

**ICANN Transcription**  
**EPDP on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data**  
**Tuesday 16 October 2018 at 1300 UTC**

Note: 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:

<https://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-epdp-gtld-registration-data-specs-16oct18-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p9ndqxxixvt/>

Attendance is on the wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/LwWrBQ>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:  
<https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Coordinator:       Recoding has started.

Terri Agnew:       Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. And welcome to the 20th GNSO EPDP Meeting taking place on the 16th of October, 2018 at 13:00 UTC. In the interest of time there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect Room. If you are only on the telephone bridge could you please let yourself be known now.

Chris Lewis-Evans:   Hi there. It's Chris Lewis-Evans here. I'm on the (Audio Bridge) for just 10-15 minutes (unintelligible).

Terri Agnew:       Thank you (Chris).

((Crosstalk))

Seun Ojedeji: This is (unintelligible) I'm on the (Audio) bridge but I'm trying to connect to the Adobe Connect as well.

Terri Agnew: Thank you Seun.

Thomas Rickert: And this is Thomas Rickert, I'm on the audio for just a couple minutes only and then I'll turn the Adobe on.

Terri Agnew: Thank you Thomas.

Kristina Rosette: Hi (there), it's Kristina. I'm having difficulties getting into Adobe but I'm hoping to get in soon.

Terri Agnew: Thank you Kristina. Hearing no one further. We have list of apologies from Alan Greenberg (unintelligible) of GAC and James Bladel of RRSB. They have formally assigned Seun Ojedeji, Christopher Lewis-Evans and Volker Greimann as their alternates for this call and any remaining days of absence. During this period the members will have read only rights and no access to conference calls. Their alternates will have (coaching) rights and access to conference calls until the members (return).

As a reminder the Alternate Assignment form must be formalized by the way of the Google Assignment forms. The link is available on the agenda pod to your right and also in the email invitation. Statements and (unintelligible) interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. We are hearing no one. If you need any assistance updating your statements of interest email the GNSO Secretary.

All documentation and information can be found on the EPDP wiki space. There's an audio casting view only Adobe Connect for non-members to follow the call so please remember to state your name before speaking. Recordings

will be circulated on the mailing list and posted on the public wiki shortly after the call. Thank you, I now turn it back over to our Chair Kurt Pritz. Please begin.

Kurt Pritz: Thanks Terri. Hi, everyone. So, I always wondered why things were more civilized in Europe and I found out because where I live these calls are 6:00 am and when I'm in Australia they're at 11:00 pm. But here they are 3:00 pm so very civilized. I don't know why that is.

So, if you look at today's agenda we'll have some brief statements of status of the small teamwork and the Data Elements work workbooks and any discussion about standing action items. Then we thought, you know, with everybody, you know, I'm watching the email list and everybody is shuffling seriously away doing stuff. And so, that works carrying on pretty nicely over email.

And you know, could use some course corrections but I think that can be done over email so we thought you know, in a sense we'll take it kind of easy today and review our planning for the face-to-face meeting on Saturday in Barcelona and then for the High Interest Topics session on Monday in the Barcelona meeting and we're still going to need some volunteers for that. I tried to just name people but it was talked down from that tree. So, we'll need some volunteers. So, that's the agenda and we hope to get everybody out a little early and so you can pack and do the things you need to on the road - to get on the road.

So, first with status of the small teams and the status of the Data Elements workbook, maybe Marika could you talk to that for a few minutes?

Marika Konings: Sure. Thank you, Kurt. This is Marika. So, I think as you all know we had a couple of small teams in which several of you worked pretty hard at addressing some of the charter questions that are not addressed through the Data Elements workbooks. So, those small teams had a number of meetings

and, you know, worked through the issues. And in some cases, have come up with some preliminary recommendations that will be shared with the full team prior to - hopefully everyone's starting to travel to Barcelona. Not all of the teams managed to reach agreement or come to agreement on preliminary recommendations but never the less we think it's still helpful to report on the status and where they got to so that can hopefully serve as a starting point for further discussion on those topics in Barcelona.

So, what staff has prepared is a kind of summary note that captures the status and where the different teams had got to for all these three topics and just to recap, you know, one of them dealt with the natural versus legal person. The other one dealt with the geographic application of the (unintelligible) specification. And then a third group dealt with the charter question that relates to the reasonable access question. And so, we'll have a summary note that we'll include in the package of material that we're putting together on the Google Drive and all of you should have received an alert in that regard.

And if you're having any issues accessing the Google Drive, you know, please let us know and we can also email you all the documents if that is easier. So, again hopefully that'll provide a good starting point to continue on those conversations and the full setting in Barcelona.

And then similarly for the Data Element workbooks. Several of you were assigned as leads for those and, you know, (unintelligible) report that we've already received several - some of those have been sent to the list, some of those staff is still working on. Berry will talk a bit more under Item 3 on a new form that we're putting together that tries to bring together a number of different aspects that we're working on.

So, again that by the end of today we'll have most of the Data Element workbooks converted to this new form and post for you in the Google Drive. For those where we may not get to it because there some of the staff

members also starting their travel we'll just post a later version but you know, hopefully have that converted before everyone gets to Barcelona. But again, good information in there. It should be the same it's just a way of presenting it in a more compact manner. But again, Berry will share that with you in a second.

So, I think that's where we're currently are at. So, hopefully we'll have all that information together for you by the end of today in the Google Drive. And again, it's really important that everyone reviews that information because it will form the bases of further discussions in Barcelona.

Kurt Pritz: Thanks Marika. Again, I want to note that some great headway was made in Purpose A in the wording of that Purpose. I think it's come together so that's great. Wording for Purpose B, some of us offered some suggestions to Benedicto and others were leading that. So, I see Benedicto's not on the call but we hope to get some working on Purpose B which you know, I think are the two key Purposes. But we see work going on in other places too. So, I appreciate that.

So, are there any comments on that before we get into the agenda for the face-to-face meeting in Barcelona? Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, good evening Japan time. For those people who may have not have access to Google Document, is it possible as I mentioned I maybe been clearly understood that there would be available on the standard email (invested) information because for reasons I'm traveling tomorrow morning very early morning and so on so forth. I might have access to the Internet about (unintelligible) not to the Google Drive and so on so forth.

And second, I'm sorry I apologies, do we have any meeting on Thursday?  
Thank you.

Kurt Pritz: There's no meeting the day after tomorrow, Thursday October 18. And I'm sure we can arrange to have the document mailed to you. The purpose of putting it in Google Docs though is that'll change over time. So, let me think about how to keep you updated when there's updated ways to do that. Go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: I have another question that I raised to Marika. She referred to me to the GNSO Report to the ICANN CC3. I said that, do we have any progress report from the team that (unintelligible) progress reports on the team because at the beginning of the meeting you had to put something sometimes or time to time but I understood that there is nothing available. The only thing we have to go to the GNSO documentation and find some very preliminary and very general progress report. I thought that we might have some progress report, what they have achieved now, where we are now at this (unintelligible) but for those people who come to the ICANN meeting may not be part of the team. Could you kindly clarify whether there is such a progress report or if not, why not? Thank you.

Kurt Pritz: Yes, I'll start and then have others correct me, Kavouss. So, I'll call Marika in a second. So, certainly we prepare weekly reports to the GNSO -- which I personally think is too often -- by Rafik and the support team does the line share of the work there. So, if you want more detail on that, you can have it and we can send you links to those. And we are also preparing sort of what's not done. So, that will identify, you know, the charter questions now remain unanswered as a way of our status. So, you know, and I think we can convert that to what is done and what's not done. So, Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, thanks Kurt and thanks Kavouss. I actually responded to your question in the context of in other efforts, I think you are asking about and you're absolutely right. The GNSO policy briefings give a general update on a number of topics. It also has an entry for the EPDP but obviously there this is a very fast-moving initiative and as such, you know, it doesn't have the latest information but you know, at Kurt said, the weekly updates exactly has

served that purpose and I believe there also posted on the Wiki and people can subscribe to those updates as well. I think they are sent in a form of a weekly newsletter. So, hopefully that will serve the purpose that you're looking for.

Kurt Pritz: And when do you think that will be available Marika?

