

ICANN Transcription Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP WG Tuesday 14 July 2015 at 1400 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP WG call on the Tuesday 14 July 2015 at 14:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Attendees:

Frank Michlick – Individual
Val Sherman – IPC
Griffin Barnett – IPC
Kathy Kleiman – NCSG
Darcy Southwell – RrSG
Steve Metalitz - IPC
Alex Deacon –IPC
Stephanie Perrin – NCSG
Phil Corwin – BC
Terri Stumme – BC
Susan Kawaguchi – BC
Chris Pelling – RrSG
Roger Carney – RrSG
James Bladel – RrSG
Sarah Wyld – RrSG
Todd Williams – IPC
Paul McGrady – IPC
Vicky Sheckler – IPC
Lindsay Hamilton-Reid - RrSG
Graeme Bunton – RrSG
Don Blumenthal – RySG
Sara Bockey – RrSG
Keith Kupferschmid – IPC
Amr Elsadr-NCUC
James Gannon – NCUC
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC
David Hughes – IPC
Carlton Samuels – ALAC

Apologies :

Michele Neylon – RrSG

Holly Raiche – ALAC
Susan Prosser – RrSG

ICANN staff:
Mary Wong
Marika Konings
Amy Bivins
Stephen Miller
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: This call will now be recorded. You may now proceed.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the PPSAI Working Group call on the 14th of July 2015. On the call today we have Chris Pelling, Graeme Bunton, Steve Metalitz, Val Sherman, Sarah Wyld, Sara Bockey, (Sara Sterling), James Bladel, Todd Williams, Frank Michlick, Keith Kupferschmid, Phil Corwin, Griffin Barnett, Roger Carney, Darcy Southwell, Lindsay Hamilton-Reid and Don Blumenthal.

I show apologies from Michele Neylon, Holly Raiche and Susan Prosser, and Kathy Kleinman has joined us as well, as well as Amr Elsadr. From Staff we have Mary Wong, (Susan Miller) and myself, Terri Agnew.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you Graeme.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you kindly. This is Graeme. I'll be chairing our first call back. Welcome back everybody. It's been quite a while since we've been on our calls together, and I'm vaguely nostalgic and we'll see how long that lasts.

Let's see if anybody's got updates to their SOIs. Going once, going twice, three times sold. Okay. So on our screen we should all be able to see the work plan.

Today's the 14th of July and we're going to begin our review of public comments, although I suspect today is going to be mostly process and less substance and we'll get into the actual substance in following weeks.

So what - getting into it though - actually let's dwell on this work plan for another moment or so. We've got one, two, three weeks, four including today to review the public comments and we have an awful lot to get through.

So we're going to talk quite a bit about how we intend to move through those public comments today, and then we're going to have to dig in and work pretty hard to get that done.

And then that doesn't leave us a huge amount of time to see if we can discuss the remaining open issues and generate some conclusions and get a draft final report out, which we're hoping to do by the end of August.

It's a pretty aggressive timelines. I think we're all going to have to come together and work pretty hard to do so, but I'm quietly optimistic that we can do that.

So let's then go on to the comment period I guess and what a comment period it was. We had a huge volume of input from all sorts of places and that was interesting and exciting, and certainly it seems like lots of people are paying attention right now to the work that we're doing.

I know Fadi was talking about us briefly the other day in front of Congress. And I don't think that changes much other than we continue to be focused and careful about our work and move forward as we have been.

So I think the plan for today is mostly going to be to have Mary walk us through what she's done with the comments to date. I might talk through the Excel document that I sent out as well.

Then we can discuss some options for how to parse and dig into the comments and different methodologies we can do. And we'll have sort of an open discussion about other possibilities of going to all of these comments, and I suspect that's going to take us to the end of the hour.

Before we get going into what Mary's done here I see Kathy's hand is up and then I see James' hand is up. Kathy?

Kathy Kleinman: Hi Graeme. Hi everybody. I never took us off our 10:00 am Eastern Time slot on my calendar. I just want you to know I thought about everybody every Tuesday at 10:00 am.

So it's great to be back. We've got a lot to work with. Graeme I just wanted to raise the flag before we leave the updated work plan that I'm not sure two weeks in the dead of summer of August is the right - is, A, enough time to conclude the open issues; and B, the right time to conclude the open issues.

You know, a lot of people are going to be gone and a lot of issues - if we're spending four weeks reviewing the public comments we need to - we may need to spend at least that if not more trying to incorporate what it is, what direction it is, what guidance it is that we're getting from this outpouring of public participation in our process.

So I'm surprised to see so much time reviewing the comments and so little time incorporating them. So I just wanted to raise that flag that I really see this as kind of September work to do because we don't want to do it while people are on vacation, and we do want to give the public their time in our process because so many people worked so hard to participate particularly from outside.

