

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN Kobe
GNSO NPOC Policy Committee Meeting
Sunday, 10 March 2019 at 10:30 JST**

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

David Cake: Welcome to the INGO Policy Committee Meeting at the ICANN (Kobe) Meeting. First - could they mute my echo? Very quick introductions from those around the table, just for the record or in the room in fact.

Raoul Plommer: Raoul Plommer Vice Chair of NPOC.

David Cake: Actually, I'm going to ask besides introductions, quickly mention any particular policy issues that you are interested in or would like us to work on.

Man 2: Well, I'm quite enthusiastic about getting onto the RPM and using that as a sort of a practice run to make policies for ICANN.

Ioana Stupariu: Hi, everyone. I'm Ioana Stupariu and I'm interested mostly in accountability and transparency issues within ICANN so, I would really like to be working on that more.

Joan Kerr: (Unintelligible) Joan Kerr. Policies I'd like to work on anything that affects the constituency.

David Cake: I'm David Cake, Electronic Frontiers Australia. Within (in Perth), I think I'm particularly interested in security issues.

Oreoluwa Lesi: Hi everyone. I'm Oreoluwa Lesi. NPOC Secretary. I'm a newcomer so, I'm just interested in learning.

David Cake: And, we've got a couple of other in - besides staff - besides the secretary and staff for the meeting, we have a couple of others in the room. So, Patrick, introduce yourself.

Patrick Jones: Patrick Jones with ICANN Global Stakeholder Engagement Team and you'll still hear from me briefly after your other agenda items.

David Cake: And, we also have Jean-Jacques. Briefly introduce yourself.

Jean-Jacques Sahel: Good morning. So, for the record, it's Jean-Jacques Sahel, Vice President for Stakeholder Engagement in Europe and also Managing Director for the European Region.

David Cake: And we also have as an observer?

Dean Marks: Hi, my name is Dean Marks. I'm actually Vice President of the Intellectual Property Constituency and I met several members of the NPOC David and the leadership program, (Emanuele) and Raoul before and I realized I don't really understand the constituency or who the members are. So, I thought if this was an open meeting and I could observe, it would I'm happy to do so. If there are any parts of your meeting that you feel you want to have closed without observers, please just tell me. I promise I won't take any offense at all. Thank you for having me.

David Cake: No, no. Yes, none at all. But I think you'll only get a little bit of what the constituency is about. Of course, we also have constituency day, but of

course everyone's so busy in constituency day going to their own constituencies.

Well, I'd actually like to change the agenda around because we do have some members of ICANN Staff who are taking things away from other work. So, I think we might skip forward and Patrick is going to talk to us about security issues within ICANN.

Patrick Jones: Well thank you very much. Maybe before I talk about security issues, I'll give a little back ground in my role in the Global Stakeholder Engagement Team and, I guess, my history before I came to ICANN. I've actually worked quite a lot with your community before I came to ICANN.

So, while I was in law school, I was in the General Counsel's Office for the National Collegiate Athletic Association which is the governing body for collegiate athletics and they're about to start the Men's Basketball Tournament. Which is what got me - one of the things that got me into ICANN. I was doing domain abuse, domain name disputes involving NCAA Trademarks and this involved going after offshore internet gambling sites and taking down the domain names that were abusing the tournament trademarks.

That led me into working with the International Olympic Committee and the American Red Cross. And those issues that they were interested in back then are still being discussed so many years later here at ICANN.

As part of the Global Stakeholder Engagement Team, one of our big focuses is to try to bring in active participants in ICANN's technical and policy work. And so, it's good to see that this constituency has grown up and is attracting new participants and so, I know, Jean-Jacques and I wanted to help you do your work. But also, how can we help you attract new and active participants?

So, I guess that'll bridge into talking about security issues, because you may have seen several announcements from ICANN and other participating organizations as we headed - came into this meeting.

One of those announcements was about pushing for forward option of DNSSEC. So, if your organization works with a Registrar or an Internet Service Provider that doesn't do DNSSEC validation, you should encourage your Registrars and ISPs to do that. Perhaps implement DNSSEC on your official organization domains.

But there were a number of other steps that were recommended for the community and other groups to think about. Some of those steps were outlined in the ICANN (ORG) announcement from a few weeks ago. There will be a session at this meeting on Wednesday, between 11:00 and 12:30, that's titled "Coming Up with Best Practices to Improve Security in the DNS Ecosystem.

And that session will be led by (Merka Kale) who is a new ICANN Board liaison from the Security and Stability Advisory Committee. If you don't already have your time committed during that slot, I encourage you to either go and listen or send someone who can observe and participate in that session. Because it should be an opportunity for the community to talk about how can a community come together around some best practices?

And this would be, I think, of interest to your constituency as users and also you probably run profit small sizes and, you know, security challenges probably of interest to this group. And, I didn't really come here with a long agenda, other than introduce myself and work we're working on. And then how that might mesh with things that you are interested in.

I know David and I have been chatting for a while about how I could either join one of your regular calls to talk about the training that we do (unintelligible) development programs that we are doing. We're frequent - we

as a global stakeholder engagement team is often asked by different community groups to come and talk about either DNS abuse, or DNS security extensions, or different DNS security topics.

And I would think that's something of interest to this group. So, I'd be interested in hearing what are the things that your constituency is interested in. And what do you feel like you need more of. Or are there opportunities that you would be interested in getting from us. So, I'm open to hearing more about that. And Jean-Jacques want to jump in. Please, Jean-Jacques.

Jean-Jacques Sahel: Thank you David. So, Jean-Jacques Sahel for the record. So, just to add to what (Patrick) said. In the past, some of the things that we heard from - in terms of operational concerns from (IPC) Members - looking at how the nonprofit community use domains is when you look at the (unintelligible) of the community that you've got problems that has people not really knowing how to renew domains. Or when to renew them. Or the fact that we need to renew them in the first place.

People having, you know, their domain high jacked in some shape or form. Having some issues with (unintelligible) or trademark issues, (unintelligible) and the same acronyms and how you sort out issues? How do you deal with these issues? And, so, I think there's a potential for us, you know, I can hope to help by, for instance, providing training which could be in the form of (writing out) or simply being on the regular calls to come in (unintelligible) topics.

So, I think, in that perspective, it would be great to hear what you're hearing from them (unintelligible) what other kind of issues and questions that would be most useful to address. And then we can prepare background documents, presentations, et cetera, to help raise awareness. And so, it's not just about - well we can certainly - we'd be more than happy, of course, to help you feed into the ICANN policy process.