Marika Konings: Thanks Kurt. This is Marika. I think as Rafik just posted in the Chat that the latest version will go out in the next couple of hours.

Kurt Pritz: Oh, okay. Thanks Rafik. So, the reason - I had a sneaky reason for asking that. So, Kavouss when you see that, if you think there should be enhancements to it or we can tell our story in a better way, I'd appreciate your comments because we want to tell the story as accurately and as clearly as we can so I'd appreciate any input you have. So, thanks for your interest in that. Kavouss, go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I will be in position to reply you tomorrow night (unintelligible) what time. Thank you. Not before.

Kurt Pritz: Terrific. Thank you so much. The next item of the agenda is planning for the (unintelligible) to (Tate's) meeting at ICANN 63 and I know we have 1, 2, 3 and A and B there to show you but we essentially have two things we want to show you. One, is that Berry's done a lot of work updating the worksheets so you know, we started with a very large matrix to determine all the Data Elements and then developed a worksheet to sort of simplify and direct the work and now with (unintelligible) many different processing steps.

We've had to augment that worksheet a little bit to include the information necessary to include all that of processing purposes. You know, is Stephanie on the call? I just want to point out that, you know, not too many days ago Stephanie, it dawns on me that we're the ones doing the DPIA and we're

doing the data processing maps. So, that's what this has evolved into. So, I think because that work wasn't done in the past this is what we're doing now.

But I saw Margie -- before we get into that -- Margie asked about calendar invites for all EDPD events in Barcelona. So, I'll ask Terri to make sure those go out. We have our face-to-face meeting scheduled on Saturday. We also have three other sessions where the agenda is not completely set yet. And that will depend quite a bit on where we get to Saturday. We might use the other sessions for small groups or you know, I really want to try to treat the rest of the meeting schedule to the extent we can as a blank canvas.

So, we have a big meeting room on three different slots during the rest of the week but we can find other workspaces so you know, as we identify tasks that need to be done, I think we can be creative in how we use the meeting time. But at least we had the schedule out Sunday - ICANN Schedule. But, help people out that don't want to download that app. I don't like to download that app. And make sure everybody has a calendar invite for those things even if it's generic.

All right, so there I was talking about new versions of worksheet and we also have an agenda for the Saturday meeting out on - which when do we want to go through first you guys? You guys meaning (Kaitlyn), Marika, Berry, Gina. We're going to go through...

Woman: There you go, let's get through the Data Elements.

Berry Cobb: Hi everybody. This is Berry Cobb for the record. For the few of you that are not in the Adobe Connect Room, I did send the two PDFs that I'll review through to the list so for easy access. So, as Kurt mentioned, you know, our analysis for understanding the purposes and the data elements behind those began right before we started in LA. You'll recall that we created a document that was basically a purpose by (actor) document which was essentially exported from the purposes or processing activities as identified in the

temporarily specification. And then we also had a modified form of the Data Elements workbook that was created by Farzaneh and Thomas.

You'll note that at the beginning of the meeting we had converted or consolidated that spreadsheet workbook into our Word Doc version of the workbooks. So, in that process, you know, we began to identify the legal bases against the process for each Purpose and we also started to identify those Data Elements that are required for that Purpose. But what we began to realize is that we weren't drilling down far enough. And so, towards the end of the Los Angeles meeting, you recall that there was a small team formed on early morning Wednesday to review through the (lawful) bases for each one of the Purpose's that we had identified.

And in drilling down they recognized that there were, you know, processing activities under this Purpose and that the lawful bases actually need to also apply to those processing activities. But ultimately what we understood is that we weren't getting granular enough. And so, in the past week as we're starting to flush out each of the workbooks, you know, we're identifying additional processing activities that occur and ultimately, we came to the realization that the old workbook version wasn't scalable. So, before I give you a quick preview to the new version I just wanted to talk about the process or the framework by which, you know, we're doing our work here. I think as Kurt mentioned in some respects we're kind of doing the DPIA work as we identify the possible policy recommendations.

So, first and foremost, you know, obviously we need to define the ICANN Purpose. There is some principle that hopefully we're working towards in finalizing these but noting that they need to be clear, specific, where possible we need to try to not be broad in defining that Purpose Statement. That Purpose Statement should be defined in a way that has an easy connection to the processing activities and the subsequent Data Elements. And of course, we also need to provide, you know, some rational connection to the mission and bylaws or contractual arrangements and understand if there

are any picket fence considerations as it relates to consensus policies. And then we're going to drill down to the next tier which is really identifying the processing activities for each of the ICANN Purposes.

I think in general what we're going to be reviewing through is at a minimum there are four processing activities that need to be considered for each Purpose. The first dealing with collection. The second dealing with transmission or transfer of the data. Third, which deals with the disclosure or the publication. In some cases, the publication of that data. And then we also need to talk about how long that data is being retained. For each one of the Purposes that we're working with now we need to, you know, there could be additional processing activities.

For example, there could be two or three processing activities that deal with the transmission or the transfer of that data. Or perhaps there could be one or two disclosure processing activity. And this is further delineated when we start assigning the lawful bases against each one of these processing activities. In some cases, the same processing activity may have two different types of lawful bases but that's directly connected to the responsible party in the (role). So, at any rate, for each processing activity work, we're also identifying this responsible party in the (role) whether it's the ICANN Registry or Registrar and also assigning whether they're a Controller, Joint Controller or Processor and of course we always had the Data Subject at the beginning of all of this process.

And then, as mentioned we're defining a lawful basis either 61B, 61F or 61A. And then defining rational that supports why that particular lawful bases applies to that particular processing activity. And then of course we're drilling down even further and we get into the inventory of the Data Elements -- which again you saw the original prototype from the spreadsheet from Thomas and Farzaneh.

And then the secondary in our older version of the workbook which basically was an extract or a (unintelligible) field matrix, identifying which fields would be required to be collected to achieve the Purpose, which fields could be optional, what fields weren't required and eventually we'll get into publication and redaction. With that ultimate goal that can do is export this data field inventory into a consolidated work product that will eventually allow us to better understand what fields do require collection and where.

In addition to that -- and I'm channeling Stephanie's request as Kurt had mentioned earlier -- you know, that we were lacking a data process flow mapping. And so, this next version tries to at least take a conceptual form of that which I will pull up into the Adobe Connect Room now. For this example, we're utilizing Purpose E which is escrow for Registrar's. What you're viewing - and I'm un-syncing the document for people to scroll through in the Adobe Connect Room. This particular Purpose is probably one of the most mature and so it seems the easiest to convert into this new form.

You'll see several similarities from our previous version but it is reorganized first by trying to assign the questions that we're asking about the rational as it related to the ICANN Purpose being defined. It still has its kind of a chain of custody as to where this particular Purpose originated from such as our Purpose's by (actor) document and the particular provision in the temporary specification but you'll recall from our older version we had two primary columns. The first was the Data Element over on the left and then on the right we had a series of questions. But they weren't necessarily organized in a way that connected a certain question with a Purpose versus one of those questions actually trying to tease out the processing activity. And so, this is where the reorganization is drawn from.

So, Page 1 that you see here in the Adobe Connect Room, the rational questions are still very much the same. You know, is the Purpose based on an ICANN contract or is it tested against GDPR and other laws. And (ED's) will have a specific response in support of that question. You know, the

question in terms of is this (involvement) with ICANN bylaws and where possible we should be documenting or drawing a connection to the reference in the mission and bylaws to help further support the rationale? And then lastly are there any picket fence considerations as it relates back to this Purpose?

Moving on to Page 2 is the lawfulness of processing test and as I mentioned earlier what we are realizing is that there are several processing activities under each Purpose and unfortunately the previous version really just allowed for questions and responses to those questions but it didn't allow for expansion of the workbook to also identify if there are other element fields that may or may not apply from collection versus transmission and (light). So, we felt it was important to be able to accurately document what is being discussed and decided on here.

Ultimately the structure's still pretty much the same as I mentioned. We're defining the processing activity on the first column. We're assigning a code to those. So, for example, this Purpose E for Registrar escrow, the collection of the registration data needed for escrow is assigned to code E-PA1 or Echo Papa Alpha 1. So, you hear me clearly. And each processing activity will have this code that you'll see the connection down below.

