Graeme and then Steve please.

Don Blumenthal: Yeah, James, I think you're absolutely right on this project. And it's not necessarily an issue of saying balancing interests; I think it's just a - which has been suggested, that's why I'm saying that. I think it's just more an issue of the number of issues we've got to cover and the time, whatever that turns out to be, that we have to do. This is one of the biggest lists of important issues that I've worked on in a working group.

I don't know if the best solution is a formal co-chair set up or a chair with an advisory committee or if we go with sub teams just built in advisory committee that way. But the chair is going to need help, there's no question. And I do think that a co-chair setup could work but there's other ways to go about it.

Maria Farrell: Okay. Thanks, Don. Graeme, please.

Graeme Bunton: I think that's a delightful suggestion from James and would be happy to withdraw my chair nomination or however that would work to - if we have some sort of vice or co or other leadership process.

Maria Farrell: Okay thank you, Graeme. Steve please.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, this is Steve. I agree with Don, this is a big job. And I'm ready, willing and able to support him as chair in whatever way makes the most sense. I tend to think that having formal vice chairs or co-chairs may not be necessary and maybe be somewhat unwieldy if it makes it less efficient for just for ministerial decisions to get made.

And perhaps, you know, since I think we - the idea of an advisory committee or something like that may make sense. And I think it's - it seems to me that we almost certainly will have sub groups here because there are so many issues and there's probably a good way to divide them up although I don't have a specific proposal to make on that.

So that might be another way to share the - obviously that - if we have sub teams we're going to need good leaders for each of the sub teams with - under Don's overall leadership. So I'm certainly prepared to withdraw or to decline the nomination for chair if Don's able to take that on. And I'm prepared to help him and support him in whatever way he thinks is most - or the group thinks is most useful in order to advance our work.

Maria Farrell: Okay, thanks Steve. So I'm going to summarize where we are and invite anyone else to make a comment or ask a question. So James Bladel suggests use of co-chairs. Don, I sense from you a preference against co-chairs but maybe an advisory committee to the chair. Graeme likes the co-chair committee - sorry, the co-chair idea - and is willing to withdraw his acceptance of nomination as a chair to then be considered as co-chair.

And then Steve, not so keen on co-chairs but again in favor of an advisory committee or indeed sub teams which may be created from the work plan and also willing to withdraw from being - from his nomination as chair. That's kind of where we are.

I think it's a - it's not something that we just want the nominees to have a view on; I think it would be fair to hear from other people on the call - other people in the working group if they have a particular preference or if they think this - what they think will be best to work.

Because we've actually - I think we've got one of those SAT or GRE questions here. Don would prefer against co-chairs but might take an advisory committee; Graeme will - prefers co-chairs or declines as a chair, et cetera, et cetera. So we've got a few different pieces to stick together. Let's take some input on what people think would be the best - or another possible approach.

Don, you've got your hand up; is that - would you like to speak again?

Don Blumenthal: Yeah, I just noted Tim's note in the chat section. It's not so much that I'm against co-chairs as such. I think that can work. But in - I think as Steve suggested in an administrative sense I think it's good to have somebody who's kind of playing the point on - just keeping everything heading in the right direction, dealing with GNSO whatever else needs to be done, again more an administrative sense rather than a substance sense.

Maria Farrell: Thank you, Don. So one thing - so I think we're trying to - we're sort of trying to achieve two different things here. One is to ensure that we've got a person or persons to take on the administrative and managerial role of leadership and the other is trying to achieve some putative form of balance between different groups.

I'm inclined to personally to view the chairmanship as a managerial job so I'm going to make this suggestion. What if, you know, Don may well need somebody to step in as chair if he's not able to chair a particular meeting, for example, when he's traveling and that, Graeme, would you be willing to be a person who was - what can we call it, the alternate chair for when meetings and such are difficult for Don to chair.

Graeme Bunton: Absolutely.

Maria Farrell: Okay. Do we have any objections to that idea? Somebody's - is that Amr, have you put up your hand? No, okay.