It's amazing to see the diversity of organizations and groups and companies, new participants, you know, struggling with our issues and trying to understand and trying to provide us input.

I think we owe it to them to work on the issues and questions that they raise, many of which we don't know yet because we haven't read their comments. Thank you.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Kathy. Someone needs to mute their mic. I'm getting a lot of typing. Two things I guess. I think this is a plan sort of working backwards from ICANN Dublin to have this - our final report done in time for that and I don't disagree with you.

It's a lot of work that we're going to need to try and accomplish between now and then but we - going into the comment period and extending the comment period that - I think we were all pretty aware that timelines were going to be tight and it may require an increased amount of work, and we can get to this at the end of the call I think when we talk about how to work through these comments.

But it - we may be doing something like subteams and we may be doing two-hour calls. We've got lots of - we have some options in front of us and so we'll have to make some choices but I don't disagree.

We need to really make sure that we are attentive to the comments that we've been given. I see Mary's got her hand up and I'm going to go to her and then you James. Mary?

Mary Wong: Thanks Graeme and thanks Kathy for your comments. I won't repeat what Graeme just said about the timeline because it is working back from Dublin. Just as a reminder I think I might have said this before that if we don't get through - final report to the Council in time for the Dublin meeting or even the meeting after that, it does put pressure on implementation assuming that of course the recommendations are set by the Council and then by the Board.

So even if the Council were to consider and adopt whatever recommendations we ultimately come up with in Dublin, it still has to go to the Board and a further public comment period.

So that's something that I think is the other factor that we looked at when we were talking about the period for public comments and the sort of consequence, you know, results that would happen from that.

The other point that I wanted to make Graeme was that as we were doing this work plan, and I know we had talked about this in one or two Working Group meetings prior to Buenos Aires, there is not much but a tiny bit of wiggle room and it may not be enough given what happened since but there is at least one week that we can have an additional meeting.

If you look at Page 2 it says, "Submit final report to the Council on the 5th of October given that the 11th of October is the Council's deadline for Dublin." That leaves that week of the 5th of October for one last meeting should we feel that we're able to stick to this timeline, so again a little wiggle room - not much but for what it's worth. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Mary. I enjoy the optimism of putting that extra week in there. James?

James Bladel: Hi. Thanks Graeme. James speaking for the transcript. And yes I - and just echoing I think what's already been said. I think that this is - this work plan is aggressive/ambitious I think as you said.

It's possibly even starting to approach the line of unrealistic to work back from Dublin. I, you know, and my concern is not just the volume of comments received, which was, you know, by my count unprecedented in the history of a PDP but also just some of the - I think the very large holes that the comment has identified in our work to date.

And I think it's not just a question of going through these couple of weeks and - even though that is, you know, a pretty heavy lift going through and checking the box that we reviewed the comments.

I think that it's - that's probably not going to be sufficient. We're going to have to take a hard look at some of the issues that were raised by the commenters and make sure that they are sufficiently and comprehensively addressed in our work.

And I think that's going to be the extra part that I don't see on the work plan, and that's why I'm concerned about the overall critical path between here and Dublin.

But, you know, I don't want to sound defeatist. I'll sit back and say let's dive in with what we've got and if we need to have intercessional meetings or a face-to-face in Dublin or, you know, two hour calls or twice a week calls or whatever we need to do let's charge ahead. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks James and that's loud and clear from both you and Kathy. And so I sort of I guess tasked the Working Group with, you know, all of us working together to make sure we are giving these comments what they deserve, and that we're not skipping over anything and we're working the best we can to accommodate all of what's been said.

So let's now go to Mary I think and she's going to talk us through what she's built and shared with us to date. Mary care to go ahead?

Mary Wong: Yes thanks Graeme. I'm just trying to bring up this Version 1, Part 1 of the public comment review tool. And this is something that was sent to the Working Group on Friday, and as we noted then it's Part 1 because it's really only part of the mountain of comments that we have received.

The first thing that I should note and I know that everybody knows this but - so this is more for the record - is that we are not just talking about the comments that were directly submitted to the forum, the 11,400 and whatever that is.

But you'll recall that we also have a template that laid out all the questions - I'm sorry, all the recommendations as well as the open questions that we had in the preliminary report.

And that is specifically referenced back to the section number and the actual recommendation that we had in the report, the idea being that people will respond to those questions in the context of how we have in the report.

So that's the other piece of this and so there's really two parts to the public comments: the direct submissions through the forum and the direct responses to the template.

And of those we had 352 responses. Fortunately or unfortunately - I think it's - fortunately for me having to compile it about 200 people, you know, started taking the template but never actually answered any questions but that still leaves almost 150.