As mentioned, we're also further delineating the responsible party and the role that they're playing. And then over onto the right we're assigning the lawful bases and need to clearly document the rationale for why that particular lawful bases is being chosen. I won't go through each one of these in detail but you will notice that this one does cover the four primary processing activities that we should consider for each process. Again, collection, transmission, disclosure and the fourth being the retention of that particular data.

Now, moving onto the third section, just one or two more minutes and then I can open it up for questions and turn it back over to Kurt. Is beginning with what is being termed as the Data Element's Map. So, again, as Stephanie

has been asking in terms of understanding the data flow, this is the first attempt of trying to accommodate that request. This is probably more conceptual in nature than a detailed data flow map as some have seen some other examples that truly get down into the type of document that's being transferred from part of your system and the role that's being played.

But the intent here is to first provide this conceptual image of how this data is interacting across the different parties and the roles that they play and if need be, we can also get down into more granular detail once we've finalized the matrix. But each one of these data element maps are specific to that particular purpose. So you'll see how this will change from one purpose to the next.

Finally is just the data elements matrix, which should be very similar. Our previous version started off with really just one column, which was all about the collection. But since, we've also assigned an additional column for each type of processing activity that is being identified. Again, collection transmission disclosure retention as you move from left to right.

For this particular right, for the escrow of registrar data, it seems like all of the fields should be similar and I'll just point that this is still very much a draft. None of it is set in stone. So the completion of some of these fields for transmission disclosure and retention are a staff starter suggestion. But as we go to refine and mature these workbooks, we'll want to confirm that these data elements do traverse that particular path.

But you'll see again that all the data elements are the same across the four different processing types. So that's basically a quick walkthrough of what you'll see on this new version. Hopefully, first, it's easier to read. Secondly, it's organized in a more cohesive fashion and again, hopefully, it connects back to the previous slide that I had demonstrated, which we're really starting at a higher level, and we're drilling our way down until we've

confirmed the actual data elements that we support the processing activity that supports the overall ICANN purpose.

And I'll note that this an iterative process, just like a drilling rig. Once they assign or once they attach the first bit to begin drilling, often it's not just a straight shot down to where the oil is at. It requires several drill bits to get to an area. Sometimes they might hit an air pocket or something that causes them to correct or change direction to find that oil reserve. We're basically doing the same thing here. As we better understand the processing activities, we should be questioning ourselves, does this processing activity actually fit to this purpose. If it doesn't, is there another purpose that should be defined or should it be assigned to a different purpose that we've already identified.

So it's very much an iterative process and I hope you like the new version. And as Marika said, we're in the process of converting the old ones into the new ones. When you receive the package, there will basically be two files for each purpose. One will be the word document, which shows the red line or the track changes. I'm trying to be meticulous at carrying over information or content from the old version into this new version and I'm trying to maintain the chain of custody as best as possible as to who offered what change and the like.

I'm also tagging certain elements that are staff suggestions to that you understand that it didn't just come out of everywhere. And then the secondary attachment will be a PDF that is just a clean version to help with the reading. So with that, I will turn it back to Kurt. Thank you.

Kurt Pritz: So this is just great work. I think that from my early days when I thought we would just be reviewing the temp spec and getting on with things. I think our work is going to have to stand up to scrutiny and the extent to which we're going here where we do these - even though they're rough, they're well thought out data processing maps and the rationale and the legal basis, and

putting that all together. I think that is what's going to make our work defensible, not only to our community but to the DPAs that review it.

So I think it's an important step and some people have made some comments in the chat room that I hope they bring up here in discussion, because some of them are important. Kavouss, you're first.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, thank you very much for the comprehensive and very detailed, and by the way, useful explanation but I have some comments to make. The first is referred to ICANN purpose. I don't know whether you refer to ICANN community, ICANN, the organization, ICANN, the Board, or ICANN in general, which is a collectiveness of all of them. Having said that, I don't know whether there is interaction between the ICANN Board and all of these things, or whether the two representative from the Board to board member plus the ICANN liaison, they would comment whenever we talk about the purpose of our ICANN, whether there is something that we need to take into account. First comment.

Second comment. I understand that we give these authorities ourselves to interpret the bylaws saying that, yes, this is bylaw correct or not correct. The purpose is in accordance with the bylaw or violation of bylaw. I don't know whether we have such authority, GNSO has such authority among the other SO and AC to come to some sort of interpretations of the ICANN bylaw thing that if this is in violation or not in violation. This is very important to note.

The second one is yes, I understand collection, transmission, disclosure, and retention. With respect to the retention, I don't understand why we're discussing these issues so (unintelligible). What is the problem of retention by six months, or one year, or two years, or five years. The data situation, data management, if they allow you to maintain the data as long as you want. What is the problem that we're discussing it for weeks and so on, so forth. What is the difficulty about that.

And the last but not least is I think we are going in too much detail. We're taking an academic and research analysis of everything. Do we need this sort of degree of details. So much details, is it manageable at the end, or sometimes we may turning around ourselves and come back to the same point that we were. So we should be really (thoughtful), really mindful not to go to the degree of detail that is not necessary.

I don't think that we have ample time of two or three years, or six years for this EPDP. We have little time and but not one year, whether less, much less than that, and we should avoid to go such detailed degree of the things and making such a university tied research academic tied research and so on, so forth. Some people may be eager to do that. Some people may be more qualified to do that but I don't think that it is outside the patience, and the time, and availability, and management of the issue. I request you kindly to see this, reconsider this matter, and control of the team, and not leave it that going too much detail, too much academic, and too much research.

I am really worried, I'm concerned, I raise this issue in the GAC meeting, and if we have any meeting with the GNSO, I raise this issue formally and ask them why we need to go through such degree of details. Whom we make the work difficult or whom we make the work more simple. We have to find a tradeoff between too much detail and so much simplicity. Complexity and simplicity, a trade off. But not going too much detail, not too much simple. Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Kavouss. This is Berry Cobb. I'll do my best to try to answer your four questions and I definitely will lean on Kurt or Marika if I misstate anything or needs clarification. The first to ask about ICANN purpose or ICANN Org purpose. Staff understanding in terms of making our deliberations focused on ICANN purposes is really from the ICANN community by which we develop consensus policies that eventually find their way into agreement that ICANN can enforce against contracted parties.

So in a sense, we're not using ICANN Org specifically, because as I believe Stephanie or somebody pointed out in the chat, ICANN Org itself will define their own purposes and terms of compliance with GDPR for the systems they manage, and all of the other types of data that might be collected for ICANN Org operations.

Whereas here, within this expedited policy development process, we're in the context of the ICANN community because we're here defining consensus policies that are eventually implemented. And as I've mentioned, down the road, potentially enforceable from ICANN Org to contracted parties, very much like the temporary specification that is in place today.

To your second question about the bylaws and do we have GNSO authority or not, or does the GNSO have the authority. I don't think I can answer that question directly. The intent of the question and answer within the workbook is just to provide rationale to point - that will point to the mission and bylaws to provide support behind it and I don't think I'm in a position to really dive any deeper and that's probably above my pay grade when it comes to that type of question.

Your third about understanding processing activities, you specifically touched upon retention. I think in general, and certainly Stephanie or Milton can maybe back me up, the reason why we're discussing retention is because it falls in line with the principle of data minimization and privacy by design. And so it's forcing this group to ask questions why exactly does certain data need to be retained and why does it need to be retained for how long.

Staff has no position or answers to that particular question but that is why - one of the reasons why we're being very precise and detailed as it relates to retention as well as the other processing activities.

Lastly, too much detail or that this is being an academic exercise. I think that it's important that we - that this group does make this very detailed because

we need to thoroughly document the support and rationale behind the consensus policies that we're eventually creating here because that will help provide a foundation for how ICANN Org and ICANN community are ever -f if there's ever a case where we're confronted with a particular GDPR type violation, we have to thoroughly document the process by which we show that a particular processing activity had a particular lawful basis and the rationale supporting it.

So I'll stop there and turn it over to Kurt to manage the queue from this point.

Kurt Pritz: Thank you very much, Berry, for that and I noticed there was some comments in the queue about which ICANN are we talking about. And Alan had something to say, and Emily too. So Emily, were you going to answer that specific question or can I ask you or Alan, or someone, to give your viewpoint on that?