But it's also about helping educate the (WIPO) community out there where (IPC)'s got a very specific and important role, I think. So, that's what we're here for. Thank you.

Man 2: Yes. And we were discussing this in the Executive Committee that one of our most successful efforts was the one we did in (Unintelligible) where we focused on the security issues and got a very good response. I think we were interested in perhaps doing that sort of thing more often. And particularly doing presentations that both - I mean, I'm probably jumping ahead a little bit, but (online with) trying to do something - some sort of outreach effort regularly at meetings.

Jean-Jacques Sahel): (Sorry) (to jump), again, for this I was - I think we're discussing (unintelligible) in fact I remember (unintelligible) which was (led last month by) (unintelligible) successful. There was a huge number of people. It depends how you want to take things. But you can imagine that for instance if part - if you saw part of (ENPOC's) work as being to inform the (unintelligible) community about domain issues - which is a sort of indirect way of also recruiting more members - then you could look and say, well ask some of our NPOC Members attending some big (society) events - just thinking out loud - things like (Unintelligible) or other big (society events) and (think) can we have an (IPC) session there to raise awareness of the issues, but also raise awareness of the fact that (IPC) exists and therefore attract members (so that sort of signals so that) we would be happy to help with.

(And you know that quite well, because we've been talking about it for years). But just (unintelligible), well we'll be very happy to support you in that.

Man 2: So, while there's specific - so, I think, I mean - you said so there's documents from (OCTO) I think you said and, of course, you know, other documents that ICANN - other parts that ICANN issue (theoretically) that can help feed into that so we can speak with some authority when we talk about best practices?

Patrick Jones: Yes, so the announcement was prepared and published by OCTO, the Office of Chief Technology Officer and I can - from two weeks ago - and in that announcement there's a bullet list of things that registrants and organizations should do to protect their domains and their web presence.

That announcement references three documents from the Security and Stability Advisory Committee. Some of them have been around for a few years, but they're actually practical information that you and your organizations should review.

One of them is called the Registrants Guide to Protecting Domain Registration Accounts and that's SSAC Document 44. Another one is SSAC 74, Advisory on Registrant Protection. So, as nonprofit organizations you're still registrants and this should be useful and practical information for your organizations you can (borrow).

Man 2: Are there other - what other security processes other than, of course, there are things like) their existing bodies, like (ASAC), what security related work is going on within our (unintelligible) that you are looking for (unintelligible) of well particularly, sort of GNSO (groups)?

Patrick Jones: The first one that comes to mind was just published, you know, a few days ago. The work of the Technical Study Group on the Registration Data Protocol Process. So, that's an output that's been developed by technical experts, plus our OCSO CTO Team and it's chaired by (Ram Mohan) who's the prior SSAC liaison to the ICANN Board.

And that provides a data model for how registration data could be accessed. I think it's something of interest to all of the GNSO constituencies and stakeholder groups. So, I think reviewing that and - that there should be a way to provide public feedback into that technical study group model. So, I would encourage you to take a look there.

Also, the security related sessions that are happening this week during the meeting. So, I mentioned the one on Wednesday. There's also Tech Day - and that's tomorrow - which does overlap with other sessions, but if you have time, those sessions are usually short, practical sessions of different technical and security issues that either registries, registrars or other organizations are seeing.

And I know the group tries to make these so that they're not just for the very technical audience. That they're for tech and interested audience and that should be something that would be accessible to you too.

David Cake: Do we have any comments on the - anybody? Do, you think this is - for example, we should take a - I mean, I think we should take a - it would be worth us taking a strong look at this technical study group document. I was going to do that anyway personally. But, I'm happy to make that an activity of the policy committee.

I mean, parts of it are quite technical, but not - there are other parts that are not. We're in fact just discussing the non - I mean, the - you know, what policy (implications) parts of it might have (are worth).

Not to say that I think it's a policy document, but it makes some policy options possible. It is perhaps a way of looking at it.

Patrick Jones: So, if I could add? If your group is interested in having either a Webinar or some kind of guided discussion of the registrant protection information that's been published or, sort of, a discussion of DNS abuse topics that we're seeing. At this - yesterday, there was a How it Works, talk on DNS abuse that (John Crain) from the CTO Team led. I think that talk is being repeated today by someone from the CTO team. I think at about 5:00 pm this evening.

There are the How it Works Sessions that are intended to be practical and accessible to newcomers and new participants - I'd point you at those. But

for in between the meetings, if you're doing regular calls and you want to have a deeper discussion of these topics, we can work on setting that up. Happy to do it. Others on the team are happy to help facilitate that.

So, it's kind of up to you. And I don't know if you partner with other (unintelligible) other groups about this, but, you know, this might be an area where, if we do a Webinar, you wouldn't necessarily need to be just for an (unintelligible) that could be open.

David Cake: Yes, that would be cool - think about that one - that idea.

Joan Kerr: So, it's Joan Kerr for the record. So, the engagement - I'm more interested in engagement than anything else, as Jean-Jacques knows. So, we've initiated a pilot project with ALAC, called (Shared Reverses). And so, we're actually stirring up a pot over two meetings.

And one of the things that I always hear is how much support there is for capacity development and marketing and strategic plans and all that kind of stuff. And so, we, a (IPC) have been developing a lot of marketing tools and materials. And a simple thing like having a card - because the problem to get printed.

So, what are some exact examples of what you would do with marketing materials (left to) - I mean, to me a card is a basic marketing tool - to me. It may not be to you, but it is to me. (And (unintelligible) okay.

We spent our time designing it, because you're supposed to design it. Volunteers spend their time designing it and then it's refused as, you know, you can have a basic one. Well why isn't the staff telling us that we should do that at the very onset so we can work at other things?

So, you're spending your time designing something and then you send it to them. And, oh no, we can't do that, we'll just do a basic one. And we could

have spent time doing something else. And for me, as chair, I really dislike wasting volunteer time. I really do. Because people get frustrated in that sense.

So, that's just an example. But on the other hand, today's a new day. I really would like to sit down with a team. And, actually we did that this morning - Juan and I - he's the membership chair at the moment - on how we can have a comprehensive marketing strategy. Not just to outreach, but also to inform people about policy. Because, sort of integrating them together.

So, it's a conversation that we can have, because we're now ready to actually to engage the community to do that. And I don't know if you've seen our Web site or anything like that. We have a new Web site. It's going to be launched on constituency day. And some of the (unintelligible) that you've mentioned, we want to have them up there.