Many of those 150 were incomplete but they did answer a few questions, and so what you see in the public comment review tool is a reflection of both those types of submissions up to a certain point.

What I've done is in each section you'll see the actual questions in the shaded box, so for example on Page 1 the first recommendation, Recommendation 1, in our report - that's the question right there.

And what I've done is put in the comments that were sent in directly to the public comment forum from the various people and groups you see here, for example the GNSO constituencies and a few community members and that's

what they've said, whether they support, if they have anything else that's in the left hand column.

And following that if you go down in Page 2 you start to see these fill-ins from the template responses. And so what I've done then is try to be as complete as possible for the first nine recommendations, and I think we had 20.

So this is what Version 1, Part 1 does. It is the first nine recommendations and it puts in all the template responses we got to those nine questions, and as much of the direct submission responses that we got in the public comment forum that's able to get through.

So at this point Graeme I think I - pause and ask if anyone has any questions or would like me to clarify anything about this tool.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Mary.

Mary Wong: And having put everybody to sleep what shall I do next Graeme.

Graeme Bunton: Oh.

Mary Wong: Oh wait. Steve has a question or a comment.

Steve Metalitz: Yes this is Steve Metalitz. Just wanted to thank Mary for doing this. You know, just looking through this, you know, some of these have comments that we can work with and others don't.

So for example Question 2 about whether privacy or proxy services should be treated the same way - a number of people just say no and don't - there's no explanation provided.

I'm not really quite sure what to do with that. Other people say no and give an example. So, you know, I think it's very useful to have this tool but it may be

less - a bit less imposing than meets the eye because many of these responses are not really something that we can incorporate into our - into a final report. Thank you.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Steve. I see Amr's got his hand up too. Amr go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Oh thanks Graeme. This is Amr. Yes I would like to ask a question regarding what Kathy, James and Steve have all sort of hinted to regarding the incorporation of comments and how it relates to the public comment review tool.

The last column in the tool under Working Group Action - is that sort of where the Working Group is going to decide on how to incorporate or whether they're going to actually incorporate any of the comments or each one of the comments in the final report or not?

So this is - there is a column to its left on Working Group Response where the Working Group can sort of just say, "Okay we note this comment. This is what we - this is our response," if there is one or not.

And then there is a Working Group Action column so what's sort of like the incorporation of public comments or the decision to incorporate them? Would that be done with each comment being reviewed and is that why in the schedule previously shared we sort of just have the weeks regarding sort of going over the public comment review and not incorporating them because it's actually - they're both being done together simultaneously for each comment?

I personally think this would be a probably good thing because then - well I'm guessing the public comment review tool will actually be added as an annex to the final report.

And in terms of sort of just transparency and how the Working Group has done its work in reviewing the comments, all the decisions can be sort of documented in the final report and available to anyone who cares what - sort of how the Working Group members addressed the many public comments already submitted. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Amr. That's an interesting approach to keeping us accountable. Mary your response?

Mary Wong: Sort of and because I think Amr's actually described exactly what the public comment review tool is for and in relation to the Working Group Response versus Working Group Action columns that's exactly right.

So for example as he mentioned, you know, in the Working Group Response column we might simply say, "Noted. Thanks for the, you know, comment," or we might say, "Noted," but we might need to sort of clarify and then in the Action column the actual clarifications.

For example we might say, "Clarify language in Recommendation 4 to change the wording from X to Y." So for those who are not as familiar with the tool, which is something that we started using relatively recently in quite a few Working Groups, that's the idea.

And as to publishing the tool typically what we do is we put a clear link to the tool itself from the final report, and that does go to the transparency point that Amr makes.

So - but the point I wanted to make is that we don't typically include it as an annex. We will include other things like the solicitations for input early on in the process, the report of comments and so forth but the tool itself is represented as a link. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Mary. That's helpful. I see James then Philip then other James.
James?

James Bladel: Thanks Graeme. So, you know, maybe the conversation's passing it by a little bit. I wanted to circle back to something that Steve said because I think he raises an important point about - for example I think he zeroed in on a couple of comments that responded with just no without offering alternatives or a rationale or something like that with a - what probably should've been more of a - and maybe it was, you know, maybe the, you know, shame on us for the way we worded the question.

But one of my thoughts here just looking at this as a glance, you know, we got 127 pages. We have - I think we should take as much time as possible but I recognize that it's not infinite.

One of the thoughts I had was identifying comments that we could safely consider to be null comments, and by that I mean something that indicates support or disagreement without offering either a rationale or any other substantive, you know, feedback.