Steve Metalitz: Could you - excuse me, this is Steve. Could you repeat what the proposal is, Maria?

Maria Farrell: The proposal is that we have a chair, which would be Don, and that we look at an alternate chair for occasions when Don is not able to chair calls, for example, if he's traveling or has other commitments.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, this is Steve again. I can support that I'm glad to fill in for Don if that's needed.

Maria Farrell: Terrific. Okay so really we're looking at appointing - possibly appointing a chair and two alternates. That has the advantage of giving us a little more support across different groups and also having a backup for Don when he, you know, I'm not envisioning lots of absences, Don, but just thinking

managerially that might be a good thing. As indeed Don when he may be on a plane this time next week, yes.

So the idea would be alternate chairs, that's correct, answering to Carlton on the list; a chair and two alternates. Ideas on that, objections or better suggestions? Okay I'm not seeing anybody put their hands up on that but I do want to give people a chance to think about that and think through the implications rather than spring it on people too quickly.

Okay so James Bladel is withdrawing his suggestion for vice chairs and supporting the idea of alternate chairs. So that's good. I note that Steve supports the idea; Don supports the idea and Graeme would be happy to be in that role as well.

Amr Elsadr: Maria, this is Amr. Can I ask a question please?

Maria Farrell: Sorry, Amr, please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: I was just wondering - I've never chaired a working group before but I'm - my understanding was that the chair and the vice chairs, as opposed to alternate chairs, typically do some offline work together. I mean, perhaps maybe before meetings and sometimes with the policy staff support. If we're going to have a chair and alternate chairs would that be different?

Would alternate chairs need to step in to fill in for the chair at times when they weren't perhaps as updated or in constant contact with the chair in preparation for calls and meetings? And I was just wondering how that would work. Thanks.

Maria Farrell: That's a very good question. So what I propose is purely a - is like a substitute, you know, substituting a referee at a football match effectively. But it is possible in some concept of this idea that the alternate chairs would have

to do a bit of preparation work or be sort of a sounding board possibly for the chair.

So I really thought about it simply as a process question but Amr raises the, you know, what potentially could go into a balance question really is if there are two alternate chairs should there - will that be sufficient if the job is a more substantive one rather than just a refereeing one?

Don, do you mind if I put you on the spot and ask you - know this is an idea I've come up with myself, but how would you view the alternate chairs working? Would they would be people you would talk to in between times or simply someone you would delegate to chair a meeting in your absence?

Don Blumenthal: No, alternate chairs - alternate chairs would have to be part of the process right along. And what I think is good about the group we've got here is we've got a good variety of the different constituencies so that you would work very well in terms of just filling in when necessary but also having everybody in the loop so that all the issues are considered. Basically, okay, a lot of (unintelligible) here right now.

Basically I would view alternate chair as the same as vice chair. We would work together and I think that's particularly good given the specific makeup of the people who are interested in forming this leadership group.

Maria Farrell: Okay. So all right, I'm just seeing some various comments coming up. Here's the deal, I mean, think if we just view the alternate chair as simply being, you know, a backstop chair then I don't think there's a concern about balance. I think if we do - I'm getting the sense from Amr's question that there is.

And now I'm also getting the sense that I am messing a little bit with well trodden GNSO terminology. So Marika, can I just ask you if you would just give us a little - if you wouldn't mind a (unintelligible) of what the vice chair is and how that is different from an alternate chair as I proposed it.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. As I typed in the Chat the concept of alternate chair actually doesn't exist in the GNSO Working Group Guidelines. It does talk about vice chairs or co-chairs. But it also indicates that it's really up to the working group to define how it wants to designate their leadership. So I think if you would decide to go for a term like alternate I think it would be important to define what you mean by that.

And if it's in no way different from how we've been using vice chairs or co-chairs who indeed serve in a more leadership capacity together with the chair, you know, in a consulting basis but also being able to step in when the chair is not available I would suggest that you maybe stick with the term vice chair as that is something that has been defined and has been used in other context. With alternate chair I think we're, you know, treading some new ground possibly.

