

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN Kobe
GNSO RySG Membership Meeting Part 2
Tuesday, 12 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>

Donna Austin: Terri are we good? I think we can start the recording. Thank you. Thanks guys. So the next session is concentrated discussion around EPDP and a number of the moving parts in relation to that.

So I'm going to hand over to Beth and she's going to take us through this session. Thanks.

Beth Bacon: Good morning everyone and I hope that you got coffee and I doubt that happened because there were a lot of people out there. If you are looking for the caffeine jolt, this session is not going to do it for you.

So basically we wanted to – we have lots of parallel and related efforts going on throughout the community with regards to data protection as well as the EPDP and the technical sides of those policy measures as well.

So we wanted to do a quick overview of what those moving parts are and we'll give everybody – you can see the broad topics listed in – on the agenda. We'll give everyone a few minutes to give us a – an update on the discrete issues and then we can have a nice discussion about resourcing and where we need to focus and where the touch points are.

In the end I would like to get out of this session some – just some increased awareness of all of the different issues that are going on as well as how they interconnect.

We can identify some EPDP team resources and that's alternates, the team as well as the support group folks who are interested in those things. I also would like to flag the IRT as an item that needs resources in the form of, you know, time and sweat and then indentified (sic) any input on major issues of concerns for Phase 2 as well as any of the other issues that we have listed on the agenda just so the folks that are leading those issues can be aware of the stakeholder group's feelings and thoughts on those and see if we are missing anything because there's a lot going on.

Right now the EPDP has some related issues. You know, there's Council IRT, team construction, roles and responsibilities, work with ICANN, Phase 2 and Phase 2 has both policy and technical considerations.

You guys are – all heard about the TSG as well. That was the effort started by Goran and has – is now going to complete in April. But – so these are all the different parts that are moving together.

I'd like to start just to throw it to Keith if I could and we'll go through the discrete issues, and then we can talk about if we've missed anything and then identify any points that need discussion. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much Beth. Hi everybody. Keith Drazek. So just did a quick update from the view of – from the Council – the GNSO Council on this topic. I think as everybody knows the GNSO Council approved the Phase 1 final reports on the 4th of March so just the week prior to arriving here in Kobe.

So the Phase 1 final report is now approved. It is out for public comments. I think it's a 42-day public comment period if I'm not mistaken and the next step will be the staff summary of the public comments submitted, and then

the Board consideration and vote on the Phase 1 final report consensus policy recommendations prior to the May 25 expiration of the temporary specification.

So just a note of thanks obviously to the entire EPDP staff and leadership, but particularly our Registry Stakeholder Group and Contracted Party colleagues who committed such incredible amount of time and commitment and sacrifice to be able to deliver that, and what I think from a Contracted Party perspective and Registry perspective was a very favorable outcome from Phase 2 - sorry, from Phase 1, recognizing that there were some components of the Phase 1 work that have been pushed to Phase 2.

So just to – wanted to note that. Now looking ahead the Council has made the decision that we are not going to reopen the charter, which includes both Phase 1 and Phase 2.

We believe that the charter for this EPDP Working Group is still fit for purpose but the Council will be working closely with the EPDP members' team current Acting Chair which is Rafik Dammak, one of the GNSO Vice Chairs as well, to ensure that if there are questions about scoping or if there needs to be any sort of clarification or further guidance that the GNSO Council's prepared to engage in that, and so we'll be having those conversations at the Council level as well.

Obviously there is going to be a transition of the chair. Kurt Pritz has announced that he's stepping down from the chair duties following Phase 1 understandably so.

Thanks again Kurt for all of your sacrifice and time and effort in that as well. So we have – the Council has issued a call for expressions of interest for a chair for Phase 2.

The deadline for responses to that is currently March 22 so not very far off, and the Council expects and hopes to be able to appoint a new chair for Phase 2 by April 18, which is the April GNSO Council meeting.

If we get, you know, a perfectly qualified candidate and it's clear and we're able to accelerate that then we have the ability to make that appointment prior to the 18th of April, but that's sort of the timeframe that we're working on right now. Donna yes.

Donna Austin: Thanks Keith. Donna Austin. So what's your Plan B if you don't have expressions of interest from people you think are qualified to do the work?

Keith Drazek: Thanks Donna. Good question. We have the opportunity and/or the option to extend the deadline and to continue to try to find qualified candidates, and in that event Rafik would continue to act as the Chair.

And for everybody's benefit and when a GNSO PDP is established and chartered there's a recognition that there's not always going to be a chair from Day 1, and the GNSO operating procedures essentially say that the GNSO Council liaison to the PDP would be the acting chair in that circumstance and that's essentially the case here.

We have Rafik who is the GNSO Council Liaison to the EPDP as well as having been appointed the Vice Chair, so he's I think perfectly capable and well-positioned to act as the chair until such time we can find the next appropriate candidate.

I know Rafik does not want the job full-time and so – and it's in everybody's interest obviously to identify the permanent chair as soon as possible because the chair obviously has a, you know, a strong hand in determining the work plan and all of the things that come next and I'll get to that in a moment. Beth go ahead.

Beth Bacon: Thanks Keith. There's been some kind of scuttlebutt about the option of finding a paid chair and paid neutral chair is what I've determined I'm hearing, so where is the Council on that?

Is – are we allowed to do that? I mean, do we have concerns with regards to precedent for that sort of a – an action?

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Beth. Good question. That's actually not something that's been discussed at the Council yet anyway. I've heard people suggest that that might be a consideration or would be necessary or welcome.

I think I wouldn't necessarily rule it out at this stage. This is an important bit of work and we obviously need the most qualified candidate possible. But I think our strong preference would be to find somebody from the community who, you know, can obviously act neutrally and be viewed as neutral and fair and even-handed, but also have sort of a strong hand on the tiller and be able to, you know, bring the group – the group's work to a timely conclusion.

So I know that there's – and this is an important time here in Kobe frankly where we should all be talking to one another and to folks who we think would be good and qualified candidates so we have a good pool of folks to choose from.

The process just for everybody for selecting the next chair will fall to myself as Council Chair, the two vice chairs, the rest of the leadership team which would be Pam Little from the Registrars and Rafik Dammak from NCSG in addition to the leadership of our Standing Selection Committee.

So there's a group of five or six – Maxim is there a chair and vice chair or two vice chairs of this SSC? Okay so three altogether.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. It's chair and two vice chairs.