And if we could, you know, it's a danger, right, the danger of summarizing something a little too bluntly so that something is swept under the rug. But I think that you could potentially take all of those null comments and say, "Look we had X number of yes/no comments and Y number no/null comments," and then collapse them all into a single line item in this comment review tool.

And I think that gives deference to the person who took the time to submit a comment, but also recognizes that we really don't have enough substance in the feedback to take anything away from that comment.

So it's just kind of taking what Steve identified here under Question Number 2 in the template and trying to see if we can collapse all of the yeses and all of

the nos that have no other substantial feedback into a single line item.

Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks James. I'm not opposed to that thinking about it. We have to be careful that we don't treat them like votes in a sense, and we just understand that all we've done is collapse them.

James Bladel: Right. And I'm sorry. I should mention Graeme I don't want to treat them like votes and I - but I also don't want to just sort them out. And I think that I'm trying to strike that balance too where we acknowledge that it's a way of capturing the input but not - but recognizing that there's really nothing for us to do with it.

Graeme Bunton: Yes. All right. Thanks James. Phil Corwin.

Philip Corwin: Thank you. A couple of quick comments here. One, when the call started I didn't have any fixed view on whether the time on the work plan was sufficient to get the work done or was unrealistic.

I do note that the comment review tool for the first 9 of 20 questions runs 127 pages, and assuming the other 11 questions are proportionate we'd probably expect about 140, 150 pages on that.

So - and we have three meetings after this for review of public comments. So while we should work with all deliberate speed that would seem to say that we're going to review 80 to 100 pages of comments per hour in those three hours.

And even agreeing with Steve and James and others that some of the comments where it's simple yes or no and add nothing can kind of be skipped over but should - can't be totally ignored because a - they do show a strong sentiment one way or the other.

It's still a daunting task. The other comment I wanted to make is that I'm not necessarily dismayed if this takes a little bit longer in that I don't think we can be oblivious to the political situation for ICANN that this report is going into.

At the time that the comment period closed it was noted that there were possibly a record number of comments on any ICANN issue. Cyrus Namazi was quoted as saying that, "This showed that the multistakeholder process was working."

And then at last week's Congressional hearing which was basically a pep rally for the multistakeholder model, one member of Congress asked Fadi about this particular issue and Fadi's response which surprised me was that the comments show that there was no consensus and without consensus the report would not go forward, which I thought was, you know, it surprised me that he would state that openly just a few days after the period had closed without analysis.

But I think this is going to be staying within ICANN I think at the Board level as somehow a test of the multistakeholder model where they can't just ignore the weight of the no votes whether they were fully informed or not, and that some additional time that lets the transition and accountability plans move forward and perhaps ahead of this project might actually be beneficial for this project and allow the political atmosphere to be somewhat less charged when the final report goes to the Board.

So I don't know if those thoughts were helpful but that's my response to what I see in front of me. Thank you.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Phil. That's good input. I think there's a - we've got a rock and a hard place, which is we need to accomplish this and we have people looking at it very closely as a multistakeholder model.

But also we have that timeline and us failing to achieve a final report or get that done in a timely fashion and hitting the expiry date could also be seen as a failure.

So it's - we have quite a challenge in front of us. I see James Gannon, Stephanie Perrin and then Steve Metalitz. James?

James Gannon: Hey Jonathan. So actually Phil said a lot of the things that I was going to say somewhat and so I think apologies if some of this has been said in the first 10, 15 minutes.

I actually came late into the call. And I don't think we can underestimate the importance of the scale of the comments that we've received. And I think out of all due respect to the people that have actually put in comments, we need to make sure that we don't rush through an analysis of them.

Even looking at them initially this morning myself, even if we take out the comments that appear to have come from the petition sites and the forum-based input, we still have well over 1000 individual substantive comments.

And I'm concerned about our current timeline being appropriate to give the amount of respect and attention to those comments that are needed. Our timeline has been very important, however things have changed.

You know, this is not a normal public comment period and our timeline was developed around a home loss. We knew it was going to be relatively big but this is - as Phil said it's possibly the largest public comment period in ICANN history, and I don't think we can step back from that and say that we're going to treat it the same way as any other public comment period.

I think it is important that we might have to take extra time, and we might have to come up with a revised timeline to give us the ability to give due

deference to the amount of work that people put in and the public face of what is going to come out of this Working Group.

We have standards of rule there and we have Fadi talking openly about it. This is a - this is bigger than when we originally - done the original timeline and I think that in order to make sure that we give the respect that's needed that we may have to go back and look at the timeline again.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks James. Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I hope you can hear me.
Yes?

Graeme Bunton: Yes.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes. Good. James has said much of what I want to say and Phil Corwin has said much of what I want to say, so I'll be very brief with what they didn't say.