Maria Farrell: Okay. So here's my sense of where we are. We kind of like the idea of having two alternates but if they are going to be vice chairs who have a more formal leadership role I think we probably need to go back to the issue of having more balance across the group. I think that's sort of implicit in what Amr was saying.

And we might need to nominate another alternate chair - sorry, another vice chair as well, so a group of three, effectively a triumvirate that would support the chair. What I don't want to do is make a - to make a decision where we think this is, you know, my concept of the chairmanship as purely administrative is, you know, not something that stands the test of time and that we need to have more of a triumvirate backing the chair up.

How about this, let me make the suggestion that we have a triumvirate and we have a spare slot for another person to be vice chair on that triumvirate and that we allow nominations for that to be held on the mailing list over the next couple of days? Would anyone have an objection to that?

Paul McGrady: Hi, this is Paul McGrady. I'm sorry I'm on a mobile; I'm not able to raise my hand in the Adobe.

Maria Farrell: Okay, Paul, go ahead. After you I have Tim Ruiz and after Tim I have Steve. Go ahead, Paul.

Paul McGrady: Thank you. What's the rationale for having three vice chairs as opposed to two?

Maria Farrell: The rationale is to allow some basically representation on what is effectively a leadership group from the different major groupings in the working group. Did that answer your question, Paul?

Paul McGrady: Yeah, I suppose that it does. I guess I'm, you know, I don't - I guess why, you know, if we're going to do more than two why three? Why not five? You know what I mean? I understand that the more slots you have the more there is potential for representation. But again the purpose of the chair is, in my mind, mostly administrative. Everybody will have a chance to voice their (unintelligible) opinion on the team, I hope. So I kind of - if we're looking for something that's going to be efficient the more people are put into those sort of administrative slots the less efficient it would be.

Maria Farrell: Okay. Thank you, Paul. Tim Ruiz please.

Tim Ruiz: Yeah, I guess I had similar concerns. I mean, there's, you know, if we - if we're going to go back to, you know, nominating to try to cover a broader spectrum of the group then, I mean, then we might as well just sit down and say okay here is who all the stakeholder groups are, we're going to get a vice chair from each stakeholder group. And I don't think that's very practical or efficient in the long run.

I think when we went through this process where we had, you know, nominations and expressions of interest and we landed on these there very capable people from three different stakeholder groups and I think they've all expressed, you know, a willingness to serve in a particular capacity so that we could have, you know, a chair and two vice chairs.

And I think at this point if we - we should just accept that instead of going back and making it more complicated at least that's my thought. Thanks.

Maria Farrell: Thank you, Steve - or sorry, thank you, Tim. I have Steve Metalitz next please.

Steve Metalitz: Yes thank you. This is Steve. I can support what Tim said. This discussion is really what I was hoping to avoid with my suggestion that we just unite behind Don as the chair. I think a triumvirate or a chair plus a triumvirate just could get unwieldy.

I'll tell you my conception of this, whether it's called - whether the role that I've volunteered for is called vice chair or alternate chair, is that Don is the chair. If he needs help or wants to get feedback I'm ready, willing and able to provide that. If he's unable to chair a meeting and wants me to chair it or he wants Graeme to chair it I'm happy to do my bit.

I just don't want us to get to a position where everything - even the administrative decisions have to get negotiated among all the interest groups and that just - I think that just makes the process inefficient. So again I'm happy to serve under whatever label the staff is comfortable with. But I do think we should have one chair who's got support from across the entire spectrum. Thank you.

Maria Farrell: Thank you, Steve. One ring to rule them all, indeed. Next up, Amr please.

Amr Elsadr: Hi, this is Amr. I just wanted to note that I supported the idea of a triumvirate in the Chat but I misunderstood what was meant by that. I agree with Steve and Tim, I don't really see a need for three vice chairs. I think Don as chair supported by Steve and Graeme should do the job quite well.