Emily Taylor: Yes, thank you, Kurt. I'm really conscious that we're now 41 minutes into the call and we're still very much on the introductory agenda item. So I was actually planning to raise that in the conversation. So first of all, I'd just like to say thank you to you and the staff for all your work in systemizing and improving the presentation, the work done so far. It's really - it's greatly appreciated.

I did - so I'm hesitant to kind of really churn out this comment but I think that the point that was being raised in the typed chat is - my point of view is that ICANN Org is not just a passive player in this process. It is, first of all, the other party to the contracted - to the sort of domain name industry contract. So it is the contracted party with the registries and registrars. But particularly, admission and bylaws require it to take on a public purpose and that's really where one gets the justification for, for example, what would have been publication on the old WHOIS for the purposes of law enforcement or those enforcing private law rights such as intellectual property.

And so in my view, it is an actor in its own right and it should be noted in these documents. And that leads onto the thing - and apologies that I haven't really had time to take on all the detail of the document that was just being presented. But I couldn't see a specific item for identifying control and process. And maybe it's there and I just missed it but we do seem to be much more (unintelligible) situations. The documents much more going through what many of us would be familiar with as this sort of data protection impact assessment.

I do have opinions on data retention laws and also on detail versus principle but take more time than necessary at this stage and hope we can readdress the next item on the agenda. But happy to clarify anything.

Kurt Pritz: Thanks very much, Emily, and I'll just add, Kavouss, that I had some of the same comments as you with regard to the amount of detail and moving forward on certain items. But at the end of the day when these documents are done, and remember, we're - I'm just checking, I think there's five but we've added a couple. So there's maybe up to seven purposes. When these seven short documents are done then we're kind of done because it answers all the questions - essentially all the questions we need to answer. So it's a good way to inventory what has to be done and then check the box when it doesn't.

And I agree with Emily that we're kind of far down the path. So unless there's some specific questions for Berry, I know he's trying to get the rest of these done in time to get on a plane. So I appreciate that work. I'm just looking at the chat. So do we want to put up the agenda for the meeting on Saturday?

Gina Bartlett: Hi, this is Gina Bartlett Yes, I think that would be great.

Kurt Pritz: So when talking about the agenda, I'm going to turn this over to Gina in a second, we made many, many versions of this despite how simple it looks.

And at the end of the day, we thought given where we are and the work that needs to be done, it would be best to focus on the key purposes that we've outlined and we think those are Purpose B, which is providing access to third parties, and Purpose A, which is the registration of the name itself.

And so want to - we know we have some work to do on Purpose B and on Purpose B we're very close, so we're going to get that done, done, done. So we think that - I think that and we sort of agreed that breaking the back on these - well, finishing these two things would essentially break the back on a lot of our other work. So that's what we chose to - on which we chose to focus.

So with that, Gina, unless I introduced the agenda in a way you didn't see fit, could you take over?

Gina Bartlett: Sure. Hello, everyone. This is Gina Bartlett from CDI and so on the agenda, as Marika and Berry have outlined, we're going to put together a packet and we really are encouraging everyone to take bit of a step back and review all the material over, to think through it. And then our goal for this meeting is really to continue driving toward the initial report. And so what Kurt alluded to, we did make some strategic choices. So this is for the Saturday face-to-face.

So we would come together and give a little bit of time for sort of the step back, high level check in, on all the work that you've been doing related to the purposes, the data elements, processing, and legal basis. And then we prioritized Purpose B for the morning and we're envisioning having an initial discussion with the full group, if needed, giving you time to meet and caucus within your stakeholder group to think about how to bridge these issues and craft some recommendations that will work for the whole team, and then come back into the full group and keep building upon that.

At a certain point, though, we will check in and try to wrap up Purpose B. At that point, we will - and this will need to occur throughout our face-to-face times together at ICANN 63 -- we will document where you have preliminary recommendations or agreements but then we will also name the different viewpoints for documentation and initial report and then move on.

So then after lunch, we are thinking that we might do some more small group working sessions with the Purpose A and Purpose B and if there's other priority purposes that folks feel like it would be beneficial to have some small group conversations to refine some of the issues. But then we'll bring those back into the large group and we'll start with Purpose A and the goal there will once again be to try to develop the answer to the charter questions, policy recommendations. And where we are unable to do so, we will document the differing viewpoints, but we're hopeful that we will be able to have the recommendations and the answer to the charter questions for the initial report. We'll take a break and then this is, I think, Kurt alluded to the blank canvas.

We will, depending on how the day has gone and what else seems to be a priority for all of you, we will then focus in on the next purpose and just keep iterating through your work together.

Lastly, you do have these other sessions, and I know we're going to go to the high interest topic session planning after we review this face-to-face agenda. But we will just check in on the approach to the subsequent sessions and make sure that we have a sense of where the group wants to head, so as staff we can prepare for those and make sure that we have whatever you need ready for you.

So with that, I'll pause and we're hoping - we would love to hear if this works for folks, if this is good starting place, and of course, we can be somewhat flexible in the meeting to follow the currents as necessary to continue to advance your work to developing the initial report.

Kurt Pritz: Marc, go ahead.

Marc Anderson: This is Marc. Thanks, Kurt and Gina for doing the overview here. You noted at the beginning that our focus of the face-to-face meeting will be driving towards our initial report. Obviously, November 5 is coming up very quickly. Just a suggestion or thought to focus our efforts on that goal. It might be useful at the start of the day, early in the agenda, to review the document that staff has been putting together. I know earlier in October, staff put together a template and they have since been adding content to that.

So I think it would be really useful and a good use of people's time to get an overview of what's in there currently, where the content came from, and where the gaps are, where we need to focus our time, especially during this face-to-face meeting in filling out those gaps. So just a thought/suggestion on there.

Kurt Pritz: We talked about that too as far as making that part of the agenda and I'm not against that. I really want to finish Purposes B and A. So I would ask let's talk that amongst ourselves. We'll talk about that and try to work that in the agenda with the agreement that everybody will have read it so it's not like a de novo review. But either send some comments or bring some comments to the meeting.

So let's - we'll go through the agenda ourselves as a test and see how efficiently we could do that. I think that's a good suggestion. Margie?

Margie Milam: Hi, this is Margie. I had made some suggestions on the list and I just wanted to flag them. One was to invite the CTO from ICANN to talk about how ICANN uses the data (unintelligible) response we have received from staff wasn't sufficient (unintelligible) I think that's (unintelligible) the purposes, especially the one, I think it was Purpose A, or maybe it's B. But having the

CTO there could help answer some questions. So that was a request for Barcelona.

I also wanted to understand what the expectation was to address other issues, such as the ones that we parked in Los Angeles. I don't know that we've fully created subteams for them yet or a timeline for addressing it. So I just wanted to understand if that was part of Barcelona. And then the third ask I had was as we start talking about legal and natural person, which it looks like we're going to talk about it in Barcelona, I'd like to invite someone from Center to walk through the reports that they published and was shared by Georgios on the list because I think that there's a lot of insight there that would help. So those are my three requests.

Kurt Pritz: I think that we talk about having people from ICANN come into (unintelligible) got talked down from the tree. But I'm for that but maybe not for that at this meeting. So let's try to do that at some point during the ICANN meeting. So people wanting to hear from the CTO as far as ICANN uses of data. I don't know if that would be in a small group setting or the plenary, but let's figure out a way to do that. And then for me, the same thing for that input from the CT TLDs and how they're handling it. I thought that report was instructive too and I think there's some good discussion on the list.

So let's think about how we can create sessions maybe within our slots or outside our slots to get input from those third parties. But I want to spend this first face-to-face meeting trying to address the key issues for us. And Margie, I already forgot your second thing. I remember your first one and your last one.

Margie Milam: Okay. The second one related to the issues that were parked. I don't know if we've addressed them all yet or have a schedule for it. So I just want to make sure that they get it (unintelligible) part of the work plan.

Gina Bartlett: The parking lot.

Kurt Pritz: Right. Go ahead, Gina, do you have an answer?

Gina Bartlett: The parking lot from LA.