We've even done specific things like identifying our (members) in specific subject matters in the region, so that we can market to them directly. Here's an issue that we need your feedback on. Will do it to everyone, but then to just write a, you know, letter to them saying here's an issue that we're dealing with. We realize this is your mission, you know, would you like to be involved? So, it's very crafted and very focused. And so, how will the team help us to craft those things?

Jean-Jacques Sahel: Thank you very much. Thank you, Joan. I wasn't aware of this (particular) example, I'm really sorry. I think I very much sympathize because I think it's wrong to waste your time as a volunteer. And generally, I think we can't just waste our resources as a whole.

So, I think it would be great to do some joint planning. I had heard that you had initiated some discussions (over there) At-Large. And just to give you an example, something we've just started to do in Barcelona, was At-Large,

we're hoping to do more - (Patrick's) involved - is that we're going to try to do more and more joint planning.

So, every year, each of the constituency (whether it's) the IPC and (unintelligible) (UC) are supposed to do an outreach strategy and that's somehow linked to (unintelligible), but that's beside the point. There's an outreach strategy, which I think is a great tool to have.

And what we've started doing with At-Large is to actually look at the (draft) strategies and help to basically try and craft it together. Or input into it from what we've seen more widely. And I think we've got potential to do that for NPOC. And as you are starting, if you think, you've got some ideas about marketing strategy, let's sit down together at the outset.

So, that we (agree together) - we say okay, so for instance I'll take - say it's an example of (you and I) and sort of central and southeastern Europe, where we do quite a bit. Not just on an NPOC but (unintelligible) it's a broader ICANN (unintelligible) for you.

You know, we look at some of the upcoming events. We look at what other topics. We look at what some of the correctuals (sic) may be. Which could be just brochures and (unintelligible). For instance, we've got EuroDIG, European IGF, we've got SEEDIG, the Southeastern European IGF, we've got (unintelligible). We make sure that we have.

So, for instance there's one thing we could do for (unintelligible) for instance, we've got just enough time - we could make sure we've got (unintelligible) there, just as a simple thing. And perhaps we think of a way that we do a bit more than that. Maybe we can do a speech or have a specific, like, brochure, maybe (with policy or with content) from NPOC.

And I think I really like you point, Joan about - it's not just (unintelligible) the (five of us) say, hey, we're NPOC. But actually, you mix it with policy

because I truly believe that it's content that attracts people. Right? You're saying this is what we're working on. This is what is relevant to you. Then you get people to come. (So, you have to prove that).

David Cake: And I would envision something where we present, you know, we present something with a strong focus on informing about security and then at the end we talk about, so what is actually changing here and how would, you know, and then we could talk about, like, what changes are happening to, like RPNs or to - or - and then probably by the time we would be doing something to roughly talking about what is under consideration from the new access model or something like that, which is a security related concern - that a lot of people, that we can also say, and this is happening now. Come and join in and be part of that conversation. And be an active policy participant.

Jean-Jacques Sahel: So, I don't know, how you want operationalize this. But we could do it at regular ICANN meetings themselves, or we can just do it as a (unintelligible), so to speak, or it would be (online) by (unintelligible) a specific (unintelligible) or we just exchange on strategy. One thing I'd say, as well, is we can make it really relevant to each of the regions.

So, for instance in southeastern Europe or central Europe, I think the security points are probably going to be quite interesting. I mean, (you and I) would be able to help out. But in Africa there might be slightly different concerns. (Unintelligible) the (America), then I would (unintelligible) (and engage) and I think we can really tailor it to make it truly relevant for people.

And I think that's the one thing that we could have done better over the years in ICANN. We do some really useful stuff, but we don't explain it to people. We just talk a lot about the process rather than the policy. And the policy is what attracts people.

David Cake: Okay. Yes, (Bill).

(Bill): Yes. Although the business cards we made didn't go perfectly, we were really quite happy with the (look) that we got. So, one out of two, it was pretty good.

Jean-Jacques Sahel: Can I just check. Sorry for taking the floor again. Do you know if our Communications people are making - are going to make a bit noise about (unintelligible) Web site?

David Cake: What?

Jean-Jacques Sahel: Do you know if our communications people - the ICANN Org Coms people are going to promote the fact that there is a new NPOC Web site? We should definitely, like we should mention it in the Daily Newsletter of ICANN64. And yes, we could do something. So, if you are happy for us to do that as the chair of the Chair of (Unintelligible) committee and Chair of NPOC, we would be happy to (unintelligible) as an action and ask our Coms people to mention it.

David Cake: Any help would be helpful.

David Cake: Okay. Do we have any more questions for Jean-Jacques and (Patrick) while we have them here? As I know, they are quite busy people and are probably supposed to be in three places at once.

Patrick Jones: That's okay. Yes, it's totally fine. I mean, I'm happy to talk more if these are topics that are interesting to you and your organizations. You know, definitely reach out to me. My email is very similar to Jacques' email - First name dot last name at ICANN dot org. You know, if you have any questions, let us know how we can help meet the needs of the group so that we're working together to help you meet what you need.

David Cake: And Jean-Jacques?

Jean-Jacques Sahel: Yes. I think, we've had a lot of ad hoc conversations. I think perhaps we could actually schedule something. Let's make it happen. It could be once a year or it could be (unintelligible) where we touch base. I'm not going to be at (unintelligible) because of budget constraints, but whenever I'm here, I'd be happy to or we just say, for instance we will have an hours' call a couple of weeks after the Kobe meeting and just look at your ideas for the year and start planning a bit more specifically. I think it would be helpful to have that, you know, schedule it so we make it happen. Whichever you think is right.

David Cake: Yes, that sounds great. And, yes, I think probably - if we're going - I mean, it seems we're thinking a lot about outreach for outreach focused events, which clearly, we should be talking to stakeholder engagement event (things) (unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: Can I just say something quickly?

David Cake: Yes, go ahead Joan.

Joan Kerr: Yes, so it's Joan for the record. So, it's probably my fault for sort of working independent and getting NPOC on track because I really felt that we needed to kind of do that. But we're at the point where - we mean business. We want the not-for-profit to know who we are. Because we think we're wonderful. And so, we want everybody else to know that.

But we're also, behind the scenes, we're getting a lot of support. And so, that makes us feel good, because when you do something valuable, people want to be part of it, right?