Keith Drazek: Great. So essentially we – there's six of us who will work as a team to review the applications and the statements of interest - expressions of interest, and we'll then from that make a recommendation to Council for the appointment of the chair.

It's a little bit unique in this situation where typically working group chairs are selected by the working group members. In this particular case because of the unique circumstances related to this EPDP and the urgency of the temporary specification, the Council decided last year that the Council would be responsible for appointing the chair and that's currently the way it's still structured in the charter so that – that's the process moving forward.

Any other questions on that? And then I'll just note – so that's – and I'll wrap up here with this because I know this sort of leads into or segues into the next discussion.

The view of Council and my view as Chair is that we had the EPDP Phase 1 with an externally imposed deadline right. The temporary specification created a 12-month window within which Phase 1 had to be concluded.

That doesn't exist for Phase 2. There is no externally imposed deadline at this time but the view of Council is this has been a single PDP and there is an urgency to all of it right.

And so we had an externally imposed deadline, very unique, but this is an urgent situation and the Council's view is that, you know, we need to move forward as expeditiously as possible recognizing that the pace and intensity of Phase 1 is unsustainable.

But I think we as Contracted Parties and Registries need to recognize that there, you know, there are pressures across the community to continue to work hard and to deliver in as timely a fashion as possible so that is the view of Council.

The question now is how does the EPDP team develop its work plan to achieve that right? And I think that gets into what we're going to talk about next.

I want to note just real quick that, you know, we're starting to hear I think some, you know, I don't want to say rumors but, you know, some indications that ICANN is concerned about the viability of a uniform access model, their so-called hub and spoke approach where ICANN would take on the sole controllership function and assume all of the liability of Contracted Parties.

I think we may be hearing in the relatively near future that ICANN has made the assessment that that's unlikely to survive and that we may need to be looking at sort of a, you know, how else can we achieve a standardized system for access or disclosure to nonpublic data that is something perhaps other than ICANN being that central sole data controller?

So we need to be thinking creatively and constructively as we go into Phase 2 of, you know, if for some reason a so-called UAM with ICANN at the center isn't going to work then what comes next? Thanks.

Beth Bacon: Does anybody have further questions for Keith? We're going to get into a lot of the fun stuff that he's alluded to at the end in the next few sessions. And good?

Okay so I just – before I throw it to Alan and Marc big thank you to Marc and Alan and Cristina who's not here but you guys can let her know that we said thank you – have done ridiculously amazing work on Phase 1 and it was not fun.

And basically they've had no lapse for the last eight months so really appreciate all of that, and leading into that as well we're going to have a little bit of a discussion on who wants to continue.

I could not dime you out. I think that Alan and Cristina and Marc are happy to continue on Phase 1 and Cristina has said she's going to come back. Yes?

Man: Yes.

Beth Bacon: Okay we're – well now she is. We're going to make her. Guys you heard it here first. Cristina's coming back. So then we'll have to decide, you know, how we shift the alternate's construction of the team itself, and then all of the support group folks who've also been really active thank you so much and hope you guys are willing and ready to continue in those roles.

We can get more into the weeds on that later. The EPDP right now - just some highlights. The – Alan's going to go over the status and some of the timeline feelings and maybe the scope of Phase 2 as well.

And then I think Marc and Alan and I can give you a flavor for some of the positions of the other parties as well as some of our anticipated roadblocks and challenges so I'll throw it to Alan.

Alan Woods: Thank you Beth. Alan Woods for the record and obviously I just want to point out as well that an awful lot of work in the background as done by Beth as well and she stepped in at the last moment to when Cristina had to take a leave of absence so thank you very much to Beth as well.

So yes to give kind of the current status obviously we're now in – starting and looking into Phase 2 and after the down period of a whole was it three weeks, which we took very happily.

The meeting I suppose with the pushback of the GNSO vote probably led us somewhat into a situation of what were we going to do in Kobe? And we started out Saturday just effectively trying to feel out all the different stakeholder groups and SGs and as well as ACs and try and just figure out

where we all stood at the beginning of Phase 2 and where we would like to see Phase 2 go.

It, I mean, it – it's very clear. I think there was probably an unfortunate mix with the TSG at the time that the timing sort of seemed to cause a bit of confusion, where the TSG seems to be put out there as a model that we should be attaining as opposed to something which was a proof of concept.

But I think we – we've discussed that and we talked to that well and we've – we're very clear that the TSG was based on a certain amount of assumptions, assumptions which may not necessarily be correct.

This is how the model could look and I think that was – we have to get past that and for those of you who attended the high intersession yesterday that was, you know, represented up on one side of the board as a – an aspirational type of model.

But, you know, so we need to start at the beginning and that was - the very important thing about Phase 2 is that Phase 1 is now complete. We left that with the Board and public comments and if it comes back to us it comes back to us but hopefully it doesn't.

But we need to start at the very beginning and figure out what is our plan of work, and I think that leads directly into the suggestion that people are trying to put a time limit on this.

We understand the urgency of it and we understand how important it is for us to do this, but unless we know what our plan of work is going to be it's very hard to set that timeline.

We all are committed to continue working as diligently and as quickly as possible on this, but we have all seen the effects of what happened when we have a – well not – a timeline which is not artificial.

It was just a hard stop timeline. You know, it caused consternation at the very end and we want to avoid doing something quickly and causing problems at the end, and actually take a good measured approach within a realistic timeframe but still accepting that there is urgency.

And I think what we all seemed to agree was that we can set a timeline, but at the same time during the process as we continue on with our work we would be able to have a review and say, "Okay realistically are we going to meet that timeline or are we going to come up against a wall?"

And I think there was a lot of the discussion on Saturday – kind of agreed with that that people were – agreed it was punishing for a time at the end there. There was a lot of meetings and a lot of thoughts and it's not just the meetings.

Of course it's the work in between the meetings and making sure that you're prepared for the next and that you go back to the SG and try and get consensus.

So I think that is the – one of the first takeaways from Saturday's meeting was that we all accept that, you know, we do need to do this with some priority but we cannot push ourselves into the same position that we found in the initial parts of Phase 1.

With regards to other status as well we keep talking about the universal access which is – now we're hoping to try and get into a concept of universal disclosure.

There are also outstanding issues that were pushed from Phase 1 and just to give you a color as to what those were, that is the additional purposes and Recommendation 2 was pushed to Phase 2.

The PPSAI and discussions regarding what should be published from a PPSAI point of view was pushed to Phase 2. Data retention was another matter that was pushed to Phase 2.