Kurt Pritz: Yeah. Yeah, so I think you know maybe we don't wait for Los Angeles, maybe we take the next few days and talk about what the best use of these additional sessions are, and put, slot those issues in for them. And we'll be sure to also contact the ICANN CTO and maybe get, who was it from Peter Van Roste? Maybe, and lift the participation in one of them.

Okay, thanks Margie, got it. Thomas? Go ahead, Thomas.

Terri Agnew: And this is Terri. Thomas, I don't see where you have your mic activated, but I do show where you joined on the telephone. If you could please check your mute on your telephone?

Thomas Rickert: Can you hear me now?

Terri Agnew: Yes, we sure can.

Thomas Rickert: So it seems to me an issue with my headset, so I've switched that up now. So quick response, a quick reaction to two points that Margie made. On the first one, I'm not sure whether that's the best use of our time to get another oral report from ICANN org, about their processing of data. So we've asked in writing, there are actually a couple more questions that we could discuss on the list about the status of certain documents that are required, such as the record of processing activity and others.

So rather than an oral report, I would much more like to get an update on what the status of those documents is and whether we can see even draft versions of these documents, and it's not when ICANN is planning to produce

those, because records of processing activities amongst other side documents that I could just leave to have it placed to be compliant.

And on the second point, the sentiment was there has been some exchange of the e-mail lists already, and I think it's worth noting on the record again that this report is to be handled with care because it is done for the CCTID world, which is not directly to be translated to the GTLD world, and also you see many of those players still being in an evolutionary process of their dealing with GDPR.

I see CCTLDs that went to two or three different versions of their approach to GDPR over time. So this is likely not the final result of how CCTLDs are going to handle this topic. So I think you know while certain aspects of the report seem to be attractive to certain parts of the community, I think it's just not appropriate to take that as a blueprint to be translated to the GTLD world. So I would really caution to use that report as a justification for a certain aspect of what we're doing.

I've been in the room when this was presented at the European coalition at the high-level meeting on Internet governance, and also later that it was presented to Center, and just to give the example of the validation point, this caused direct reaction from Center members in the room. So, you know, I think we would be best advised just to read it, adjust it, and then those who've read it can then inject their thoughts into our process, but I'm not sure whether it's worthwhile actually trying to take this as a basis for (unintelligible).

Kurt Pritz: Thanks very much, Thomas. Kristina?

Kristina Rosette: Well, my mention is going to be much shorter because I was going to make many of the same points that Thomas just made. So I will fully endorse those. I would just suggest/recommend that as a general practice going forward, that we try and avoid inviting people to come in and just speak to us and walk

us through documents, that if we have very specific questions that we would like answered, I think it would be a more productive use of our time to create those questions, send them off to the person, get the response, and then set up time to talk with them about any follow-up questions that we may have.

I think at this point we all really need to be focused on efficiency and effectiveness, thanks.

Kurt Pritz: Thank you, Milton?

Milton Mueller: Hello, everybody, this is Milton Mueller, Georgia Tech, Internet Governance Project. Again, much of what I was going to say about the reports has been said by Thomas and Kristina, so I won't duplicate that. I will notice, however, that there's a GOTLD regarding their approach to the GDPR, which also has interesting results.

In both of these cases, just read the study. I mean, the CCTLD one is very short and not hard to grasp, it's just a survey. So we certainly don't need to waste time having somebody present it to us.

That in fact leads to my initial impetus for this question which is, I thought that we were trying to go into Barcelona with a draft report and so I was very surprised, I mean I understood that when (Barry) presented the way the staff has systematized the results that we've gotten from our meetings so far, I thought that's very good.

We can now use this and prepare a draft report, but I'm not hearing anything in our discussion of Barcelona about having a report circulated at that time, nor am I hearing anything about developing that report in Barcelona.

Now maybe I'm missing things, there's a lot of information flying around. Do we plan to go into or come out of Barcelona with a draft report?

Kurt Pritz: Thanks, Milton. I'll comment that there is that draft report that staff circulated around some time ago, and one of the first comments was that we should review it, make time during the meeting, I think (Mark) suggested we review it and make time during the meeting for doing that. So I recommend that everybody read that report.

To me, there's certain prerequisites that must be addressed before we're close to ready or ready to launch a report, and then I have a vision for how complete you know our work has to be before an initial report is launched.

So we will review the draft report such as it is, but I certainly see you know this purpose, Purpose A still needs work, Purpose B still needs a lot of work, some of the small teams where consensus was originally built, like consensus seems to have diverged, so there's additional work to be done there.

So the answer to you know how close we are to having a report going into Barcelona is, you know, I don't know, but we can certainly review what is there and do a gap analysis as to what's not there. Thomas? Is that an old hand, Margie?

Margie Milam: Sure, I think there were some questions in the chat about the purpose for some of these requests. I think it's a good idea to have the discussion with the CTO separately, it's that, you know takes away time for the planned day.

I mean, that way those that are interested in the topic can attend, but the reason why Marika had asked, you know, what we were looking for, we were looking to understand how, who was data factored into the way that ICANN reacted to some of the big malware attacks, Conficker and Avalanche. Because I think that really is something that instructs us on how these purposes can be, you know, finessed to ensure that that kind of work can continue.

So it's not irrelevant to talk to the CTO. And then with regard to the CCTLD report and the weekend, the reason why that was raised was because that shows what can be done, whether or not it applies in the GTLD space is a different thing, but we're trying to think about how to do operational, make changes that are operational and can be implemented in, and many registrars are already doing some of that as they sell CCTLD, so that was one of the reasons for that.

Again, we can do that as a separate call if people aren't interested in hearing it, but that's the basis for the request.

Kurt Pritz: So Marika or (Caitlin), could you capture from Margie those points about the specific topics for the meeting with the ICANN CTO, and let's just ask them to meet with us and set up a separate meeting and you know, those that are interested can attend. Those are topics I hadn't anticipated, the ones Margie brought up. So let's put up a meeting for that.

Marika Konings: Kurt, this is Marika, it may be helpful if we first take that question in writing to the office and get the to respond and then indeed see as someone suggested, see what based on that response whether people want to have a follow up conversation and we can see as well who is actually present in Barcelona.

Margie, if you don't mind maybe formulating that question in the chat and I will note it in our notes and get that relayed so hopefully we'll be able to get a response before ICANN 63 starts. Kurt, also had my hand up.

Kurt Pritz: That's a fine way to, I'm sorry, I didn't see it. So yeah, I think that's a fine way to proceed. It's probably easier to have some give and take so those that are interested could meet with, you know, meet with the office of the CTO.

Can I, Marika can I go to Farzaneh or did you have a specific question you wanted to respond to?

Marika Konings: I actually wanted to respond to one of the previous points, I'm happy for Farzaneh to go first.

Kurt Pritz: Okay, (unintelligible) go ahead please.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you, I just wanted to comment on the meeting CTO. I think it is unnecessary for the team to meet with the CTO and have put it in the chat. And there's no agreement here with (unintelligible) to meet with the CTO, then roll of icann org. in fighting the cyber security has been portrayed wrongly over and over, ICANN does not fight with (unintelligible). What they do is that they might attend or participate in some working group or they do not view the personal information of domain registrants to, to provide cyber security.

So what we need to do is that if someone requests something or a meeting, I don't think we should just accept it. I don't have a problem with Marika's question, it's my suggestion to just send a question to the CTO, have already had that counter-productive meeting with the compliance last month, and I think we are just going to derail. And we don't have a draft report going to the meeting so please let's not waste our time, thank you.

Kurt Pritz: Thanks, go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Kurt, I just wanted to point out, and I've put some of that as well in the chat too to Milton's question on the initial report. The previous face-to-face meeting (unintelligible) share kind of the broad outlines of which element need to be contained in the initial report.

A lot of that is actually more kind of an administrative nature, you know reporting on who participated, you know what early input was received and the heart, at least from our understanding, the heart of the report will be a

response to the charter questions and any preliminary recommendations that are attached to those responses.

So that is the chapter we put together shortly after the Barcelona meeting, and I shared again the link in the chat, and you know we kind of clearly flagged as well where the gaps are and that is of course all the work we're currently undertaking, and the hope is or the idea is as we move through you know some of the outstanding items as well as the data element workbooks, we're kind of able to slop all of that into those gaps so it will become kind of a full package.