And by the last stakeholder group we're referring to the Non Commercial Stakeholder Group, to be honest I'm not sure there's anyone in the NCSG who is willing to step up right now to serve as vice chair so I guess this whole discussion might not be so relevant unless someone offers or volunteers and so far we don't really have any. Thanks.

Maria Farrell: That's great. Okay, I think we're getting toward a conclusion here. Michele, you're up next. Michele, I think you may be on mute? Okay, while we're waiting to see if Michele - I'm going to call on Volker please.

Volker Greimann: Hi everyone. I originally also thought that it would be a good idea to have one common chair instead of one chair from each interest group. And I still think that is a very good idea, a chair that everybody can unite behind.

I do think, however, that we have a very, very contentious working group potentially ahead of us with a lot of work ahead of us. So it might be a bit much for one chair and it might be helpful to have backups or people that the chair can delegate certain functions to just to ensure a smooth flow of the working group. Yeah, that's what I just wanted to throw out there.

Maria Farrell: Super, thank you, thank you, Volker. All right well I think what I'm hearing really is that this idea of needing a third person to be a vice chair is unnecessary and inefficient and also - and I'm beginning to think myself really it's also up to the incoming chair to decide how he wishes to use his vice chairs as well and in keeping with the GNSO - the guidelines for how we do this sort of thing.

So thank you all very much for bearing with me during that discussion. I am going to propose that this working group agrees I think by consensus to propose that Don Blumenthal be the chair of this group and that he be assisted as vice chairs by Graeme Bunton and by Steve Metalitz. And can I suppose - can anyone put up their hand to speak or type into the - on the Adobe if they have an objection to that approach.

Steve Metalitz, I see your hand is still up. Do you have something to add?

Steve Metalitz: No, I'm sorry. That - my hand should have been down, sorry. I support your proposal.

Maria Farrell: Okay, thank you very much. All right well, look, it looks - I'm not seeing any objection so I think we probably achieved the first of what I hope will be many consensuses of this working group which is to appoint Don Blumenthal as our chair and Graeme Bunton and Steve Metalitz as our vice chairs. So thank you to all of you very, very much for offering to do so much work and help us get this working group where it needs to be.

I think that's all we need in terms of a formal decision making process. Personally as the liaison to the GNSO Council I will need to formally let them know and - I certainly hopefully agree that Don will be the chair and we'll have two vice chairs.

That being the case I think all there is for me to do is to congratulate and hand over the chairmanship of this working group to him. And basically let him know that, Don, we have two items to go which is review the draft the mind map and Marika was going to give us a quick presentation on that and then do some brainstorming and then confirm the next steps and meeting.

So thank you all very much and over to Don.

Don Blumenthal: Thanks. I was a little bit hoping this was going to be kind of like American elections where they appoint somebody and he doesn't have to do any work for three months. But nope.

Yeah, I appreciate it and just what I think is probably best is to move forward and take a look at this, the mind map that Marika prepared. These are very - any of you who have been in any Mikey O'Connor-led project knows these well. And I can't say I'll use them as much as he does but they're excellent planning tools.

If you want to work with them on your own they're prepared with freeware. We can send that link out. But at this point I think it's probably best for me to stand back and let - ask Marika to talk about the mind map and how it came about.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Don. Yes, so this is Marika. And yes, you know, credit where credit is due it's Mikey O'Connor who's actually brought the mind map concept to GNSO working groups and at least from my experience to date they have been very useful in capturing at the start of a process the different ideas and suggestions in one place and allowing as well easy grouping or changes around as conversations go.

And from that it's (unintelligible) as well very useful to actually extract from that the work plan. The mind map basically identifies what are the different elements that the working group needs to tackle or needs to achieve in order to come to the charter questions.

So from that it's - the next step would be to derive a work plan. And then at the end of the process the working groups often go back to their mind map and say okay did we actually do everything we set out - or we said we were going to do? So it proves as well a way of checking our work as it was set out at the start and looking back to make sure that all the bases were covered.