However, that is something that is very much so within ICANN Org's court because it is for them to do their own data audit and then to tell us, "Okay we wouldn't necessarily need you to retain data for X amount of time."

But again that is much more a registrar issue for our colleagues and we in the Registry Stakeholder Group have always supported as best as possible our registrar colleagues on that because, you know, we – what happens and what affects them will potentially and most likely affect us in a very similar manner.

And then the city reduction point – that's Recommendation 11, another matter that was pushed to Phase 2 because there wasn't a very clear-cut agreement on that.

So again these are all things that are in addition to universal access slash disclosure model. We will be talking about additional issues that were just pushed from Phase 1.

You know, some of them are still remaining to be somewhat contentious but again, you know, and I think one of the feelings was, you know, was there a – and somebody said this to me yesterday from another stakeholder group and they said, "Do you think that there is a damage in the relationship between as a result of what happened?"

And I think the answer to that is no of course not because we all go back to our stakeholder groups and we will follow what our stakeholder groups say. They were put into a difficult position, and Phase 2 begins and we will continue on as we always have in good faith and try and get through this exceptionally thorny and difficult legal and technical issue continuously.

So, you know, but also what we did suggest for the resources is that we – if we had the team building type day and I think that would be great. That, you know, we had a long fraught period of time and then the resources - if we can just actually have some sort of a team building event just to bring us all back together in advance of Phase 2 because again, you know, nerves were frayed as a result of tiredness, impending deadlines and everything such as that.

So I thought that was – and that was a call that came actually from the GAC reps as well from Lauren Kapin and I – we are happy to agree. There – the last thing I would say that was outstanding because clearly I caused a child to cry – I’ve made them sad.

I’m so sorry. The last thing then is we have a few outstanding legal issues so we had Byrd & Byrd come in and provide us with some really good guidance. So there was questions posed by the – a legal sub team that were sent to outside legal counsel and say, “Okay these are sticky issues that we have. Can you give us a legal opinion on this?”

And we as the stakeholder group – or not stakeholder group, the team will review that. Now we have not had a real opportunity to actually review them in great detail yet as a PDP team so that is the next thing.

We’re going to take them, we’re going to review them and see where they will lead us as well, and then also rely big time on Byrd & Byrd going forward because they’ve given us very, very good - maybe not conclusive but gave us clarity on some of those issues. So that’s where we currently are at the moment and I will toss it back.

Beth Bacon: All right. Have – Keith has a question and then I want to throw it to Marc as well to add anything that he’s – that we may have missed. Thank you for

basically just outlining the scope of what we have ahead of us, and we'll get into some other - more details.

You mentioned the TSG. Yes way to jump ahead - making me cry too. And then we're going to talk about – we'll talk about those – the policy and the technical issues surrounding that but Keith...

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks and thanks Alan. Yes it was – it struck me that the crying started just as you mentioned the GAC reps. I'm not sure what that was all about. No just joking.

Actually the – there's a maternity station or a nursing station right outside the room here so that's what that was. So I just wanted to talk – you mentioned the tent – the timelines and deadlines and I didn't mention that but I would – I'd like to.

The Council's view also is that while it's urgent, imposing an arbitrary or artificial deadline would be a mistake. So whatever deadline we come up with or you the EPDP comes up with needs to be based on a – an informed work plan that can be scoped appropriately for time, hours committed, resources, staff resources, I mean, there's a number of components to that consideration. Thanks.

Beth Bacon: Does anyone have any other questions before we – Marc do you want to add anything?

Marc Anderson: Thanks Beth. Marc Anderson. You know, I just – I do want to add that – and one of the, you know, there are a number of unique things about this EPDP. One of the unique aspects of it was that, you know, we as members of the working group were asked to represent our stakeholder group specifically, which is a little bit different than how other working groups are typically done.

And that was a new experience for me but being able to work as part of a team, working with Cristina, Alan, Beth, the other alternates and our support team many of whom are in this room was really a difference maker I think for us.

And, you know, in addition to just within the registries we were also able to establish a really good working relationship with our registrar colleagues, and that ended up being a very successful collaboration as the working group pressed on.

And so, you know, that to me was a really, you know, positive experience and I wanted to sort of take a moment to reflect on that and, you know, and thank everybody who participated, who got on support calls, provided feedback - input and really helped, you know, helped us as your representatives do the best job we could representing the Registry Stakeholder Group on this working group so thank you for that.

Getting back to, you know, the EPDP I, you know, I think, you know, Alan did a really good job sort of covering where we are. You know, it sort of struck me as I was listening to Alan's update that we're really in a transition phase.

You know, we finished our Phase 1 report and we're transitioning to Phase 2, and Beth's going to talk next about the IRT but we heard from Dennis who'll be the ICANN staff person assigned to the IRT.

So we're going to have to figure out how to implement what we did in Phase 1 and so that's coming up. And we're also going to have to figure out how we're going to proceed - develop a work plan, a pace and operating principles for how we're going to proceed in Phase 2.

And on top of that we - as Keith mentioned we need to identify a new chair. So the working group really finds itself in a transition phase as we roll from Phase 1 to Phase 2.

It has provided a little bit of a welcome downtime for some of us who – who've been putting a lot of hours in, but it also gives us an opportunity to think about how we want to proceed with Phase 2, identify the issues that are really important to registries that we need to make sure we get coming out of Phase 2, identify the things that we need to have in Phase 2 recommendations and the things we want to make sure don't go into a Phase 2 recommendation, and so being able to identify what those things are, set our priorities as a stakeholder group and be able to have guidance to the representatives on that group to help us know what are the issues we need to push for and fight against as this Phase 2 wraps up.

So, you know, so again, you know, so for me, you know, I just want to highlight, you know, having the support group, you know, all of you who participated and that gave us guidance and helped us, you know, get to a Phase 1 outcome that was acceptable to us – that was greatly appreciated and important to us but, you know, we'd ask again.

You know, Phase 2 is coming up and so, you know, we're going to need that same level of support, guidance and help as we get through these Phase 2 issues.

So I know we have IRT and other Phase 2 items so I'll throw it back to you Beth.

Beth Bacon: All right, thanks guys. Sam you had a comment you wanted to make.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks Beth. This is Sam. I just – Marc talking about this being a period of transition – I did just want to note that, you know, at the ExCom we're thinking about things like resourcing but we - also I think this is a good moment to try to get some feedback from you guys as our members to make sure that because this is a representational PDP that you guys are getting the updates and the information that you need, and that you feel like you have

the opportunity to provide input and make sure that your voices and interests are sufficiently heard and represented.