I think we might as well face the new timeline right now rather than dither around. I agree that it is tempting to put the comments that have not - where there has been no arguments made, just an opinion in other words - it's tempting to put those aside.

But I don't think that that is a fair and accountable way of dealing with comments. Nowhere do we say that we need to write a record undergraduate essay to put in comments on a proceeding.

In other words they don't need to cite the court case. They don't need to give chapter and verse as to which particular section of the document they are alluding to.

So I think we can place them in a category of unsubstantiated comments perhaps but we cannot dismiss them. And so that's not going to shave a whole lot of time off the time for reviewing this.

And, I mean, frankly we have put in how many meetings so far on this? I don't want to rush this. I want to have a chance to look at all the comments myself so that I can be sure that we're being fair, so please give us another couple of weeks to do that. Thanks.

Oh and one more thing. We have many groups and organizations who are scrutinizing ICANN as they have not in the past, because they've suddenly realized that there's something they care about going on here, so if that doesn't heighten the accountability I don't know what is.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Stephanie. I'm clearly hearing lots of the message that we need to be very careful with these comments and give them their due. And pending Steve who we'll hear from in just a moment we can talk about the actual process we want to go through, and different approaches that we can take to get through all these comments and give them what they're owed. Steve?

Steve Metalitz: Thanks. Steve Metalitz. Yes I'm responding mostly to Phil. There are a number of things in his comments and in his statement that I - concerned about but just this focus on two.

First, the idea that we - only going to be working on this during our one hour or 90 minute - however long they are calls, I think that reflects some misunderstanding about what our job is now.

And I think we'll get to - although I'd like to give Mary a chance to explain all the other work that she has done and that Graeme - and Graeme to explain what he has done to help make these comments a bit more manageable, I hope that before we conclude our call today we can also agree on a way forward that involves subgroups looking at comments on particular issues

and then reporting back to the group as the - a way of parallel processing that can maybe help us deal with the large volume of even - and I would agree there are even a large volume of substantive comments, although it's rather misleading to look at the gross numbers and extrapolate from that about how much work we have to do.

The second point I would make is, you know, Phil is always as always quite astute about identifying the political environment that we're working in here. But I would just like to emphasize what - a couple responses and have already said, which is there's a political problem with not being - not moving on these and not coming out with a report.

I don't think our - this timeline is a proposed one and I think we should accept it as such and it may need to be adjusted. But the longer that we fail to produce a final report I think that reflects - that is going to have an impact on how the transition and accountability issues are being viewed, because an organization that cannot deal with an issue like this even after we've spent two years discussing it just in this framework and many, many years prior to it in other context, that's not very encouraging as far as the institutional credibility of the organization.

So I think yes we have to take a more balanced view of this, but I would encourage - I'd like to - I hope we can hear more from Mary and Graeme about what they've done to help us manage these comments and then talk specifically about how we're going to address them in - hopefully in some type of parallel processing setting. Thank you.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Steve. And so what I think we'll do is we're going to hear from Kathy and then we'll go back to Mary to see if there's anything else she needs to cover on this document.

And then maybe we can look at the one that I built too and then we can segue into the - what are we all going to do to get through this. Kathy?

Kathy Kleinman: I'm looking forward to the last one - how we go through them. Yes just very briefly that I'm getting a sense here that there's some kind of penalty for having extended the timeline for comments to 60 days and we extended that.

You know, we had the discussion to extend from 30 days to 60 days because we felt with more time to do outreach and education we'd get more input, and that's exactly what happened.

This is a huge success. We got more input and we got it from groups that have never participated in ICANN before, and from thousands of individuals that have certainly never participated in ICANN before at least to the best of our knowledge.

That's a huge success but I don't see why that shortens the timeframe for response, so I'll save more comments till the end. But, you know, so far so good but I don't think that takes away from what has to happen now. Thanks very much.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Kathy. So let's go back to Mary. So you've put this together. You still have a bunch more questions to summarize and put into this. Is that correct Mary?

Mary Wong: I do and so this conversation is really helpful because from the Staff perspective, you know, we're very clearly aware that short of putting everything into the tool we really can't do anything else.

And in fact it looked really scary at least at first brush as Steve Metalitz mentioned, because we certainly can't do any editing or any other sort of subjective selectivity.

But what I did want to follow up on and thanks for the great timing Graeme is that if you go back to Page 1 of this tool - and I have a TBA or to be added

under what is termed Part 1 where I've got general statements and comments and overarching principles.

But, you know, that's just kind of a placeholder title. The reason why that's there is that in contrast to the individual specific listings of each template response that you guys were looking at, you know, that Steve and others have pointed to, those were easy to input - well tedious and time consuming but easy in a sense because, you know, the template goes question by question and so I could put in response by response.