So what I've tried to do in this initial draft - and you'll see it up on the screen here - if it's difficult to see you may use the full screen option or just open a copy of the file on your own desktop. It was circulated earlier - I think late last week and it's also posted on the wiki.

But what I basically tried to do here as a starting point is group together the relevant information first of all about the working group and the basic requirements so there's one place where people can find the information. And - about the effort itself under the project information.

Then the first category here I titled Basic Requirements so basically looking at, you know, what are some of the basic things that need to happen before the working group even can start thinking about the charter questions. So what I've noted there for now is the review of the background documents. Those are all posted on the wiki.

And I know we have quite a few new members joining this working group so really like to encourage everyone to have a look at those materials and make sure you're familiar with those as they will be an important guide to these discussions.

A basic requirement for the working group will be to develop a work plan. It was also suggested on the last call, and I've already tried to capture that here, that as a starting point the working group may need to look at definitions or working definitions of the main terms to make sure everyone's starting from the same page.

Outreach at an early stage to other ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committees is a requirement under the PDP rules as well as requests for GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies for input so those are some of the starting elements there.

And then you'll also see below that the charter questions. So basically what I've done for now is just listed all the charter questions in this chart. And the idea would be that, you know, the group looks at these and maybe checks, you know, are there any groupings that can be done, what are some specific pieces of information that would need to be gathered or collected in order to be able to address these questions.

So what I've done as well in the mind map for each of these sections to actually try to identify possibly some guiding questions that you may use in this conversation.

So for the basic requirements some of the things you may want to think about is, you know, what additional information should be gathered or reviewed at the outset of the process?

You know, should there be any additional information on current practices, for example? And one thing we've noted here and then it's a conversation we'll also have with our colleagues that are supporting the EWG is that the EWG is actually already planning to do a survey on the existing practices of current providers of privacy and proxy services looking at relay, reveal, unmask procedures and conditions applicable to them.

If there are any specific questions the working group thinks would be helpful to include in that survey we could work with our colleagues to make that happen. Or if working group members believe that should be a separate effort or a survey we would conduct, for example, amongst our members here. It's something we will also be able to do.

And, again, this is just a starting point. There may be other questions you think we should be asking when we look at basic requirements.

And then in relation to the charter questions, you know, some of the questions you may want to ask as part of this brainstorm is, you know, what

information is required in order to be able to answer these charter questions? And it may be as a grouping, it may be for separate items. You know, would it be helpful to group certain questions into clusters? Are there certain ones that, you know, obviously belong together or can they be answered separately?

Or is there a certain order in which they need to be answered? Or certain questions do they need to be answered first before you can actually decide a response to the other questions?

One of the suggestions we've put here is, you know, would it be possibly helpful to conduct a survey amongst the working group members on each of these charter questions so we actually would get an idea of where working group members stand and it may also help identify which are those questions where there's actual agreement or a relatively common position on what the response should be and which are maybe those questions where, you know, we're very far apart and obviously those are questions that may need more time or more dedication.

And again it may be the question, you know, which ones do you do first? Do you first go for the easier ones or the more difficult ones? And then of course the question eventually I think once you've gathered some of this information as well is, you know, how does the working group want to tackle these?

Is it something the working group will do as a whole working through all these items? You know, would sub teams - is that a way of dividing up some of the work? But I think that's, you know, probably a question that we'll get to at the end of the brainstorm when it's probably more clear of how people believe, you know, what information needs to be gathered and how these questions can be tackled.

And hopefully from there it will become easier to determine what will be the appropriate next steps or the best steps to take in order to get to the end point in responding to these questions.

So that's a little bit what's behind the mind map. And, you know, the idea would be, you know, as you talk today and maybe the next meeting and the meeting thereafter - I don't know how much time we'll need - I'll try to capture, you know, your comments and your feedback and then I'll try to capture it in the mind map and then, you know, push out updated versions of those.