So Phase 1 – it all started and spun up very, very quickly. I think we have a little bit of an opportunity here to maybe make some adjustments to the way we provide updates or the cadence of, you know, information sharing.

So just wanted to note that at the ExCom level we're very open to hearing the feedback from members because, you know, the – this really excellent team here is working on your behalf not just on our own behalf so please just let us know if you have any thoughts on this.

Beth Bacon: And keep in mind also it won't be quite the deluge and pace that you were getting in Phase 1 one hopes. Does anyone have any questions on EPDP Phase 2? What the progress is right now? Do you all have – do you want to flag some issues? Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks Beth. Donna Austin. So (Krista) - I think Keith might've mentioned that or Beth. I'm not sure. So who does the summary analysis for the Board on the pub – on the – their public comment process? Do you know?

Beth Bacon: So you mean who from staff does the summary?

Donna Austin: Yes.

Beth Bacon: I would believe it's Marika, Berry and Caitlin. They're a stat – they're the staff who have been working on the EPDP so I would imagine – what?

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: Where's Berry?

((Crosstalk))

Beth Bacon: Hey Berry.

Donna Austin: All right, thank you.

Beth Bacon: And I will – now that I see that Berry’s in the room we said thank you to our team. Really the – we would not have a Phase 1 report without Berry and Marika and Caitlin.

They have been amazing as usual but really above and beyond. Kurt I’m sure you can also attest they’ve been incredibly helpful, always on the ball, never, you know, they’ve only screamed at us once or twice.

You know, and, you know, no they’ve been delightful and taken a lot of hits with a lot of grace, and we really appreciate all your hard work and we wouldn’t have made it without you so thanks and please it on to Marika and Caitlin.

A little clap for you guys all right. (Unintelligible). It won’t be weird when you walk up to Marika and just be like, “This is from the registries.” All right, so we will – if there’s no more questions on EPDP let’s – itself we’ll move on to IRT and roles and responsibilities as you can see here.

It seems like a - strange bedfellows for a – for an agenda item but after Phase 1 right now as Keith mentioned the – you voted. It went to – the report went to the Board.

It’s out for – it’s currently out for public comment and following the Board’s acceptance crossed fingers of the Phase 1 report we’ll – they will then charter an IRT, an Implementation Review Team.

Is that Implementation Review Team? Yes IRT and in my view this has been kind of more important almost than Phase 2 just simply because we've done all of this work on Phase 1 and now it will go to review team.

And if those recommendations that we've spent months and months hammering out are interpreted not quite correctly or something is implemented – decided to be implemented in a way that changes the spirit or direction of a recommendation, it can change the agreement for all – and possibly the legality with regards to GDPR of those policy recommendations, and quite frankly it could impact registry and registrar's ability to flexibly and – flexibly apply these recommendations to your business models.

The IRT is going to handle a lot of issues. Some of them will be purely IRT which means registries - registrars, those other folks that have - other preshies (sic) that have participated on the EPDP Phase 1 will be involved in those.

And then there are a few recommendations that are - purely direct ICANN to engage with Contracted Parties and those are the ones that are to do with anything that would touch our agreements.

We were very clear in the EPDP that those items should not and cannot be discussed with the whole group simply because it would bring a third party into a contract that they're not a party to so that's not – it's a deal breaker for us.

So part of the IRT is going to be parsing out those issues, what – who is involved in which of those issues and then getting to work, and making sure that the good work that the staff has already done -- the good work that we have already done -- is implemented in a way that is true to the goal of the actual recommendations.

I'm going to pause before I get to roles and responsibilities and see if you guys have some questions. I also see Dennis in the back of the room so if you want to just, you know, hit him hard go for it. Go ahead Donna and then Marc.

Donna Austin: Thanks Beth. Donna Austin. So IRT's Implementation Review Team - if we've got any new folks in the room and that's a secondary process to the – once recommendations are approved by the Board the usual process is that staff are directed to implement the recommendations.

The effort is led by staff so that's Dennis Chang as I understand it and then there is a call for volunteers I think to populate the review team. So I guess my question here is, is that process going to change at all given the sensitivities around the EPDP?

And also the recommendations that are intended to be direct negotiations between Contracted Parties and ICANN – I'm just wondering whether - maybe we can talk to Becky about this whether - when the Board approves the recommendations whether there's a possibility to pull those recommendations out in some way or highlight them in some way that they are to be negotiations rather than, you know, part of the overall implementation so make that distinction and make it quite clear so that – because, you know, as you say the risk is that the policy discussion will be related – is generally rigid (sic) or, you know, whatever during the IRT phase and we want to try to avoid that.

So just kind of thinking outside the box whether that's something we could potentially, you know, ask the question anyway.

Beth Bacon: Yes thanks Donna. So when I said, you know, first we'll part – we'll kind of parse out the issues that's exactly what I think we need to do is go through and say, "You know, notice – notify – identify the items that are IRT," and that it could be those – that full set of volunteers and then those items that are,

you know, the recommendations where they say, "We direct the – direct ICANN to engage with the CPH on this," and see if – how we manage those two streams to do exactly what you're saying. So I will also say I think Dennis also bailed.

Man: Yes.

Beth Bacon: I would too guys. So I think I will – I think the flexibility and understanding, you know, the IRT has guidelines but it's – always seems to be a little bit different every time.

So I think getting that nailed down is really important and I will happily take the task to walk that through with Dennis and get some more information and come back to you guys. Marc?

Marc Anderson: Thanks Beth. Marc Anderson. I think there's a lot to unravel on this IRT step and, you know, Beth touched on one of the things that I think is important. You know, with the frantic pace I think especially at the end one of the, you know, one of the byproducts of that is the language is not nearly as, you know, as firm or, you know, as fleshed out as I think a normal EPD, you know, a normal PDP's recommendations would be.

And so the risk there is that, you know, with the language not as firm or fleshed out or as wordsmithed maybe as we would like it to be, having focus on the implementation phase is doubly important.

Obviously it's something for any PDP that we need to pay attention to and make sure staff is implementing the policy recommendations as was intended but here, you know, because of the frantic pace and, you know, the fact that we sort of ran out of time to wordsmith things as well as we maybe would've liked to, I think this becomes particularly important and something we need to make sure is on our radar and we're paying close attention to.

The other thing I think is, you know, I want to sort of highlight here is that, you know, with the IRT I think, you know, Donna sort of started to touch on this a little bit.