Regardless of how we deal with that what I haven't attempted to do is similar types of comments that were sent directly to the forum; similar in the sense that they were either, you know, replications of one of the form letters that were being circulated or were simply general statements of, you know, "Please protect our privacy," or, "ICANN, you know, please don't do this because X, Y and Z."

So none of those have been added to this template for a number of reasons. One is I think some direction from the Working Group as to how you want to deal with that would be very helpful, and Graeme this might be for the next agenda item.

Second, one thought that Staff had but we didn't start doing it was to, you know, kind of take a lead from what James suggested that if we can use some of the correlations that have already been done, and Graeme I know you're going to talk about what you guys have done yesterday - to look at those general statements if - rather than individually listing each of them and there are thousands of them if we could collect them in some way into this Section 1 of the tool.

So that was something that I did want to bring up to the Working Group for discussion and for instruction. And the last thing I'll say for now Graeme and everybody is that another document that we prepared, which I don't have on

the screen and I won't pull up unless you guys want it, is a summary of some of the comments that were sent directly to the forum.

And if you're still on Page 1 you'll see that those - that summary document includes summary of the comments from say the ISPs, the IPC and a few other community members, and that was intended to help the Working Group members as you start your own review or your group start your review, however you want to do it.

What we've tried to do there is go through all the comments that were sent directly that did not appear to be form letters or templates and pick out extracts from them and replicated exactly those extracts in the summary document.

That's about - I think Steve you said it was maybe 35 pages. Hopefully that's helpful and that's the second document that we sent. And Graeme I'm going to stop here because I see Steve has his hand up.

Steve Metalitz: That was an old hand. I'm sorry. I'll take it down.

Graeme Bunton: Okay. Is there anything else to add to that Mary?

Mary Wong: Well not at this point because I'm a bit concerned that that might be too much information for everybody. I can show the other summary document if you like so that people who haven't had a chance to look at their emails can see what it is that I was talking about.

And then Graeme I don't know if it would be a good time then for you to talk about the correlation that you and your folks have been doing. So here's the document and over - back to you.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Mary. So this is just a collection of some of the larger comments that have come through?

Mary Wong: It's a collection of what I could tell were the - all the comments that made specific reference to either one or more of the open questions that we had or that specifically addressed one or more of the recommendations that we had.

I won't say that it's foolproof because obviously with that many comments I may have missed one or two, but I can say that I'm fairly confident that this represents the bulk of the comments that we have received to date that do address or try to address either one of the recommendations or one of the open questions.

Graeme Bunton: That's great, Mary. And thank you. As people are pointing out in the chat, this comment period I'm sure has been extremely arduous for ICANN staff as the volume is quite intense. So thank you again.

Allow me maybe briefly to walk through what I sent last night if you have that uploaded, that'd be great. Just to make sure everybody's clear.

Mary Wong: Yes, I'm going to try and upload it right now, Graeme if you want to start talking. I will probably get it up in a few seconds.

Graeme Bunton: Sure, thanks. So I sent out last night an Excel file with all of the public comments that I could get from the website, what I had done was a developer wrote a program to scrap the entire comment period. It grabbed the sender, the subject, the body of their message.

It has a link to any attachments, a link to the actual comment itself. And then I added a couple of extra fields to assist in analysis. And the sort of goal that I had for this thing was to allow us to sort of filter and focus on different bits of - or different attributes of these comments.

Now it's distinct from what Mary's done in that she is looking at the content of comments to figure out where those similarities lie and I'm sort of looking at

the form. So I've added a few columns. One is - has attachments and that's a yes or no.

And this is an Excel file so you should be able to filter in Excel to look at, say, only comments that have attachments. And typically if they do if it's a short comment that has put their substance into the attachment, it's got to a link to go look at that.

The other columns are - there's a word count so that you can sort by length of comment and that's helpful I think, at least for triaging and figuring out which of the really long ones and which are quite brief.

And then there's a column called name sheet and this column I used a string of text that was in all of the template name sheet comments. And if that string of text existed in the body of the message then they'd get a white flag on that.

And this allows you to filter in or out any of those comments. Now there are plenty of comments that I think came from name sheet where the person chose to write their own comment and replace all of the text, in which case it has the usual name sheet title or subject but the body is completely different. Those would not have the white flag.

Conversely there is a name sheet comments where they've written extra on top of the template message so those would have the white flag but then you can sort by word count to get at the messages that are substantially longer or shorter but contain that message.

So all of this is meant to provide a sort of relatively easy way to slice and dice the comments, figure out which ones you want to read first. You know, whether you want to prioritize the big ones or the ones with attachments, however you wish to do it.