And of course in between calls, you know, feel free as well to provide any feedback or suggestions on the mailing list as well. And hopefully that can serve as a kind of repository of our thoughts and as said eventually hopefully we'll be able to distill or extract from that a work plan that then the working group can, you know, work from and update over time.

So I think that's in a snapshot what you have in front of you and I'm happy to answer any questions you may have. Just maybe one last note I think Don mentioned the freeware but - or FreeMind, which is I think the one that Mikey uses.

This is actually another one, it's a proprietary one but it does give you nicer color so it's - that's why I've used this one. But I think there's a way as well to export it to the other format if people would like to use it themselves or play around with it.

Don Blumenthal: Thanks, Marika. I was kind of curious where the colors had come from because I didn't remember it from FreeMind. What's the name of this program?

Marika Konings: I think it's MindJet.

Don Blumenthal: Okay.

Marika Konings: It's a nice little icons and colors and it's a - it's a bit for fancy but, you know, you pay for it as well.

Don Blumenthal: Right okay thanks. Are there any thoughts on - I see some things going on in the chat here. Any thoughts to add here?

Michele Neylon: Don, it's Michele. I hope you can hear me?

Don Blumenthal: Yeah, we got you now.

Michele Neylon: Yeah, fine. I had my...

((Crosstalk))

Don Blumenthal: ...queue here but yeah. Oh and you're first go ahead. Sure.

Michele Neylon: Yes that's why I'm speaking. Before I drop off - I have to drop off the call in a second. Just as this made reference to the EWG just to remind other people in the group that both myself and Carlton and Stephanie are on the EWG.

And related to that it's not the actual EWG itself that will be doing any surveys, it's ICANN support staff I think who will be conducting them on behalf of the EWG. So somebody from staff might wish to correct me or strangle me. Thanks.

Don Blumenthal: Any hostile reactions? Okay I guess you're safe, Michele. Thanks for that clarification. I'm just going to add that in addition to the EWG the - well it's not going to be determinative - the Thick Whois PDP group looked at some of the issues that are going to be important in our work so there's a few sources to take a look at as we're going along. Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Don. This is Amr. I was just going to mention I'm not sure if Marika mentioned this or not. And apologize if I'm repeating what she said. But just in terms of one of the things that a mind map at this stage might be useful because there was mention that we might work in sub teams later on so sometimes when we have so many questions we need to answer using a - in a charter for a working group we can take a look at these in the mind map and perhaps see if we can group any of these questions together and get sub teams to start working on them.

It's just a certain approach which mind maps have proven useful in the past and I thought this was worth mentioning right now. Thanks.

Don Blumenthal: Definitely. Appreciate it. Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, thanks. This is Steve. First, thanks to Marika for preparing this and putting some of this in context. I agree that what - that this research that the EWG called for is obviously extremely relevant to our work. And it might be helpful to have - the staff can either just send around how they plan to approach it and what their time table is and so forth or if they can - could present briefly on that in our next meeting that would be very helpful.

I'd just like to comment also on the idea of a survey of participants. I think that could be useful in terms of - not so much in terms of resolving issues but identifying which ones are fairly non controversial among our members and which ones aren't.

But I think there's another survey that would be useful or at least input from some of our members, those members that are registrars and that operate privacy and proxy services can help answer some of these questions about current practices. And of course those that have signed on to the 2013 RAA now have an obligation to post some of this information about their practices and about their policies.

And maybe it would be - just for convenience it would be helpful if the registrars participating in this working group could forward that information to the staff who could then compile it. And that would be at least part of our baseline of what's the status quo and potentially a source for best practices and for - and for standards that we might ultimately recommend.

So I would - I think a survey of all the members on the issues might make sense. But definitely a survey or a questionnaire or a request to the registrar members to provide this information would - could be extremely helpful.
Thank you.

Don Blumenthal: Thanks. Yeah, I think the registrar members of this group are going to find themselves on the spot whether formally or informally more than once as we go along. So why don't we go to a registrar person? James.