You know, staff is – and, you know, staff is given the task of implementing the policy and they form an IRT to invite – advise them on the process of doing that but the recommendations that came out of the working group are very – are varied in their nature.

Not all the recommendations that we made are going to result in implementable policy. Some of them are recommendations to the Board for things the Board should, or, sorry, the GNSO Council should take a look at and do.

Some of them are as Beth and Donna mentioned recommendations that contracts need to be updated, and some of them are recommendations that will result in actual policy language.

And so the first step that, you know, Dennis is undertaking - and we got a short briefing from Dennis on Saturday and we're going to have another session on Wednesday where we're going to talk in a little bit more detail about implementation of the Phase 1 recommendations.

But what we're going to – what the – that first step is to identify what are all the actionable items for GDD staff to implement? And so that'll be sort of the first step for us to look at, "Okay what is that list of items and is that, you know, do we agree with that?"

Is that, you know, is that the correct list of items that need to be implemented? What are all the action items?" So I think it's, you know, I think it's really important that we pay attention to what's going on in this IRT phase.

We need to make sure that, you know, the intent of the recommendations is adhered to and that we – and we make sure the implementation, you know, is done, you know, sort of in an open and transparent way that ends up with recommendations or policy language that we're comfortable with.

One last note I guess - and apologies for dragging this one out but one last note is there is - typically an IRT is formed after the Board approves a – approves the policy and directs GDD staff to implement it.

In the working group – in the working group's recommendations there was a recommendation that sort of - an informal IRT to be formed ahead of time noting sort of the time crunch to get these policy recommendations implemented.

And that's, you know, that's why we're starting to have these IRT conversations here in Kobe rather than to wait until Board approves them, so our GDD staff led by Dennis has recognized that recommendation and is looking at what he can do ahead of time to get the ball rolling.

So that's a little bit of a different wrinkle that we're seeing with these policy recommendations. Thank you.

Beth Bacon: Thanks Marc. Does anyone have any other questions with regards to just the kind of brass tacks of an IRT and what we have ahead of us with regards to maybe seeking some participation?

If you would – do have an interest please let Donna, Sam or myself or Jonathan or Sue know - anyone up here.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Any important one?

Beth Bacon: Anyone. So if you have any interest in the IRT it – or in addition to the – being on the EB team – EPDP support team or any of the – any of these working groups please let us know.

There's not necessarily going to be official call for interest at this point -- I don't know -- until the IRT asks for it, but it would be really good to be able to gauge who's willing and able and supported and has the time so we can start kind of doling out responsibilities or at least mapping out who's going to be the most tired.

So I'll move in – Marc alluded a bit to this with the pre-IRT work. It started - perhaps you guys were on the Registry Stakeholder Group call. Becky Burr noted that the ICANN Board as well as Goran had an interest in starting these discussions with us and, you know, to make this - as painless as possible the transition from recommendations into an IRT and then into, you know, the different policies and actions that come out of the recommendations. They understand that there's an appetite for continued expediency with regards to the EPDP final report recommendations across the community and they don't want to - they would like that to go smoothly.

So when we say roles and responsibilities, that is one of the efforts that has come out of that desire from ICANN Board. And what it is, is they reach out to the ExCom of the registries of the registrars.

And we started to do essentially a data audit of the registry and registrar and ICANN data flows, which was discussed and done a bit in the EPDP but not necessarily to the extent that we would have liked or that we need in order to go ahead and make the potential changes to our agreements that will come out of the recommendations of the final report.

The foundation of that will be identifying the roles and responsibilities of each of the contracted parties and ICANN. And the foundation of that is to understand who has the data and what they do with it.

So the roles and responsibilities effort we've gone through it with a small team and started working on that. We are, you know, there was some question as to whether getting started a little bit with ICANN and others, mostly Dan Halloran's team, would be seen as jumping the gun on the EPDP process.

But because it's very foundational work, I think that that concern is not one that we need to get too worried about simply because it is foundational. It's going to be a living document. It can change. It can be amended as we work with ICANN, as the IRT goes through its work.

But it certainly will feed into operational as in several of the recommendations that are - impact our agreement or could impact our agreements. I'm going to stop for questions and then we move on a little bit. You guys are just scintillated.

So I want to also say thank you to the small group. We've had some folks working on this chart for several months now in bits and starts, squeezing it in in between PDP work and, you know, small crying sessions. So I really appreciate everyone who's given their time and their expertise to this. We'll certainly be able to share it around once we work with ICANN.

So the plan there is to identify again the roles and responsibilities of each party as that would be foundational to any sort of a -- I'm not going to say ACA but it's ACA -- for our contract so that we can have identified roles and responsibilities and apportion the liability appropriately from GDPR amongst the parties. Does anyone have any questions on how this will work? Okay. Rubens thanks.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl. If ICANN is unwilling to name its JCA, what else they could name it?

Beth Bacon: We've been going as ham sandwich.

Woman1: (Unintelligible).

Beth Bacon: Yes. Yes. So basically there's just some sensitivity about calling it a JCA but with ICANN and some of the contracted parties. So we are going with - it is identifying the roles and responsibilities so that we can correctly apportion a liability that might come as a controller or processor.

So also we're going to - we've started these conversations here at ICANN and we've got ICANN taking a look at some of this - our preliminary work. And we're going to continue to work on that. We have a session on Thursday so we can report back to see how that goes and just give you a flavor for what the timeline will be for this.

The goal is to have something - and again, this can be a living document. It will amend and change a bit. But have the nuts and bolts of it in place by the time the IRT is chartered so that it can feed into that work and be a supplement and really help folks hit the ground running. Donna, did you have...

Donna Austin: Just one.

Beth Bacon: Did I read your mind? Okay. So I want to move - we have Phase 2. We've covered a lot of the policy parts of this. But I would like to put Marc on the spot and have him talk about the more technical aspects that we're going to have to tackle in Phase 2.

One of these things is the TSG; if we have some time after, we can dig in more on what the TSG is and what some of the policy concerns are that we think might be a roadblock.

Keith let us know that ICANN is rapidly losing confidence in it, which makes me really happy. So I think that there's some movement there. And we can get into that after. But Marc, do you want to go over the technical nuts and bolts?

Marc Anderson: Absolutely. Thanks Beth. Marc Anderson for the transcript. You know, looking at this and within the tech ops group we've had a lot of conversations about the interplay between some of the different initiatives that are going on.