Now I do know there's - the A, it's not perfect, some of the format's a little funny because it's been scrapping. And B, I know I'm missing a few comments but I've been able to identify which one those are and I will update that spreadsheet at some point today and send that out.

So that's there if anyone has questions on that particular document they can send that to - or they can maybe ask on the list because others might have that question as well.

I see Steve's hand up. Steve?

Steve Metalitz: Yes, this is Steve. I just want to thank Graeme for doing this because we had talked with the staff about how we could get IT and ICANN to do something like this. I think this is a potentially useful tool, exactly for the purpose that Graeme mentioned, it's kind of prioritizing which ones to look at first.

Not to say you don't look at all but, you know, ones that are clearly template comments and have very small word count so you know little has been added to those template comments, I think those could safely be looked at later in the process than those that are more detailed and not machine generated.

So I think for that it's going to be very useful for either the full group or for subgroups to identify where to start, which is with the volume this great it's always a daunting problem.

So I just wanted to thank Graeme for doing this and I know he's going to clean up the few glitches that he mentioned and I think we'll really have a very useful document at that point.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Steve. I see Kathy's hand and we've got - excuse me, about 12 minutes left and we do need to talk about how we want to approach this. And Kathy, if you want to offer opinions on where we want to do longer calls or subteams, I'm happy to hear those right now too. I see (Phil)'s question in the

chat, I sent it out as an email either last night or - I think it was last night. I can send it out again if you haven't received it.

Kathy Kleinman: No, Graeme, I just wanted to raise a quick flag about the spreadsheet. If I might, can I take a minute to do that?

Graeme Bunton: Yes.

Kathy Kleinman: Okay, cool. First, I love this. This is outstanding, it's a quick way to review and in combination with Mary's work, this is great. I did want to flag the word count because I had kind of thought I could go through and look for the longest word count as being the comment where people dealt into substantive.

What I'm thinking actually with the spreadsheet is this might be the way that we've been looking for to account for a lot of the shorter comments that have come in. But I just wanted to flag that I looked at, say, NCSG's comment and we have 18 words, that's because that's (Rafik) submitting it saying on behalf of the Noncommercial Stakeholder's Group I'm submitting the attached comment.

So I just wanted to flag that the word count in this case may not be our reference point and that a lot of the longer comments may actually be an attachment. I just wanted to share that, thank you.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Kathy. And that's why the has attachment column is there in that I would use those two filters sort of at the same time so that you can ensure that you're paying attention to - if that comment has an attachment or not and going to read that attachment. And the length should be there to go find that.

So I wouldn't use - I would maybe do a filter of exclude attachments and then sort by word count and you would get the comments where people have put their substantive message in the body rather than as an attachment.

We've got it, just in time, thanks, Mary. I don't see any other questions at the moment and we've got ten minutes left. So we're sort of dancing around it a bit over the course of this call. Steve's hand is up. But we really need to figure out an approach.

Now we all have a lot of individual reading to do on our own time but it could be that we need to tackle these comments as subgroups. It could be we need to do two-hour calls. It could mean we need to do multiple calls a week. And I think we're a little bit curious to hear if people have a preferred approach because I think it's going to be quite a challenge for us to get there.

I think with the subteams what we would be doing is breaking out into specific questions that the initial report raised and then we would - that subteam would tackle comments that refer to those specific questions. And then we could bring that back to the entire group.

We need some way of - I think it was Steve who was calling it parallel processing to get through these. I'm going to go to Steve and then James. Steve?

Steve Metalitz: Yes, thanks. This is Steve. Just briefly, yes, I think that I would recommend that as the way to go. I know we all need a little bit of time to become a little more familiar with the tools we've been given by Mary and by Graeme.

But my suggestion would be we might start with a few areas that where we specifically asked for comment and asked - in some cases had different versions out for comment.

So some of those are in section 1.3.2 of the report dealing with escalation of relay and the world of law enforcement, some are in 1.3.3 which frankly I think is the source of a lot of the - or is the focus if you will if there is a focus

for a lot of the comments and one that - where we may see a very clear trend very quickly.

And then possibly one other group looking at Annex E because there we also had some bracketed language, different alternative formulations and it would be useful to see who responded to that and how they - where they came down.

Again, not in a voting way but just to see what the response was. So that would be my suggestion is to start maybe with those three groups and perhaps there would be others that would be logical. And see if we can get those groups to report back to the full group quickly and give their assessment or their conclusions.

Obviously everything has to go through the full group eventually but I just think this may be more efficient than trying to assemble the full group each time to go through all this. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Steve. I'm very curious to hear if others have opinions on that approach, if that's something we would like to move forward with then I - I think we would need to be sort of - we're not going to be able to divide up into our subteams on this call.