James Bladel: Hi, Steve. Thanks. James for the transcript. And just wanted to lend my support for the idea that we start to categorize some of these charter questions. Right now they kind of read like a letter to Santa. They're all over the map and I think that there are some common elements that can be teased out that we can start to group them into categories.

And as far as, you know, registrar disclosing their existing practices, you know, I think that at least in the case of our affiliated privacy service those are publicly available. So I think we probably would be happy to just share some of those materials that are currently, I think, available and of course would, you know, be happy to share what we can to inform the working group going forward.

I just wanted to maybe put another idea out there with regard to the survey. I wonder if it's helpful - the survey or poll or whatever we're going to call it, the questionnaire. I wonder if it's helpful if we have folks work on this in groups? You know, as we've identified there are some basic interests here.

I think I would be curious, for example, to understand the overlap or the divergence between, just as an example, registries and registrars, on how they might respond differently to some of these questions because I'm not entirely clear on that. So anyway just my thoughts on those questions there. And like Michele I have a hard stop at the top of the hour. Thanks.

Don Blumenthal: Thanks. Thanks, James. Yeah, I think we will - one of the first things we'll have to do is start looking at these questions and then, yeah, taking a look at backgrounds and figuring out how to reach out to all different groups to see how they fit in whether for the questionnaire or just more general approach to the work.

We are getting up to about 5 minutes of so I wanted to see if there's any other comments before we get to the last item of the agenda? Okay, well I think we've talked a little bit about what the next steps are at least in the short run, is to look at these, try to do some groupings, try to figure out how we're going to address them in general and then more specifically see if we do want to break into sub groups, see how those might be organized and proceed.

The one thing I notice here is next meeting I know there was some discussion last week about trying to do some alternating. Is that still on the table? Mary?

Mary Wong: Thanks, Don. This is Mary. I think we had considered that maybe that's something that we can do at the start of the New Year given the few meetings at the time last week that were left between now and the end of the year. So we are - staff is working on the premise that at least for the - up to the last meeting in December that it would still be at this time and on a Tuesday but certainly we can look at other options going forward.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. Given that the meeting after next will be Christmas Eve I got a feeling that maybe the next one will be the last one for this year.

Mary Wong: Exactly.

Don Blumenthal: Never mind, Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just to note because we did look - after the last call - at the makeup of the group. I have to note that we had quite a few members joining so of course we haven't factored them in. But based on that I think we found that only two members are currently based in Australia and that's Holly and David Cake. All the other members seem to be (booked) around European, US time zone slot.

So that may be something that the working group wants to, you know, consider as we move into the New Year how, you know, how we can accommodate some of those that are located in different time zones.

And one thing - and, you know, this may be something to discuss with David and Holly whether, for example, just moving it up one hour earlier if that would really help them or whether that doesn't make too much of a difference for them. But maybe it will soften their pain a little bit while it still is, you know, works for others as well.

But maybe again it's something to consider as we move into the New Year. And maybe David and Holly have some suggestions on how we can make that work it would be helpful I think as well, you know, so it's not too painful for them all the time.

Don Blumenthal: Right, appreciate it. Well I see David's on the call. We're right at the end but if you could let us know we'd really, really appreciate it. Holly maybe too but my list doesn't scroll down that far. Oh yes, there she is.

Holly Raiche: Yes.

Don Blumenthal: In any event okay we're wrapping up at - right about 11:00 here. I generally will try to do hard stops. I think right now it makes sense just because I need to get myself a little bit up to speed. Thinking about being in the spot and actually getting it kind of changes perspectives a little bit.

So why don't we just figure we will meet next week, same time. And in the mean time we'll talk to Marika and Mary and get Steve and Graeme and me on the phone and figure out how we're going to go forward.

Maria Farrell: Thanks, Don.

Marika Konings: Thanks, everyone.

((Crosstalk))

Mary Wong: Thanks, Maria. Thanks, Don. Thanks, everyone.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Thanks Maria and Don.

Don Blumenthal: Thank you.

END