And we did already open this up where it's kind of a Google Doc where people can start already flagging if they have any issues or concerns or comments or edits on that draft, but that is where it is currently at. So again, the idea is that all the work we're doing will hopefully slot in, you know, neatly into those gaps that were identified.

In certain cases, the group did already agree on some preliminary recommendations and as such those have been documented there. But of course, any further input on that is welcome.

Kurt Pritz: Thanks, Marika, Milton?

Gina Bartlett: Kurt, can I just jump in?

Kurt Pritz: Sure you can.

Gina Bartlett: I just for a second, Milton, this is Gina Bartlett. So you know the agenda is really driven to speak to what Marika just said, to try to get these issues resolved so that we can include them in the report, the initial report. So I just wanted to just, you know, I know we've been talking about options for bringing more information into the room and you know note the importance of the initial report as well as we'll circle back around to the parking lot from LA.

But I just want to, you know, check in that this approach, to concentrate on Purpose B and Purpose A, which is really I think the chair, you know Kurt and staff thinking that that's going to sort of bring us a long way toward the initial report. I just want to confirm that this agenda's working for you as our starting point for Saturday. Go ahead, Milton, thanks for waiting.

Milton Mueller: No, no problem to wait because that is exactly the question. So you talk about this agenda. I think I would like to see the agenda or at least our activities in Barcelona focused on actually producing a report and answering the gaps in the report. In particular, I rarely hear mention of the temp spec these days, but it's my understanding that the purpose of this group is to actually revise the temp spec.

Now looking through Marika's draft reports, I see that she has identified specific areas where there are gaps, although it's hard to tell, what does the cyan color coding mean, exactly?

Marika Konings: This is Marika, so the yellow color coding, if I remember correctly, is those areas where we're basically slotting in whatever the group is working on, because that's already work in progress, is just hasn't been finalized yet. The blue items are those that at the time that report was documented, those charter questions didn't receive air time yet.

A number of those have already been or have started being addressed by the small teams. There's still a couple of items, and you know the leadership team is tracking those and trying to see how we can fit them as well into the Barcelona agenda. There's still a couple of charter questions that we haven't really talked about

So again, we are closely tracking that with the leadership team, and are coming to see where those will fit in best, during ICANN 63. But indeed, as you said, the main focus is to, you know, get the work completed on, you

know, the yellow items so that can be filled out, but also make sure that the blue areas will be able to either document where we are but even better have you know firm responses as well as preliminary recommendations associated with those.

Milton Mueller: Okay, well my point was going to be that, and I think Gina and (David), if they're going to be mediating again, this would be a good, kind of directed to them, that when we discuss these purposes there's a constant danger of getting involved in abstract discussions about generalized approaches to data protection, and what I'd like to see is that all of these discussions about purposes, particularly B, which definitely is a problematic one, be focused on specific ways it would amend or not amend the temp spec.

What would be the implications of any definition or re-definition on the actual language of the temporary specification or the actual change in the policy underlying the temporary specification.

I think if we tie those discussions to particular parts or modifications of the temp spec, that we will make better progress because I can see all kinds of debates about the nature of Purpose B when they're detached from the specific context. But we should always be asking ourselves, "Okay, if X is, if so and so is right about the formulation of Purpose B, what difference does it make to the temp spec?" And if we like this argument or don't like this argument, what difference does it make to the temp spec? Am I making myself clear?

Kurt Pritz: Yeah, I think so, this is Kurt. And so, remember that our current Purpose B, the way it's worded is really replacing four or five of the purposes in the temp spec. We decided that in changing the temp spec we were going to eliminate those four or five purposes and roll them into one.

So that is changed to the temp spec and then to flesh that out we need to determine the legal bases, the legal basis to the processing steps and the

data to be collected. We have to determine each of those in order to one, answer the charter questions, which is something we have to do besides amending the temp spec. And then developing a policy.

And you know I don't know if I agree with you that our job is to amend the temp spec, that's what I thought coming into this exercise and you know, reading the charter for the 15th time or 50th. You know, it says our job is to develop a policy and I've been told that our job is not to amend the temp spec but is to march through the charter questions and create a policy.

Milton Mueller: But that's what I mean, the temp spec is the policy now and we have to replace it with a policy, that's what I mean.

Kurt Pritz: Right, but I surely take your advice or admonition that we want to keep the discussion focused on, you know, what we're trying to do here. We made this compromise that we were going to limit our discussion about data for Purpose B, the data that was collected and retained, and then make that available for disclosure for certain purposes. And I surely want to maintain a laser focus on that, and not become theoretical.

So I'm rooting for you to correct us if we ever veer off from that. But I also think the, you know how we've evolved this discussion and used the, you know, the data matrix and now these workbook sheets are essentially an official way to go about that.

Milton Mueller: If I could hold the floor for just another second. There's some talk about Purpose A as being terribly problematic. I was in the Purpose A small group and I think unless something bad happens I don't see that being troublesome at all. I think we're very close to an agreement on that.

Kurt Pritz: D'accord, yes, so I agree, and there's been great progress made on the wording of it over the last several days, so. But Purpose A covers, you know

feeds into some of the other purposes, so having that be done, done, done, I think will help us answer a lot of charter questions, you know. All right.

Gina, do you want to do, want to carry on?

Gina Bartlett: Yeah, I think unless anyone has any thoughts, I mean I think that we are pretty much real good to go with this agenda, we will focus in on you know moving us toward the initial report and I appreciate staff sharing that report. I think we've heard from them that if we can work through these issues, document the answers to the charter questions and any policy recommendations, that will give them what they need for the report, and Milton your notes around keeping everyone focused, you know, noted and we'll do our best to do that.

Margie Milam: Unless there's any other hands I think we can move on Kurt, I think we were going to next talk about the high impact session, or I'm sorry, high interest topic, sorry.

Kurt Pritz: That's okay. So I think, well you can read this, so we'll go to, you've seen this already before. And there's still blanks along the right hand side, but it's to map you know especially a broad look at our work, and describe what we've done.

So in the first section the TDP background, I really want to talk about how I think our group's departed from the typical TDP work. And that is what's different about EDPD, which isn't too much. But also talk about how we've developed our work processes and our study. To a really good extent I think a lot of your time is spent in analytical work, you know, describing in the right amount, understanding GDPR, understanding the right amount of detail for describing a purpose, understanding the meaning of legal basis, and the processes we're marching through.

So you know I want to, you know, I'll find fault where need be, which could take up the whole time, but you know also applaud the work done by others. You know, this latest set of work by barriers is, you know, is an evolution that builds over time. So I want to describe, you know, some of the tools we're using and methodologies, and however you're beating your brains out.

You know, anybody else on this call can take over for me. But so very briefly, you know, we want one person to describe the purposes for processing data, and that would be, you know, we've boiled the purposes down to so many purposes in our work, and reviewed them. And the staff will provide a preliminary slide deck for the presenter's review So you can see there's ten minutes on the agenda for this, so it's pretty broad brush. We can divide up the time differently if you want.

You know, describe the different data processing activities that we've come up and why that's important. The different data processing terms, then updates to other consensus policies. So you can read these and other recommendations and outstanding issues, so these pretty much track to the chapters in the charter. If you want some more detail on what these things are.

So you know we've had this out for a long time, so I'm really not amendable to big changes in this road map. But I am interested in garnering our volunteers for each section. We have suggestions, but I don't know, I don't know if Gina or Marika wants to give a pitch here.

Marika Konings: Yeah, thanks Kurt, this is Marika. So I think as Kurt already said, you know, whoever's presenting here is really doing so on behalf of the EPDP team and staff will be working on capturing where the group is at, you know, by Monday on the different charter questions and documenting that in the draft slide deck.

In some cases hopefully that will be in the form of preliminary recommendations and others, and maybe more of an outline of where, you know, positions are that and where the group is still deliberating and undertaking further work.

So I think the ask is really here for people to raise their hands and indicate if they're willing to volunteer, whether that's for a specific topic or whether the leadership can slot you in wherever there is a need. I did already note Alan Woods volunteering early on in the chat, so I've already taken his name down.