And I think that's really what this update is for is just to sort of give everybody here a flavor for some of the things that are going on, how they interact and, you know, what the impacts, ramifications are to us as registry operators.

So there are a number of moving parts. You know, I was listening to the TSG session yesterday and I, you know, I came away from that thinking that this is just one piece in the big puzzle that is this GDPR future RDDS solution that we're trying to get to.

And so I'll start with that one. The TSG Group, the Technology Services Group is something that was put together to - as a (Yuron)'s initiative to come up with a technical solution to how a unified access model could be implemented.

And in part it was intended to prove that RDAP could be a solution for the technical challenges that were faced in a post-GDPR world. And so that's what the TSG Group went off and did. They created a model for how a UAM could be implemented realizing that they didn't have policy to base that on.

And what that meant is essentially they were developing a technical model without requirements, which depending on the engineer you asked that's either their dream or their nightmare, you know. Yes. Maxim's shaking his head over there. Maxim, you want to go?

Maxim Alboza: It's choice in where you have to have the technical requirements before you start creation of the - I'd say design of data flow, where data comes from, what happens to it, who touched it, where it goes next.

And if you design a system for that before you have the structure, basically just waste time and money at the best. Or you have something you cannot change. You sometimes cannot add modules. It's a nightmare from technical perspective.

Marc Anderson: Thanks Maxim. That's a real good point. And I might - I'm looking over at Alan because I'm going to try and put him on the spot here. But I think when I - I think he'll understand why in a second. Because what I think Maxim's hinting at is one of the things we never did as a working group is do a proper data impact assessment.

And it's something that was brought up multiple times and this may be closer to Alan's wheelhouse than mine. But if I could throw it over to you, you know, I think that's a good segue to talk for a second about a data impact assessment and why that might be important to us.

Alan Woods: Thank you. Alan for the record. I'm going to have to say ironically EPDP stuff was happening at a back channel there and I didn't listen. So Marc, could you just ask the question one more time? Apologies.

Maxim Alzoba: Yes. Short version. The technical study groups comes with something for which in reality you have to have the data flow design before you start implementation.

If you design something on the basis of something which is not compatible, which was in reality required, you have software solution or maybe the - you have description of software solution, which is users. You spend time and money and most probably you will not be able to change it. So that was my (question).

Alan Woods: Thank you. And apologies for that. Yes. Absolutely. So and this is the way we approached it. I think we had a quick chat before the TSG session. And the TSG were given a task based on assumptions.

And, you know, at its highest, as I said earlier, it was a proof of concept. Given a policy when created, can we create something in the system that would support whatever would come through? And it was based on a lot of assumptions.

And I suppose when I first read that, all of the assumptions were alarm bells to me because the assumptions - a lot of the assumptions were patently false and would never be legally acceptable to be perfectly honest. But that's okay. That's what they were given and that's what they went and they did from a technical point of view.

So to Marc's point about the DPIA, yes, absolutely. What we need to do is we need to come up with a policy from beginning to end. And this is something that I raised on Saturday that our goals for Phase 2 and even looking back over on Phase 1 perhaps, this was at the - the NCSG actually raised it but a DPIA of Phase 1 as well.

But we should present Phase 2 in the form of a data protection impact assessment. Because what we need is some sort of a clarity or a guidance, not a statement of whether or not we are right or we are wrong but from a data protection authority.

Up until now the approach of the data protection authorities and the Europe Data Protection Board has been what I kept on calling the begging ball approach in the sense of this is something I made. Can you tell me am I right? That will never wash with them.

So what we need to do is use the GDPR. It's written clearly in Article 36 that there is a process for a prior consultation. Once we go through the phases and we present them with this is what we are planning to do, could you give us an indication as to whether or not this was likely if implement well to be on the right side of the GDPR; not whether it's compliant but are you going to have an issue with this?

And that is what they would look at in an audit. So, yes, I think that is a very important thing. Okay. Thank you.

Marc Anderson: Thanks Alan and Maxim. You know, that's a real good point. And, you know, if we had done that from the get go, right, that would have - that would have been excellent input to the TSG Group for them to be able to have, you know, proper assumptions and be able to, you know, I think develop a better model but something we can look for or remedy in Phase 2.

Beth Bacon: Yes. Thanks. I just wanted to add two sentences to that. The DPIA part of - I mean you can think of that as part of doing that is doing a data flows analysis. And that is what we're going to try and do in roles and responsibilities. We're charting that out now so that we can lessen the pain and not have to re-litigate this as we go through implementation.

So I just wanted to note that that is something that we're trying to do even though it didn't get done in Phase 1 to maybe the extent that we might have needed. Thanks.

Marc Anderson: Agreed. Thank you Beth. So we have these puzzle pieces. We have the work of the TSG Group. We have this UAM concept. You know, Keith talked a little bit about that.

And, you know, as Alan mentioned, you know, we've already started discussing this not in terms of unified access model but so much as a

disclosure model, a method for disclosure of non-public registration data for those with a legitimate purpose or legitimate need to access that data.

And then we've got a tool, RDAP. And part of what the TSG Group did in their work was proof out that RDAP was indeed the tool to suit the purposes of, you know, of, you know, the community; not just contracted parties who have to provide the service but those that rely on the service for their legitimate needs in order to access that data.

And I, you know, I know we have a - we have a session and I'm trying to be cognizant of the fact that (Rick)'s going to give us an RDAP pilot update later. So I don't want to steal any of his thunder. So we'll hear a little bit more about where RDAP is and what the (implementations) are on that in a little bit.

But, you know, these are all pieces of the puzzle that we're trying to put together in sort of the right order to come up with a, you know, a solution in this post GDPR world.

And we need to have, you know, the right combination of, you know, of policy, technical capability. And, you know, I want to use the word legal certainty but I don't think we're going to get legal certainty but some level of legal assurance that what we're doing is, you know, is reasonable in this post GDPR world.

So I think again, you know, to me it's, you know, all of these, you know, all of these puzzle pieces need to come together. And our focus during Phase 2 and in conjunction with that the implementation of Phase 1 IRT recommendations will be really trying to put together this puzzle in the right order.

So hopefully that gives you a little bit of a taste of what, you know, what these specific pieces are and how they relate to, you know, the work of the EPDP,

how it impacts Phase 2 and (also) registry operators. Happy to answer any questions on any of these.

Beth Bacon: I just learned that there's - we're going to get I think 15 minutes on RDAP, the implementation later on in the session. Donna's laughing. So...