But it's probably something we need to do this week over email so that we can begin that work prior to next week's call.

I see James and then Amr. James?

James Bladel: Hi, James. I'll be brief, don't worry. I'm not (unintelligible) to using subgroups in principle but I think we need to be very clear on how we're going to actually procedure along that work if we're going to go down that route.

So before lending my full support to going into subgroups I'd need to see how we're actually going to manage that process. And just on the point of additional calls as opposed to longer calls, my preference would probably be on longer calls.

A couple of us here, yourself included, are working on (unintelligible) and there's a lot of work coming up between now and October, particularly on accountability. So additional calls means additional scheduling conflicts and things get messy.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, James, that's good input. I've got Amr and then Marika? Amr?

Amr Elsadr: Yes, thanks, Graeme. This is Amr. Yes, I think I would agree with what James just said. I am a bit concerned and I did put this in the chat a little earlier. I'm a bit concerned that using subteams might actually be less efficient than perhaps longer calls every week so two hour calls.

I'm just concerned there might possibly be a duplication of work being done, a subteam goes through the comments and then reviews or questions being asked by the full working group later. So I would probably be more in favor with longer calls with the whole group that can review the comments together, just go through them once, get them done.

But I do note that Marika also responded to my concerns in the chat. I have to admit I didn't really understand what she meant so I guess I have James (unintelligible) sort of questions (unintelligible) with a clarification on how the process would work in terms of subteams reviewing and then sharing with the rest of the group for the clarification on that, that would be appreciated.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Amr. That sounds like a perfect time to go to Marika.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Graeme. This is Marika. I'm glad I had my hand up because exactly, I wanted to explain a little bit on how this has been done in other groups such

as the CWG stewardship for example which also has quite a substantial number of comments and they were actually working on a very tight deadline.

So the way they approached it and it may be - you know, something similar, could potentially work here is where staff basically assisted at the first instance to categorize the comments, you know, similar to the way Mary has approached it and identified, you know, which parts related to which questions or which parts of the draft proposal.

Basically those then were broken out and I think, you know, Steve or somebody just gave a first suggestion on what, you know, those topics should be.

And for each of those topics a number of people would be identified and would volunteer to be willing to look at those comments and basically what the subteam would do or a group of volunteers, and maybe not even need to be a formal subteam, would basically be going through those comments, formulate a draft response, and identify whether any action is recommended to the proposal or to the initial report based on that comment.

Basically the idea would be then once the subteam has done that and it could either be done, you know, through an email conversation at least in the CW stewardship some groups did it through the forum of a Google Doc or one person took a pen and came up with the first list of responses and then someone would comment on that.

And then they would kind of, you know, bring that all together. Some groups did it through calls, basically going through a call and then writing up the responses.

But basically after that each subteam would turn that back basically to the full group and basically share that, you know, well in advanced of a call to allow everyone to look through that and basically be able to indicate saying, well,

those responses I'm actually not happy with or I don't think it actually responds to the question or say the recommended action - I'm not really sure if that is what we want to do or I don't agree with that.

And then basically it would allow you to only discuss those items where there's a need - a feeling or a sense that more discussion is needed. But at least what we saw as well in the CW stewardship and I guess here there may be as well quite a few comments that may be very similar or where a similar response may apply.

So that is where the subteams can help and take, you know - make sure that then the full working group calls can really focus on those where there is actually substance that needs further discussion.

So that's a little bit the idea or at least the approach that the CWG stewardship used and I think worked pretty efficiency because it really allowed for, you know, really a small group to do a lot of the leg work and, you know, keep the working group calls really focused on, you know, very substantive issues that needed further conversation or resolution in order to be able to incorporate that in a final report. So I hope that makes it clearer.

Graeme Bunton: That is helpful, thank you, Marika. I see Amr's hand up but we've only really got one minute left so I might ask you to take that to email. And so I think our homework is to think about the subgroup approach that Marika's just described and the chairs and I will take that offline as well and have a conversation about what we think is going to be best.

But we'd also love to hear from all of you. The other thing I'm seeing in the chat is to - if we have to do longer calls it would be preferred for longer rather than multiple.

So I think that brings us to our time. We need to sort this out in very short order so we can begin working through these comments. I don't want to

spend too much more time on process because as we've heard many times today we need to give them their due and let's get to that.

So if you could all please engage over the next few days as we sort out exactly how we want to do this and then we can get to the business of doing it. And with that, we'll close the call. Thank you everyone for coming. And we'll see you on email and we'll talk to you next week. And Steve will be chairing next week and I will be on vacation actually so enjoy.

Man: Thanks, Graeme.

END