So, I really want to thank you for offering the services, as long as it's, of course, followed up, right? So, you know, one of those - because if you promise something, I hope people do it so I don't like fluff. And so, we're really serious about moving ahead. And we feel, I can say, and I speak for

myself, I feel confident that we have everything in place to satisfy the marketing objectives that we have.

We have the people who want to be involved. And so, we're serious about it. But I hate being frustrated when someone says, oh yes, next week. You know, if it's committed, let's do it. So - so thank you for offering and hopefully I can hold you to it.

Jean-Jacques Sahel: That's why I'm suggesting we don't just say, let's do it. We actually schedule a date. Let's make sure we can do that. Maybe when we finish the meeting, we'll (diaries) and adjust. Thank you.

Joan Kerr: Okay.

David Cake: Well, and unless we have any further questions, I think we've got a few really useful, sort of, takeaways for us in how using information from, sort of, OCTO (Unintelligible) from the GSC we can out structure some outreach events, Webinar and otherwise related and a few things for us to pay attention to. So, I think we've got some very valuable - and start(ed) some valuable discussions about how to go on forward.

So, I think, I'm going to - oh, (Patrick) want to say something?

Patrick Jones: So, one more thing for you to think about. So, the Board's in the process of finalizing the strategic plan for the new strategic plan for '21 to '25. That document has two areas related to security that are advancement over the language from the previous strategic plan. And as we turn that document into an operating plan and start to schedule the activities that are going to deliver on those security related objectives, the ones that are of most priority or interest for your constituency, it would be helpful to feed that back into us.

Because, you know, as for (GSE) and the other parts of the organization that we're developing - the activities that are supposed to deliver on those

strategic objectives, we want to make sure that they're not just developed by the award without community support input.

So, we want to be sure that the activities we're doing also meet objectives that you have. So, think about those things and if there's something that is a higher priority, then another one - feed that back into the process.

David Cake: Okay. Is there a particular way that we be good to do that feedback? Or...

Patrick Jones: So, at this meeting, there will be a community session on the strategic plan. So, definitely go to that. I think the board is still in the process of publishing the community response to the public comments that were received on the Strategic Plan. But as we're developing the operating plan, there will be public comment opportunities. So, take advantage of that and think about how you can, you know, provide as much detail on what should be a priority to us in that process.

David Cake: Yes. No, I think that that is a really useful comment that gives us, like, a solid - a good bit of work to work on, I think. I think, that's a really - that would be a really helpful discussion. And I think we might - when we start talking about our strategic agenda, we'll add that to it and work on getting - like talking to our member organizations and getting some of their priorities about what do they think of stricter security issues to particularly focus on.

Does anyone have any further questions? Or should we let (Patrick) and (Jean-Jacques) go to their - well, do I have any further questions?

Patrick Jones: (Unintelligible)?

David Cake: No, no, no, no. I mean, just move onto other issues, if that's fine?

Patrick Jones: (That's fine).

David Cake: Thank you. Thank you very much for attending, both of you. Moving back to the agendas at once. I think we're going to look at the issues that we have to deal with during this meeting. So, get back to, sort of, counsel motions and other sort of current policy issues during this meeting.

And then we will have - then we'll have a general talking about planning for what to do in this committee, both, and in, sort of, (and talk) policy activities generally. Which will be both talking about capacity building and, I think, you know, identifying other policy work to do as part of our, sort of, strategic agenda. Things over the next few months.

I would - don't think I was planning to have a - so, (unintelligible) building. We were planning to include a little bit of a focus on the RPM Working Group and (Martin), of course, is Vice-Chair of that Working Group. So, that one of the - the big issue on the agenda here will be Trademark Clearinghouse issue.

I was planning on having a brief presentation on the history of the Trademark Clearinghouse issue from (Robin) but I think she - no one has seen her yet and she did have some big travel issues. So, I suspect she probably hasn't arrived. And even if she has, she's probably not in any state to give a presentation.

So, I'm going to talk briefly about that. But I won't be able to give you the detail I'd hoped. And after that, will be, you know, any other business and wrap up any future meetings and so on.

So, I'm just going to move on. (Unintelligible) can we have the counsel motions up on the (unintelligible). Yes, thank you. So, we don't have - unfortunately we don't have NPOC counselor here. (Martin) is not able to make the call - as I say, just giving a quick check to see if he's actually online. But no, he's not.

And so, I'm just going to quickly go through the motions on the agenda. There's not much in the - mostly we're focusing on the motions within the council agenda. While there are a few interesting things including the Adoption of the (CSC) Effectiveness Review Team Final Report. And on the consent agenda, and in general discussion. There's also the - and the reappointment of (Becky Burr) to the ICANN Board. Of course, that's the other half of the GNSO.

Now we have a couple of issues on the - is it - something's on the ICANN - I'm sorry on the GNSO Council Agenda which are not motions and I think - but I think we should - should be aware of to understand if we have a comment on the discussion.

And if we do, we should contact one of the NCSG counselors and discuss them if we have a view. Now, I said (Martin) would be - who is, I guess - I mean, of course all counselors are NCSG counselors and we should feel free to approach any of them. But, of course (Martin) is the one we would normally see most of in this committee. But Amr Elsadr is replacing him at this meeting and I'm sure would be happy to hear any concerns, but also any other GNSO - any other NCSG counselor.

The issue - the discussion issue of the PPSAI - the Privacy Policy Services - I should know this one - Privacy Policy Services Accreditation Initiative (sic)? No, I don't know what it was. But with the - I should remember. I was on this group for quite some time and it took up a lot of time -- is related to privacy and proxy services. Now, this is policy that was completed some time ago as a policy process.

And the idea was like I said, standards for how privacy and proxy services should operate. If they wish to be accredited by ICANN. And then an accredited ICANN - the idea being that the - an accredited private proxy service is one that ICANN was really comfortable with. You know, its contracted parties being involved with in supporting.

And while ICANN can't possibly try to regulate every single organization that provides some form of privacy and proxy service, especially since it was well-established in the working group that includes essentially every attorney - you know, lawyers that are able to offer this service by virtue of attorney-client privilege.

They wanted to control how these services were generally operated and add an accreditation process which looked at how - when privacy proxy services should give up information about their clients? Such as when, you know, law enforcement was investigating a crime and when they should not and that sort of thing.

Now the interesting thing about this process which was, in many ways, as with so many debates about privacy at ICANN, seen as sort of a part of a long ongoing multifaceted - multifront war about privacy in ICANN over many years - this one was somewhat contentious, but it did eventually produce consensus recommendations. But then had incrementation (sic) review team.