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: I'm laughing because we've got four items that up to an hour but we've only got 45 minutes to squeeze them in. So that's my bad math. But...

Beth Bacon: In which case, have at it because we've got a little bit of time.

Donna Austin: Yes.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the transcript. A question to EPDP Team. Am I right that the biggest challenge -- sorry, (I'm reading), sorry -- that the biggest challenge is going to be to identify which legal concerns from the point of view of community are legal concerns, which are legal from the point of view of European DPAs?

For example, large part of community thinks that the - what they think is legal, not necessarily is compliant with what GDPR says about it.

Beth Bacon: I think we can spend an hour on that answer. That's absolutely right. There's - one of the main - I mean that's what we've been kind of knocking our heads against the entire Phase 1 and I'm sure we'll continue in Phase 2.

It's differing interpretations of the law. There are parts of the community that are just have - they have a certain end in mind that they know what they want and what they say they need. And they would like the contracted parties very much to, you know, bend their compliance with the law in order to provide that.

And what we're trying to do is find a happy balance where everyone actually gives up a little bit but everyone's not - no one's breaking the law. But it's in the end we are the liable folks because we're the ones processing, collecting, disclosing, you know, these are our businesses.

So that's right. I think it's a constant circle. I don't think it's going to go away in Phase 2 and certainly it's probably going to intensify a bit. Phase 1 identified the aggregate - the new aggregate minimum dataset.

However, Phase 2 is going to make use of that in saying well what can I have, you know, when I'm a third party and I request it. You know, which ones can I have? Which ones can I have in combination? So it's going to be a challenge of kind of going over that again and saying what do you need, what do you actually need, you know, and how can I get that to you.

Marc Anderson: I want to - agreed. And I want to expand on that a little bit. You know, I think, you know, in Phase 1 for me the focus was compliance with GDPR. You know, that was certainly, you know, from our perspective the priority.

In Phase 2 it's about access or disclosure, if you will, of the non-public registration data. And I think, you know, for me the challenge there is we've been tasked in our charter to identify what are the policy recommendations that are needed in order to accomplish disclosure of non-public registration data.

And I've played this out in my head. You know, I'm not sure, you know, if you try and put those words together, how do you write, you know, put words on paper that accomplish that?

And I think that's really, you know, the challenge that we're going to be facing is how do we - how do we put words together? How do we write out the words that accomplish that goal of writing the policy recommendations

necessary to accomplish access to non-public registration data, you know, where there's a legitimate basis for accessing that data?

You know, and for me I think that's the big challenge we're going to be facing in Phase 2. Alan.

Beth Bacon: Did you - Alan, you hand - okay.

Alan Woods: Yes. Just Alan Woods for the record. Very small comment. In the normal world this concept of disclosure is for each individual company, each individual controller, each individual processor to an extent.

The difficulty for us is that the community things that we should all just do this collectively for the ease of another party. And that is a very difficult thing to get over because of this community idea.

So, you know, we have a lot of work to get people to that way of thought as well. So bring it on again. I said that yesterday. I'll say it again.

Beth Bacon: And I think it's also - it's that has been graduated by this hub and spoke dedication. That there is an assumption that if there is an accredited body to put in the middle, then it really limits the liability. But under GDPR you're still liable and there is actually no accreditation mechanism that exists.

They talk about accredited bodies in GDPR but they don't tell you what those are or how to become one. So that's something that would have to - we'd have to wait to come from the European Data Protection Board. Sam, I - all right. And then does anyone else - okay. Sam, then Rubens and then Keith.

Samantha Demetriou: Yes. I mean I think what we're - the fundamental question that's guiding Phase 2 or at least a Phase 2 where there is some kind of universal system that all contracted parties would be beholden to is this question of whether a

group of people as a whole can be determined to have broad access to data in theoretically all instances. Right?

You're taking out the balancing by saying - by making it an individual request. So I think it's important when we talk about this with our colleagues and other parts of the community to continue to remind them that disclosure does happen, right.

You can go to your friendly neighborhood registry or registrar and make individual requests. But trying to bring that, which is somewhat clearly outlined in the GDPR, to a system that is not contemplated at all is where the fundamental challenge is.

And I'll remind everyone a little background of history that I can put out the UAM proposal paper -- I think it was a discussion draft, something -- over the summer and we as the contracted parties, the registries and the registrars submitted a letter to ICANN basically saying, you know, we support you guys looking into whether this is something that is legally feasible.

You know, you're out there having conversations with DPAs. Please go do that. I don't know that we've ever received any kind of answer. So, you know, maybe one of the things we need to be thinking about is as registries or perhaps at the Council level, you know, maybe holding his feet to the fire a little bit on getting some firm clarity on where those conversations are.

And I know that's been a slippery issue in the past. It's hard to get firm answers out of him. But, you know, the time might be right before everyone starts diving headlong into Phase 2 and putting a ton of effort behind that.

Beth Bacon: Rubens.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl. One thing that (clearly) that happen during the TSG session is when I pointed out to them that the model they proposed actually had more information security risks.

And it was clear to me then there was an untold requirement over there; was the notion that that practice would be able to hide out law enforcement requests and assure secrecy to those law enforcement requests.

So ICANN would forward them to contracted parties not telling who they came from. And then assured them people are not knowing that (SDI) interesting these are - that are the domain holder.

And that seems to be a untold aspect of the model. And when - if that really comes about that will probably have stronger implications (unintelligible) for non-U.S. contracted parties that we most likely face legal issues with their own local enforcement agencies.

I will leave to Maxim to explain what would happen in Russia if that happens. Brazil might be similar. But that was a revealing moment for me yesterday.

Beth Bacon: It sounds Rubens like you're suggesting we should hear the data subject rights in the GDPR. Crazy talk. Keith.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much. So just an observation. As (Yuron) has talked about the uniform access model and the hub and spoke approach especially recently, he's been very clear that the only way something like that works is if you can significantly reduce or eliminate the risk to contracted parties.

And so I think when we talk about UAMs there are a couple of questions, right. One, is it legal? Right. Is it compliant? Can you do it under GDPR? Then there's the question of the assumption of risk. Right.

And while it might be legal or compliant and we don't know that but it could be, the question of whether ICANN could reasonably assume the risk of contracted parties and the size of some contracted parties is an entirely different question that may not be viable.

So I think there's a couple of different components there. So again, as I said at the outset, I think one of the key questions is if it's not a uniform access model with ICANN at the center taking on all liability, what is it? What does it become?