And I see Margie's hand up, I don't know if she's volunteering, so I won't put you down yet Margie, but again hopefully others will also, will be willing to put their hands up. I think we probably will need to try and see if we can find some time, probably either on Sunday or Monday, to get together with those that have volunteered to present on behalf of the EPDP team to make sure we're all on the same page.

You know, one of the main objectives is - of course is to share with the community where the group is at and what they can expect to happen, you know, shortly after ICANN 63 and of course encourage community members to be ready to provide input during the public comment period because obviously there's, you know, limited time available.

And there probably won't be any room to extend the public comment period beyond the minimum time frame that is set aside.

So I see a lot of hands raising. Kurt, I'll give it back to you. I hope those are all volunteers but I'll let you confirm that.

Kurt Pritz

Go ahead, Margie.

Margie Milam: Actually, it's not a volunteer although I'd be happy to volunteer if you'd like to assign something. And Kurt, I know you couched this with we've had this outline out for a while and you don't...

But honestly, I think this outline does not take good use of the time we have in a high interest topic. I think focusing on process and background and that kind of stuff is more useful when we've actually already had an initial report.

And I would propose that we spend more time on issues that we'd like community input on so focusing on, you know, like obviously the things that we're working on, you know, and have been working a lot on, the purposes, you know, and really getting, you know, audience participation on some of those things because otherwise, it becomes more of a dry discussion.

And a lot of the things that are in the agenda are things that could be handled through a report versus taking up, you know, a good amount of time in a high interest topic. So my suggestion would be to allow for more time for substantive discussion from the audience.

Kurt Pritz Thanks, Margie. Let me table that and go through the rest of the comments. Oh, I'm sorry. Emily?

Emily Taylor: Hi. I was going to make very similar comments to what Margie said. We've got - and I know, I'm really sorry that you said you didn't want any input on the agenda but there you go.

Life being what it is, people are going to overrun on their presentations. It's also a bit challenging - I think there's probably many people, such as myself, who would be happy to volunteer to take a slot. But it is very difficult to know how to get across the - you know, the state of the - the state of play on topics where there is very little news here (unintelligible).

And actually the opportunity that the high interest sessions give us is to interact directly from the community and to get their feedback on how we're doing. And if we plan to only give 20 minutes or so, a half an hour, for discussion then we're not really going to get that. And I can pretty much guarantee that so many agenda items that we're going to take up our time and there could be two seconds left at the end for questions.

So I really do suggest that we have a bit of a rethink and approve. How people volunteer, I'm not really sure how to put across how any of us will be able to put across what we're up to at the moment and be quite right.

Kurt Pritz            Thanks, Emily. Kristina?

Kristina Rosette:    Kristina Rosette. I agree with Emily and Margie about perhaps tinkering with the agenda for the high interest topic session to provide more opportunities for input. I think it would probably be very helpful to maybe divide the session in half and literally make the first half presentation and the second half Q&A.

I was also going to suggest, given that as I understand it the idea is to have members present on particular topics and cover kind of that whole range of topics, that, not to put an additional burden on those folks who've agreed to participate, but to really strongly recommend that anyone who is going to be a lead on a topic, you know, kind of share in advance, you know, preferably by the end of the day on Saturday, kind of the bullet points of what they're planning to cover so that everyone else who may have a differing view, to the extent that we are trying to capture those, can present them.

I think it's going to be much cleaner if we try and address those issues on the front end rather than on the back end.

Kurt Pritz            Okay. What are - say those issues again on the front end, the controversial issues or?

Kristina Rosette: Well, just to the extent that we don't have consensus on particular recommendations or on particular topics. I think, you know, naturally for example, on a topic that I have a particular view on, it's going to be easier for me to present my view than perhaps the opposing view.

And to the extent that we want to make sure that it's an even and balanced presentation, I think making sure that everybody else knows basically what everybody else is going to cover is going to I think make the session more productive in terms of value and make it easier for all of us to address questions that we may get individually afterwards. Thanks.

Kurt Pritz So I'm for a lot of what's being said here. What I'm not for is presenting views for one side or another. In other words, I'm for presenting where we differ but I don't want to have a debate among the members of this team at the big table as they cover it, I'm for this position or I'm for this position.

But I am for amending the agenda to, let's say, here's an issue, you know, if you want to comment on that here, go ahead. So, you know, what the - Marika's typing the same stuff to me. So, you know, what's the state of play so, and - but not advocacy.

So if you guys would accept that then, you know, I'd gladly go into a - you know, have a short brainstorming session here about, you know, big topics that we could work on for an agenda going forward.

So (Alex), you're next in the queue or are you just volunteering?

Alex Deacon No. I just had a comment. I wanted to support what Kristina said. I think that's a good idea, if we can - if we split the session in two and, you know, keep the first part as a - maybe a compressed version of what we have and then I think Kristina suggested we leave more time for Q&A.

And what we could do, thinking about what (Margie's) point is, perhaps we could preload some questions, right, that we would want to ask for input from the community or get a - you know, get thoughts from those outside of the EPDP.

It looks like we could - it wouldn't be too difficult to achieve, you know, what we've put here in this agenda but still give - you know, leave people with a better understanding of where we are, where the disagreements are and some of the discussions that we've been having. Thanks.

Kurt Pritz                   Right. Go ahead, Thomas.

Thomas Rickert:   Thanks, Kurt. I guess what we need to achieve during the high level - or high interest session is to make the community understand what we are doing and why we are doing certain things.

And I think that ten minutes from 15:20 to 15:70 is not enough time to explain the basic principles like data minimization specificity of purposes and the legal bases in the catalog of 6.1 to the audience because I guess that sets the scene for them moving through the various processes activities, their legal basis and so on and so forth, and update the group on where we are and solicit feedback.

So I would really ask you to reserve more time for that as it will hopefully take away some concerns from the community.

Also, I would strongly recommend that you have a clock ready, a timer ready, so that no intervention from the floor takes longer than 90 seconds for example.

And we should also be very clear that we are presenting the interim findings of our group and ask for feedback on the specific points and that we will shut off whoever makes interventions just arguing for why whois is so important or

make other interventions to lobby for a certain interest because I guess that's what we've heard over and over again over the last couple of months.

And I'm not saying that this is not important but I guess we need to make sure that this session is going to be very focused on soliciting feedback on whether we got it right to be precise on the purposes and on the legal bases and on the rationales that we've been working on.

Kurt Pritz           And I wonder how - so thank you, Thomas, and maybe you can help present that initial part, which I think is important.

And I wonder how we can actually ask questions that would get us some help. So some questions, you know, I - sometimes I term questions as being legal questions instead of policy questions. But, you know, I wonder what expertise or help there might be in the audience where we have questions where the - where they could help us out.

I'm really with Thomas and others in thinking that we want to, you know, ask our questions carefully so people, you know, don't stand up and say hurray for our side and make the same arguments that we've heard in the public comment, you know, leading up to this.

And so how can we - you know, what are the topics or what are the kinds of questions we're - we want to ask to engender input that would be meaningful to the audience and even meaningful to us? Any ideas? Yes, Milton.

Milton Mueller:    Yes, I think that if we do this preparation right, it's pretty clear where there are gaps or disagreements. And we could frame questions about those disagreements that are deliberately designed not get a parade of people saying hurray for our side in the well-known divisions but that would say here's the choice you have to make, you know, between, for example, GDPR compliance requirements versus some kind of need for data and, you know, where do you come down on that particular issue in a very factual way.

I'm not - again, I haven't gone through Marika's report in great detail so I don't know exactly what she's flagged as questions that need to be answered.

But in terms of the purposes, for example, if you're talking about Purpose B, you know, there are very clear arguments that have been made for and against having a purpose like that and whether it's an ICANN purpose or a registry and registrar purpose. I think if you narrow down the questions to the binaries that we have to answer to develop the report, you could have a constructive discussion with the audience.

If you try to just open up, you know, what's your opinion about this or that then, yes, you're going to get arguments that we've heard already and just long repetitions.

Kurt Pritz            Thanks, Milton. Anyone else? Kavouss? Go ahead, please, Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Hello? Can I talk?

Kurt Pritz            Yes, go ahead, please. Certainly.

Kavouss Arasteh: I think you need to decide number of items you want to discuss and associated with that, you have time management and to see how much time you can devote for each of those but not putting too many items. And dealing with each with a very short amount of time and discuss all just in a very vague and incomplete manner would not be useful. It would be counterproductive.