There was some controversy about the action of the implementation review team. And the implementation review, in considering some of the issues around this, has effectively been asked to stop work on the implementation PPSAI. And the implementation of this policy has more or less, sort of, slowed to a near-stop.

So - and the implementation of PPSAI may not actually - some of it may end up not - unclear if it will take place. So, this is, sort of, an issue that's worth discussing. We don't have an answer, but if you have an opinion on this, I think we should consider - the PPSAI, I do know, that there were some specific consideration given to the operating concerns of NGOs in that, on the grid, we fought very strongly for the idea that we should not - even though privacy - even though privacy legislation often infringes the rights of individuals,

the NGOs, just because they were legal persons rather than natural persons, did not mean they should have no privacy rights and the privacy rights of many NGOs were very significant in that there (unintelligible) some NGOs or the GSO activist nature and things like, went in shelters and so on. Their information about the privacy of the operation of the - them can invite harassment if it's made to the public.

So, just bringing that one - I don't think - that's an ongoing discussion. I don't think there's any point where we need to have a position or get involved. But I think it's worth us being aware of and discussing that issue.

There's also the GNSO Policy Development (three) implementation is a very interesting area. But it's too broad, I think, at the moment for us to really look at it. I think it might be worth us taking a look at the changes, to policy, process in a few months when I guess the team is a little bit more familiar -- when we've gone through the sort of, existing PDP in more detail. And we can understand the significance in some of the changes.

I'm going to say, the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy - I'm going to skip over as none of us are contracted parties. The WHOIS Conflict with Privacy Law is another complicated issue that has become extremely complicated within the - because of the huge changes to how we handle WHOIS. Kind of played by the (PDP)

I think some of the things I said about the PPSAI apply to that. We should - it'd be worth talking to a counselor about. And so, actual motions on the agenda - do we - sorry, I got lost in the...

Do we have a separate document with just the motions? I further wish to talk about the (PDP) too here because we could be - right - right. So, the two - the motion - oh, so the only motion on the agenda is the approval of the Customer Standing Committee which is being handled as part of the (consent) (unintelligible) of things.

So, I - we have been unusually quiet, in terms of motions. Yes. That's probably because the GNSO council actually had an emergency special meeting as well only, like, a couple of weeks ago, specifically to approve the EPDP Phase One Report so that it will be definitely approved and out in time for this meeting. And so, they called their meeting to discuss the EPDP Phase One Report rather than to discuss what will be, you know, yet again.

So, I think that probably looks at most of the issues. I have to say this ICANN, in terms of what is going on policy-wise is once again incredibly dominated by WHOIS and EPDP related.

Discussions? Now I'm going to do a brief presentation in Constituency Day about the EPDP. But does anyone want to discuss what's going on with the EPDP further at this time? I mean, I don't mind doing it, but (like I said) I'll give a - the presentation I'm going to do on Constituency Day is to actually more or less start at the beginning.

What is this thing - what is the term spec? Why are we here? What is going on ending going to the recommendations more particularly, then go through the different purposes that have been identified. And then talk about what's going on in Phase Two.

The only thing I can say about Phase Two at this point, we - Phase Two will include discussion of what, in ICANN, we call an Access Model. What in GDPR terms we would probably call disclosure. So, when you give out data that is not public when it is made available to somebody. And how we will do that both legal - handle that both legally and technically.

So, while there is a technical, spec technical services group report that (Patrick) mentioned, it will be part - we'll be going on in parallel essentially. So, there's a technical group working on the engineering of it, while the EPDP

will continue to work on the, sort of, policy implications and how that will work at the same time.

That is probably an appropriate point. And the TSG has operated more or less independently until now, I think there'll probably be a little more back-and-froth between the two groups from this point.

I am planning to continue as an alternate on the EPDP. I don't think I have the time to contribute that I think this particular Phase Two. I have some issues that I, you know, think I can usefully contribute on. If anyone else is, sort of, interested in being part of the EPDP Team, feel free to identify yourself, because we have lost a few people.

But I think many people would warn you off, the amount of work involved in that one. I think that's probably enough on what's going on, at this meeting. I think I had tried to summarize and I'm sure I could have given you a bit more insight into the counsel discussions, but I'm not a counselor. So, I'm just sort of going from my, you know, knowledge of the issues and the agenda rather than having been privy to (LA) council discussions.

But do we have any questions about things that have been going on at this meeting and what we should be - what issues we should be looking at? I would - I mention we do have, of course, two other giant rolling PDPs that I did not bring out on the council agenda because they're in the middle of their work.

One is the RPMs that we're looking at soon. The other is the new gTLD's - the new gTLD's - future new gTLD's (review). Which is - a lot of which is done, but Work Team Five had a couple of active meetings during the weekend, which include geographic names as part of Work Team Five.

Joan?

Joan Kerr: So, it's great that you're going to give a - for the Constituency Day, I'm really looking forward to hearing it from the basics to the specifics, right? That's for the budget. So, is it possible for us to do a quick synopsis of - I'm thinking this, I'm thinking out loud of course - sending it to the members saying, you know, policy (unintelligible) is going to be talking about EPDP and maybe say these are the focuses that we're going to focus on is NPOC? So, just to drive participation. Is that possible? Or it wouldn't matter?

David Cake: Have we decided what we're going to focus on is NPOC within the EPDP? I don't know that we have yet. Do we have, yet - I mean we could have that discussion.

Joan Kerr: Well, then can we have that discussion then?

David Cake: Sure. I mean, I would probably jump to the very big - within - well there'll be a response - there'll be an opportunity to come in on Phase One - will be coming up fairly soon. So, before it goes to board vote I think there's another opportunity for public comment and we should do that soon. So, I think that's something we do have to have a discussion about.

The main focus of the report - there's a lot of detailed stuff about - I mean, the temporary specification essentially replaces large chunks of the existing Registry and Registrar Agreement. I mean, pretty much anything to do with WHOIS.

There's the most important change - the thing that's really crucial - what Phase One essentially spent most of their work on, was - according to the GDPR, you have to define the purposes for which you collect information. And then, disclosure outside those purposes is much - is more difficult, right?

So, you can disclose information for purposes of a legitimate third-party interest. But what is the legitimacy of that third-party interest has a real - you know, has to have some real, sort of legal balance behind it.