It's still potentially as in the charter of the EDPD a standardized system for access to non-public registration data. Right. And of course now we're introducing the concept of not just access but disclosure, right. And so let's just use that interchangeably for the moment.

So the question is, as Sam noted, disclosure and access is happening today. How do we improve that? How do we make that more predictable? How do we potentially automate that? How do we introduce accreditation schemes? Is there an opportunity to do all of that utilizing some of the good work of the TSG?

And so, you know, I want to just caution us all and especially when if somebody says UAM is off the table, ICANN's not going to do it. It can't do it. We got to think of something else. Other parts of the community are going to freak out. Right.

I mean so I want us to be in a position as contracted parties to say wait a minute. That was just one possible option. It was never guaranteed that that was going to be viable legally or otherwise. But we're still committed to engaging and trying to figure out a standardized system for access and disclosure. Right. So thanks.

Beth Bacon: I didn't see any other hands so I'm going to take the (priority) of the fact that I have the button to put myself in the queue. Keith, I very much agree. And I think when we do talk about the TSG and where it's like there seems to be a waning support for that, I think that's just one option. And it seems that, you know, the (unintelligible) and the policy really didn't really come together there.

And I will - I said this, you know, when we were developing our comments, as Sam mentioned a while back when they first started talking about a UAM. You can certainly do this and the best way is to - you can do something. We can certainly make it better.

We can make something - we can develop things that are predictable, not necessarily you check a box and it happens but predictable and understandable on the clear guidelines, clear questions to ask, clear information to provide.

But the best way to do something that - to reduce liability is to just make a compliant system that is compliant with GDPR. It doesn't have to be new and special and different. It just has to be compliant and that's how you reduce liability. So I think that you're absolutely right and we need to be careful how we talk about it.

Did I see any other hands on this? Marc. And then Maxim and also we have about ten minutes. So I just want to (slide that). Thanks.

Marc Anderson: Thanks. I'll be quick. I just wanted to respond to Rubens' point about, you know, anonymous access to the data. That was an assumption that the TSG Group made but it's not a discussion we've had as part of the EPDP.

So, you know, I look forward to when we do have that discussion. But, you know, ultimately that's just an assumption TSG made. And ultimately it'll be

up to us in Phase 2 to determine what the policy recommendations are around that. So just wanted to respond to that real quick.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba. Very short note. Am I the only one who sees that party which implements policy, requires access is the controller? So those who require access to be provided most probably will be controllers (unintelligible) third parties.

And given the large amount of papers proving that they have an influence the policy, we will be able to share (finds) with them. So.

Beth Bacon: I'll let you bring that up the next EPDP meeting. So guys, I really appreciate you guys sitting through, you know, an hour and a half of this. I hope that it's been helpful

Just a short hand for those folks who have been in and out; if you're looking at the agenda, essentially the role and responsibilities document that we're doing is a data audit. We're working with ICANN to make this - to smooth into the IRT so that we can have some foundational information.

We will keep you updated. There's a meeting on Thursday for the small team and some ICANN folks to start working on it. Once the IRT is chartered, that will likely go in parallel with Phase 2. So again, it's a resource split. So we're looking for volunteers and expressions of interest in just saying I'm available to do some lifting for those things. So as IRT goes, once it's chartered, we'll keep you guys updated.

The Phase 2 is underway now. They're developing the timelines and some draft schedules at these meetings to hear in Kobe. So as we move out of Kobe and into next week, we can probably share with everyone some updated timelines and you can get a better picture as to what the time commitment might be if you are interested in supporting those efforts as well.

So and then as Sam mentioned, if there are better ways to give you updates on all of these pieces and moving parts or just Phase 2, we'd be happy to facilitate that. Just let us know that you don't like something and we'll figure it out.

Hopefully it will feel less like a fire hose of information because the pace will likely be slower than Phase 1. And then the only final thing I might mention is - Keith you brought it up -- the processions of, you know, saying no to things and yes to things.

One question is do - the final report is still out for comment. Does the Registry Stakeholder Group (say I might have chatted) about this earlier. Does the Registry Stakeholder Group want to make a comment, which is basically a really nice (work thanks).

We're committed to Phase 2 looking forward to it. And use it as a positive influence especially considering we've just had some no votes in the Council and it's created a little bit of a (turmoil).

But other than that, I just really appreciate everyone's time. We'll open it up to - Sam will go and then we can have final questions if there are any. If not, lunch is here.

Samantha Demetriou: I hate to be the one keeping you guys from lunch. Sorry. This is Sam again. And I just did want to mention - chime in on that because I'm realizing that we don't have a dedicated comments update on the agenda for today, which is totally fine because there's - we'll cover it on our next privacy call.

But what we've been talking about vis a vie the final report and the public comment for that is, as Beth mentioned, so many a comment from the Registry Stakeholder Group supporting the completion of the final report for Phase 1.

And they're noting our support for those recommendations as they've been approved by the GNSO Council. And perhaps also, you know, laying down a marker for our - the registry's commitment to working on a system for standardizing access in, you know, Phase 2 whether that is a UAM or something of a totally different color.

But that's the thinking so far. We'd love to have any input that anyone else in the group wants to provide on that. And hopefully we'll get a draft circulated fairly shortly because we think it can be pretty concise. So stay tuned for that one.

Beth Bacon: Does anyone have any other questions, concerns? We can always do this slower and over a drink if anyone ever needs that. So don't - if you're feeling overwhelmed, don't feel badly. If there are no more questions, I'll just give it back to Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks Beth and thanks for your efforts in regard to some extent as being the general in marshaling this effort. So big thanks to her but to Marc and (Alan) and Kristine for being the front line on most of the calls and all the support behind that.

We have to take a group photo as is tradition. I think (Sue) do you want to just let us know what we're supposed to do?

Sue Schuler: Yes. Just a couple logistical things. The group photo is going to be first. Just because of lighting in the room, we are going to take the photo towards the back of the room. So the people that are sitting in the chairs right there that's where we got to move to. And we'll form a grouping there.

For the lunch, which is (next). I had sent out something asking you whether you were going to attend lunch or not. I got 69 responses. But 15 of them decided not to identify themselves. They told me yes they were going to eat but didn't tell me who they were.

So if you told me who you are and you said yes, you get to go to lunch first. And then other people can go through. If you did not respond, then if there's food left over, you're welcome to join us. But we're going to do the photo first. So if everybody could kind of head towards the back of the room where the lighting's better and we'll get set up. Thanks.

END