So prioritize the items that need to be discussed. Assign the time for that sufficiently as more or less Thomas mentioned. And then put the remaining as a second priority. Thank you.

Kurt Pritz            Thank you. Thanks, Kavouss. That's good advice. Margie?

Margie Milam: So you asked about how we could craft those questions. It seems like obviously we've got three subteams, right? So each subteam could come up with questions that help frame the issue that they're grappling with. And those could be three topics.

And then I think - then the next one is perhaps a slide that has all the purposes as we've developed them so far, knowing that they're drafts. And then maybe even asking, you know, some questions related to the purposes themselves.

So that would be about, say, eight or so questions. But it really would help get focused on the things that we're all, you know, trying to analyze and debate.

Kurt Pritz Right. And so here's my frustration. So we have an hour and a half, right? And even with these topics that we have here recommended to give people an overview of where we are, time is so tight. And I'm - you know, four different sections with people lined up at the mic, that's tough.

So I'm trying to think how to manage that. And we're not going to settle that here but we have a number of good ideas and I really take on board people's constructive comments or void as they are.

Gina, please go ahead.

Gina Bartlett: Yes, you know, I - just to go back on what you're saying, Kurt. I don't think that we will be able to ask, you know, such specific questions like eight different questions even though it would be super instructive and helpful potentially to hear from people.

But, you know, maybe we could allocate more time for people to weigh in kind of on a broader level. Like maybe - we'd need to think about this more but like I like the idea of having the purposes available and asking people

something along the lines of, you know, Q&A to understand that here - how are these purposes resonating with you, what is your overall thought, you now, what's missing.

And so maybe it's a particular purpose but maybe it's the suite of purposes. I think we need to think about where the most value would be added but it's not, I don't like this or that. It's sort of help us think more deeply about this, what - you know, what questions are raised for you, what are we missing or what should we be thinking about. I think I would frame in that - in those terms. And maybe there'll be some things that we can uncover that will inform your work.

Kurt Pritz Yes, I think that's well put. So let's take that back. And we'll take your comments on board and work on this some more.

Marika, do you have like a list of people that have volunteered?

Marika Konings: Thanks, Kurt. Yes, I do. So if you're supposed to be on the list but you're not named, you know, please point it out in the chat and the other way around as well. If you're named but you don't want to be there, do let us know too.

So what I have now is Alan Woods, Diane Plaut, Thomas Rickert, Hadia Elminiawi, Emily Taylor and Milton Mueller as volunteers. Oh, and I see that (Ashley) has just volunteered as well so I'll add her to the list too.

Kurt Pritz Great. So I think we have some homework. Does - and I just want to reiterate my position that, you know, we're up here, we're, you know, the people participating are reporters and not advocates. So if you disagree with that, you really need to let me know, but I don't see a way to make it work other than that. We're all - you know, we're all on this one team.

So I'm just like looking through the comments. So Alan Woods, you say you're confused. So could you elaborate on that? And besides, we haven't heard your voice today.

Alan Woods: I don't know if that's a good or a bad thing at all. No, I'm just confused about the concept of having pre-prepared questions that we ask the community to give us advice. I'm just - I don't understand.

The high interest session is so that we are up there to present, to inform people who are listening to us and work that we are doing and that have interest to inform and to bring them along with us.

I just don't see this point. I ask this point, opposed to this point, where that could help us. I don't think we're at a place to even phrase those questions. And if anything, it would just go to showing how far apart we are on certain issues rather than unite us in any way.

So I wouldn't be particularly supportive of having these prepared questions in that sense because again I don't think that's the purpose of the high interest topic. But, you know, that's just my opinion.

Kurt Pritz Any comments to that? Kavouss? Gina, did you have a - is that a previous hand?

Kavouss Arasteh: No, it is a previous hand but it was lit. I lit it again. So could you...

Kurt Pritz Okay.

Kavouss Arasteh: ...kind please repeat how many topics you have, what are the time available and how many person volunteered to do for each topic or the two collectively - two or three of them in one particular topic. Once they prepare something, if this presentation will be rigorously and aggressively criticized by the other, the result will be catastrophic and counterproductive. Thank you.

Kurt Pritz Well, we have an hour and a half. The - Marika will type into the chat how many volunteers and speakers we have. And my understanding is we're going to rethink the topics to make them more directed at - one is the process we're going through to arrive at conclusions and, two, more - a more specific status of where we are reporting on where there's agreement and where there's still work to be done.

You know, I really take on board Alan's comment about, you know, difficulty of asking the audience questions. So what we're going to do is, you know -- well, I'm afraid to blurt the wrong thing -- but we're going to readjust the time allocations and the topics to mirror our work a little better. And we're going to think about how we could invite audience participation. Milton?

Milton Mueller: Yes, I just think that Alan has convinced me that we don't want to wake up the sleeping dog by soliciting questions.

But I think if you do focus on carefully delineating the work we've done, that it would be used to have an open-ended, completely unstructured Q&A period, as currently you have, what, about 20 minutes, 25 minutes scheduled for that. Maybe you can - it can be only 20 minutes and just not have any questions until then.

And then whatever questions people ask, people ask. If they make speeches, they make speeches. We'll get the temperature of the room, to use a felicitous phrase.

But I do think we need to give people a chance to react to what we're doing. Hopefully, with some time limits there won't be an abuse of that open-ended session. But we might get some valuable input.

Kurt Pritz Yes, I knew I was wise by urging Alan to talk. Kavouss, go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. If there is more than one person to speak on a particular given subject, I don't think that it is more - it is productive that two people or three people talking on the same subject. Among themselves, they should have one as the leading person who speak about the subject and the others complement if there's something has not been addressed by that person but not repeating what has been said. Thank you.

Kurt Pritz Thanks, Kavouss. I think that's really good advice. And to the extent, you know, if there's, you know, a bunch of the people on a panel, to the extent it's a conversation rather than everybody taking turns, I always think that makes for a better session too. So thanks very much.

So we're going to take the agenda back and noodle it. I like - I appreciate everybody's intervention. I think it took us down a really helpful path and we'll wind up in a good place.

Does anybody from staff have a wrap for the meeting?

Marika Konings: Yes, Kurt. This is Marika. I have the list of action items and questions that came out of today's meeting. So first action item is for staff to put together the ICANN 63 document package that will contain all the materials that are to be reviewed prior to ICANN 63. And the related action item is for the team to review these materials before starting our meeting on Saturday.

Next action item is for staff to prepare a draft slide that - for the high interest topic session and then the related action items as well, for the leadership team to further consider the input received on the high interest topic session and to consider how to adjust potentially the draft agenda.

We had one question note for ICANN.org, namely further input is requested to explore how whois was used before the Temp Spec was adopted in OCTO activities. The original org response does not address that issue, for example that OCTO use whois in its law enforcement training and outreach activities,

our engagement with the cybersecurity community or to facilitate a response to large-scale (unintelligible) attacks such as Conficker or Avalanche. And that's all I have.

Kurt Pritz Thanks, Marika. Does anybody have any comments before we close? Great.

So on one hand, I feel a little bad that we lose time to discuss substantive issues to talk about these administrative matters. But on the other hand, I'm learning that, you know, unless we make time for them and talk about these agendas, these points don't get made and our product is less good than it could be. So I appreciate your time for the meeting.

I hope everybody has a safe trip that's traveling to Barcelona, and I look forward to seeing you.

Let me just check messages here. Oh, is that a new hand, Kavouss? I thought it was a previous hand.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. As I have discussed with you in a private chat, I would like to request the colleagues to maintain the utmost of our friendship and universality and unity with each other, avoiding to attack each other, avoiding to criticize each other, avoiding to go beyond the limit of politeness. I have observed tonight something in a written way. I don't want to raise it. But if that continues, I would raise it formally. Thank you.

Kurt Pritz Thanks, Kavouss. And I think we have some good comments in the chat there at the end. So thanks very much again for your time for the reasons I've already stated, and I'll see you guys in a couple days. Take care of yourselves.

Woman: Thank you, everyone. Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Operator, if you could please stop all the records. To everyone else, please

remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END