And otherwise, a casual disclosure or regular disclosure of information is only legal under the GDPR if it was collected for that purpose. So - if you - so then basically - so if you consent to a (button) saying you understand this information is being collected for the purposes of marketing, then it's okay for them to market to you.

But if they have not done that, they have not informed you that that is what the information has been collected for and used, it's illegal to use it for that purpose. Now, we (unintelligible) about seven purposes. Six of those are probably, while there was an enormous amount of Web (sniffing) and (obsession) of the detail, six of those purposes are probably relatively uncontroversial.

And they include things like, you know, collecting information in order to establish a connection between the owner of the domain name and operation of the domain name. Or, in order for ICANN to send you information about - or your registry - in order to send you information about technical problems with the registry or your domain name, or a number of purposes like that, so they're relatively straightforward - I should probably bring up -- the useful thing here - is a log pressed by (Milton) who summarizes this fairly well.

Now the - (Unintelligible).

Man 3: So, the GDPR gives six lawful bases for processing data. First one is consent, and its contract, legal obligation, vital interests, public (tasks) or legitimate interests. Are we talking about only the legitimate interests here? Are those, again, cut down to six or seven?

David Cake: No, we're talking about - I mean - essentially - there's a - it all gets quite complicated because, I mean, I think we're talking - I mean, we're talking about legitimate - yes, legitimate purposes. We're talking about - now well

the seven criteria that we're given in the EPDP Report after extensive debate. I'll just read them out. Right?

So, the purpose one to activate a registered name. Allocate it to a name holder and establish the rights of the holder in the registered name.

Purpose Two. Enabling responses to lawful data disclosure requests to main the security stability and resiliency of the domain name system in accordance with ICANN's mission.

Purpose Three. To enable communication with the registered name holder and that is relating to the registered name.

Purpose Four. To provide mechanisms for safeguarding registered name holder's registration data in the event of a business or technical failure. So, that one is essentially to enable data escrow (provision) so, every registrar and registry - or every registry is required to basically give a backup of the data and give it to a registered escrow provider.

So, most registries, like, Iron Mountain, who are very famous global providers of data storage sort of service - data storage and backup services. And then if a registry fails, like goes out-of-business. Or otherwise fails due to some disaster, then ICANN has - (unintelligible) data ICANN decides they are no longer able to run the registry - the ICANN has registries that have volunteered to be ready to take over a failed registry and that will transfer that data out of escrow.

Purpose Five. To enable contractual compliance monitoring requests to (notice) activities, so that's related to having a contract - the contract parties' contracts.

Purpose Six. To operationalize policies for the resolution of domain name disputes. So, that's related to things like the UDRP. When the UDRP is filed

you're able to get work out who to contact - you know, you need to be able - if you want to initiate a dispute there needs to be a means to contact the other party.

Purpose Seven. To enable registries to validate that a registrant makes the registry eligibility criteria. So, is a specific registry has a specific - is not open, they may ask to prove that you are a genuine non-profit or sport organization or something.

Now the one that's probably the most controversial of these is Purpose Two. Which is enable response to lawful disclosure requests to maintain the security stability and resiliency of the domain name system in accordance with ICANN's mission. It doesn't sound that controversial, but there are a couple of reasons.

One is the enabling responses to lawful data disclosure requests is sort of vague. If it's a law enforcement agency, they're already able to get accesses on the ground for (unintelligible) legitimate third-party. So, what exactly does that include? And there's a lot of explanatory material in the report about exactly that - with how much that includes. And exactly what is the security stability (unintelligible) system and how does that apply to RDS and disclosures (right at security).

Now, when (Milton) being - (Milton) is very forthright, I guess, and cross-purpose to a stinker. But it's certainly - I think everyone on both sides of the issue agree that this was a very controversial and difficult discussion. So, that's probably the one way I expect debate will be focused, as to what exactly is a lawful -- So a lot of Phase Two is likely to deal with what is a lawful data disclosure? And what exactly is security stability and resiliency. Extend and the issues are things like, for example, security - some people in the security industry have said, essentially, well if I get - if I identify one domain is being used to (spam), I should - or over DNS abuse purposes, I

should be able to quickly find out every other domain owned by that person, if I don't even know who owns it.

How can I do that? And then there's a lot of discussion about whether that security issue is - within ICANN's remit, right. Like it may be a security issue, but is security of the domain name the system issue? Is it lawful? Do you have a right to do that sort of thing? How would it take place if you did? There may be some rule where we can, you know, if we decide a legitimate security request to get access to that information, how do we decide what is a legitimate security request.

And all of this stuff, we think we're going to go in in Phase Two, where we have to decide. Answer questions like how do we decide what is a lawful - I mean not a - law enforcement is a whole different issue. But largely law enforcement can do that. They have well established procedures for working out who is and isn't law enforcement and whether or not they can request a particular thing. But where we get a request from someone, you just sort of - to what extent should we be required to cooperate with someone and give up data to someone. And, I'm speaking in general vague, I can rather than, obviously, none of us here are registrars or registries.

But to what extent are you required to give out information in response to a request to some form of alleged domain abuse? Yes.

Man 4: So, wouldn't it be like technically impossible to find out what domains does a single person own?

David Cake: That is a good question. And, I mean, the answer is, if they are - so the answer is if they happen to have to registered them all at the same registrar, then it's very easy. But do with it - how do we do it cross-registrar and cross-registry, like it's theoretically possible, but how would you do - what mechanism would you do that that is not involving information sharing that contractual parties are not obliged to do and may not be very keen on doing.

So, yes, that is a good question. And it's very easy to answer with open access to data. Where, of course, you can just sock in data, as much data as you like, from all registrars and create some sort of database. But should we even allow that? That's a good question?

And there are ways to do it without data sharing and one - there are a lot of proposed methods to do it with sharing some sort of database of (hashed) information so you -- and I'm probably getting too technical here, but you know, you can (phrase) those into a number and then that's - into a very large number or, you know, identifying a, sort of, tag that you can't go backwards, but you can compare.

So, that - there are ways to do it technically. But that is the sort of thing that I expect both in the technical growth and in the (unintelligible) side where we'll be discussing in some, probably, excruciating detail (unintelligible).

Yes, and I've already said then, of course, - if you feel I've (unintelligible) on perspective or feel I've mischaracterized any part of the process (unintelligible) - yes, yes.

Dean Marks: I just wanted to say - thanks, my name is Dean Marks. I'm with the IPC. I know some of you from Leadership Program and I think this is really interesting for me. So, thank you for letting me observe.

I was just going to say, I went to the (RDAP) workshop this morning and so, I didn't realize how flexible the technical capabilities of RDAP are versus what may be currently implemented and so, I just think it's going to be interesting for both the EPP Team and the Technical Study Group?

David Cake: Yes.

Dean Marks: Or is that what it's called, TSG?

David Cake: Yes. Technical Study Group.

Dean Marks: I can never get the acronyms right. But, you know, those sorts of things were, you know, what search capabilities are possible that still protect privacy. And, David, you're a technical guy so you would have much more knowledge that I would about whether, you know, RDAP offers the sorts of policy - potential as a technical vehicle to help strike the balances with authentication and authorization and all that stuff. Thanks.

David Cake: Yes. Yes. No, thank you very much Dean. So, and just - and to mention on that point about the RDAP, which, as you said, is a very technical issue to be done by RDAP, mostly by a technical group, but there are intertwines with the policy issues in really interesting ways.

And one of the ways is it adds a lot of capabilities to how - it's not as simple as, you know, this person can get access to data and this person can't. There's - it supports things like multiple profiles and the (agents) of authentication. It supports things like, quite a lot of search capacities.

One thing it does, is it is designed very much, technically, as a - essentially, sort of, Web - http services. So, it's able to leverage all the existing work that has been done on secure authentication and secure - and all the different -- No the secure authentication, but you know, federated and all sorts of using the authentication that's sort of essentially from other services - plug in authentication of other services and things like that.

So, there's a lot to be done there. And, yes, it adds a lot of capacities that we -- But I mean, I think we've been used to a little bit - staged focused on mostly what the - what the new models for registration data doesn't do. Right? We've been focused very much on what it stops us seeing, but there's a whole lot, when we get into this, where I think it will enable some very interesting models of what we can do that we need to think about quite a lot,

including like, you know, possibly, you know, dedicated third-party services that do some version of authentication that you, you know, people - registrars could subscribe to and things like that. That are very, sort of, there's a long way to go on this process before we're done, but we're probably past the most, the biggest or the most -- No we're not past, but we may have been past the worst of the bits that are sort of adversarial ending to some of the more creative, where can we go from here, sort of, (bottles) of it.

So, it's a very interesting, sort of, (part) in the process. And we all fervently hope that EPOCH Phase Two will be less painful than Phase One. And I will say, Constituency (A), (Reason, Ranking, Phase One is because it was on a very, very tight time scale and so, the amount of work involved was very intense - the process is extremely intense.

And although very tight time scales are very restricted in the number of people that are able to be involved so, all of those people who were directly involved basically got heavily - basically spent a - had their lives dominated by this thing for the last seven months.

So, I'd like to move on from that, but if you have any comments that - particularly I'd be interested in what you think we might do in the policy committee and policy activity related to the EPDP.

And remember we'll discuss that in a Constituency Day, but to get to the operational and direct, I think we do want to add a comment from the EPDP even if it ends up being a fairly mild one. We may or may not choose to get involved in - I mean one, I think our policy comment should be guided by feelings about their organizations, basically.

So, the first step is finding out if they have strong opinions on it and (treating) to work from there. But I think very much, that just going, hi everybody, read the Phase One Report. It's only, you know - over a hundred - it's only - what is (unintelligible)?

Man 6: One hundred fifty.

David Cake: One hundred and fifty pages and wade your way through the dense legalize privacy law and just get back and, you know, give us a thumbs up. No, like, that's not going to work. So, we're going to need to work out how - we'll like identify how we can easily express concern - you know, get some feeling about concerns from members on that. You know, and then narrow it down to, you know, some very - a few questions that we can ask that won't give us a definitive answer, but it will, at least, give us an idea of whether there is some interest and what issues there is interest about. So...

Dean Marks: Sorry, it's Dean again and if I'm violating protocol because observers are only supposed to sit in the back and not say anything, please tell me. Okay?

Woman 2: (Unintelligible).

Dean Marks: Okay, well thank you. I just thought it might be interesting to the members. You had mentioned that we've (blogged), which I think is, you know, pretty short to read as opposed to up to 150 pages. That gives a very good high-level summary.

If folks were interested in what a different view is on the EPDP, there's a blog that's (Stan Hammit) did from (Mark Monitor) and I'd be happy to send it to you. It's also very short and so it could be something interesting if folks just wanted to see, you know, a different viewpoint from (Milton's).

David Cake: Actually, we were talking about exactly that. Having - putting together a few different comments on it. So, that would be really great. So, I'd be really happy if you would send that.

Dean Marks: David, I'm going to email it to you if I have your email address and you can distribute it. I mean however, you guys want me to send it to you, I'm happy to send it to you.

David Cake: Yes, that would be great.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, it's Raoul. Dean, could you maybe tell us, or do you know, of any brand issues that no - NGOs or not-for-profit organizations have? Like, sort of, in the recent years? Or have there been, like, sort of, any new developments protecting those brands on the Internet?

Dean Marks: Yes, Raoul, I wish I knew. I had thought certain organizations like Red Cross had had some issues with problems of - and I don't know for sure honestly.

David Cake: Yes, so I mean, the Red Cross and IGOs and a few other specific cases where there's already ongoing - I mean specific rules that apply to them and that, I think they're either just broader, you know, and more just - you know, rather than things like the Red Cross where there is an enormous body of very specific lore about the Red Cross and an enormous body of ICANN argument about, specifically the Red Cross.

I think it would be good to learn about the just to what extent it's an issue among general NGOs and...

Dean Marks: That's what I'm thinking.

David Cake: Yes, and which trademark - and which (unintelligible) issues are a bit of a focus for them. And I think in this case, I mean, there's an enormous amount of policy debate. I don't want to shy away from us getting involved in that if there is interest, but also just in terms of the outreach - again, I don't think a lot of NGOs are aware of a lot of the existing (unintelligible) protection mechanisms, and really understand them as well. So, you know, I think it would be really useful if you could (unintelligible).

Dean Marks: Actually, no. Basically, I don't on the Trademark issue. I would say, I think I know of some NGOs that are engaged in child protection issues, where their concerns are on access to who has data? They're not law enforcement. But they're you know, non-profit organizations that are trying to assist law enforcement and so, you know, to be really blunt, I think they're less concerned about privacy concerns - personal data privacy concerns - more concerns about how do we try and be able to quickly investigate to try and take down, you know, child sexual abuse imagery or things like that.

So, I think the interests are probably all over the place, honestly. A really interesting takeaway for me from here - which I really appreciate - is the notion that as a nonprofit organization, even if you're a legal entity, you may be involved in sensitive issues where, you know, having the protection of names and addresses can be very important in terms. And it's, honestly, something that I had not - had not even crossed my mind. So, thank you.

David Cake: Joan.

Joan (Joan Prevekerd). I have a card for you, because I need cards. So, the information goes to our very wonderful (secretariat) who will collate and then will put it back. Thanks.

David Cake: Unfortunately, I realize that we've had a really interesting discussion about EPDP, which wasn't really on the agenda. And we had - and the discussion with (Patrick) and (Jean-Jacques) went a bit overtime. So, we've got only a very few minutes left to discuss the RPM and TMCH issues. And also, any other business.

So, first I'm going to jump out and say do we have any other business that anyone wants to bring up at this point? Because, I'd rather we not cram it all into 30 seconds. No? No? (Unintelligible).

So, I want to talk about (it wouldn't be from - all over - we've mentioned our strategic agenda a number of times. If anyone has any comments they sort of, want to make about that now, that would be good. But otherwise, I think I'll just collate a number of comments made throughout the discussion and send that out.

Joan Kerr: We actually - I was approached by a couple of other - (Joan (Prevekerd)) - a couple of other constituencies that said they would also - could provide us with their high-level papers on - commentary on any issues. Is that something we should point to for the committee as well?

David Cake: Yes, absolutely. If you could follow up with that on email, because...

Joan Kerr: Yes.

David Cake: So, I going to sort of, get to the issue - and so, that thing (unintelligible) the last five minutes, I'm going to try to talk said capacity building and so on. So, what we - the plan for capacity building is, instead of looking at a specific skill set, like writing comments, or something. But to generally look at the overall - on how to we engage in the policy process?

And the idea is we'd look at a focus issue, which is the RPM working group. Which - though (Martin) isn't here he has (vast chairs) that will be able to come in and tell us what's going on in that group at each point.

And what are the issues? And then when we come to add a comment, well the idea is that we will be understanding more - when we come to add a comment, we will have a fair understanding of the issues involved but also, to guide - to talk to people about how you engage in policy work. That I can sort of, fully - with a specific example, of how you might make a contribution to the RPM Working Group.

And now, (Martin) says the main issue in the RPM sessions this afternoon is going to be the Trademark Clearing House. So, in order for people to - if people don't want to - either go to those sessions or look at the transcripts, or just talk to people about what's going on, to gather some information about the TMCH and the next meeting of the Policy Committee, we will talk about the issue and (go by) the email list. And by the next meeting we can go.

So, what happens there, what are we - how do we feel about it? Do we have a response? You know, to help that guide out (unintelligible) public development of a comment or so.

And I was going to do a very brief background on the TMCH in about the two minutes remaining. The Trademark Clearing House is essentially a database of trademarks that you voluntarily submit trademarks to. I think there is a cost involved with submitting them, which is used to fund the TMCH. It's not operated by ICANN. It's a separate contract, I think.

What it does is offer services particularly in the early phases of new gTLDs, the summarized process. If your trademark is in the clearing house, you can apply for registration of the domain before the public. So, if you want to grab your domain and your trademark and domains as soon as possible, it controversially allows a number of variances to the domain name, like misspellings and such, unrelated terms.

It also can be someone after the domain is launched applies to - I think, if a period after domain is launched, tries to register your trademark domain, it will both give them a warning that they might be violating a trademark and give you an alert that someone tried to register it. And then you're able to sort of, better protect your domain.

The controversial part is that the - a lot of the details of the TMCH were not developed through open GNSO policy processes. There was a meeting to the - there's basically, shortly before, the lead up to the new domain process,

there was a number of, sort of, suggestions or, I mean, well demands is probably really the -- from some constituencies they needed to put in more trademark protection and this is what (everyone) suggested.

There was a meeting at which these issues were discussed. There was, what was called, the Straw Man a sort of, (draft) policy, which never really went for a -- on (draft) protection which never really went for a (unintelligible). GNSO or other open community policy processes that nonetheless made it into the African Guidebook.

So, there's a controversial background. I'm sure people will talk about that. I intended (Robin) to be involved here to give a much longer summary. But the longer summary is - goes through a number of phases of appeal against the inclusion of these issues in the African Guidebook and appeal against - and you know, efforts to discover how the process happened and (unintelligible) and I think it's worth both looking at.

I will try and send three to the mailing list, a link to (Robin's) article that she wrote about it and see if I can find a sort of, counterpoint to other claims. And we can look at the issues of whether it was legitimately developed. We feel it was appropriately developed policy and then should it be changed and reviewed - or even if it wasn't, are we used to it enough by now? Have there been issues? And discuss it.

But that's probably all I have time to say on that issue, as we're 20 seconds overtime. Do we have any future, any last comments from anybody? All right. Well, I thank you all for your attendance. I think not everything - we didn't get through everything on the agenda, but on the other hand, we got a lot of other things that weren't on the agenda done. Which is really helpful actually.

So, that was great. The next meeting, we will get - we will have it - I think we will return to monthly meetings, planned to be on a Thursday night around 13

UTC. I wasn't able to do that the last meeting, but we'll, hopefully, return to that. If anyone has any questions, I will be trying to do the - probably, my feeling is at future meetings we'll do the first, at least 15 minutes, will be sort of, general policy, what has changed and ICANN sort of updates.

But either we'll look at a particular - we'll focus on one specific operational objective. So, like preparing this questionnaire about - just to get feelings from the membership about EPDP. Or we will be probably the second meeting, maybe, we will focus on a capacity building objective. Well, we already have now, one of each for the next meeting, but we'll work on that.

But the capacity building is still intended to keep following this RPM issue as an example. It does have one disadvantage which is it's quite legal. But it's, I mean, you're going to have to deal with that (unintelligible) at some points. That's what some issues are like. And if you want technical, we'll get plenty of that in the EPDP discussions.

Okay, thank you everybody. And the other issue is we still have - I've got to gage if we have interest in looking at Universal Acceptance issues, which was another one that would be a good outreach issue. It's not really - in ICANN terms, it's not technically kind of a policy issue at the moment. The policy is done. But there are a lot of efforts to continue useful work on that, including outreach.

So, that will be a good one for us to look at in adding to how (unintelligible) used. So, I'll try and get (Don Hollander) to come and talk to us at a future meeting. Thank you.

END