

ICANN Transcription Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP WG Tuesday 21 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 21 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
Kathy Kleiman – NCSG
Darcy Southwell – RrSG
Steve Metalitz - IPC
Alex Deacon –IPC
Stephanie Perrin – NCSG
Phil Corwin – BC
Terri Stumme – BC
Susan Kawaguchi – BC
James Bladel – RrSG
Sarah Wyld – RrSG
Todd Williams – IPC
Paul McGrady – IPC
Vicky Sheckler – IPC
Amr Elsadr-NCUC
James Gannon – NCUC
Holly Raiche – ALAC
Jim Bikoff - IPC
David Heasley - IPC
Kiran Malancharuvil- IPC
Volker Greimann - RrSG
Lindsay Hamilton-Reid – RrSG
Griffin Barnett- IPC
David Cake - NCSG
Michele Neylon – RrSG

Apologies :

Graeme Bunton – RrSG
Don Blumenthal – RySG
Sara Bockey – RrSG

ICANN staff:
Mary Wong
Amy Bivins
Stephen Miller
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: The recording is now started, you may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Cindy). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the PPSAI call on the 21st of July, 2015. On the call today we have Val Sherman, Steve Metalitz, Holly Raiche, Sara Wyld, Todd Williams Alex Deacon, James Bladel, Phil Corwin, David Heasley, Terri Stumme, Vicky Scheckler, Kiran Malancharuvil, Jim Bikoff, Volker Greimann and Darcy Southwell.

We received apologies from Don Blumenthal, (unintelligible) and Sara Bockey. From staff we have Mary Wong, Steven Miller, Amy Bivins and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. Kathy Kleiman has also just joined the call.

I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you, Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Okay thank you. And welcome, everyone. We've had a very active week on the list with a number of interesting exchanges, some of which I think have helped to move us forward. And we have an ambitious agenda today but of course we have a lot of work ahead of us as well.

So I think the first item on the agenda is for updates to Statements of Interest. Does anybody have anything they want to update on those? Okay, if not we can move to Item 2 which is the revised work plan and possible face to face meeting at ICANN 54.

So what is up on the screen now is a document - it's dated 2-July but I think it's actually supposed to be 20-July. This is an update that the staff prepared. We have been working - we talked last week I guess about a work plan that

would allow us to file our final report in time for it to be taken up (unintelligible) and so that meant finalizing the report in September.

There was a good deal of pushback against that as well as some support for that on the list. So we asked the staff to come up with an alternative time table for us to look at and talk about today. Meanwhile the staff raised to us the possibility of having a - there being funding for - or approval, authority, whatever, for a face to face meeting of the working group on the day before the Dublin meeting, the Friday preceding that meeting. I'm not sure of the exact date.

So - and we asked that they work that into this work plan. I guess it's October 16. So we asked that they work that into this work plan and this was what was sent out yesterday afternoon I guess.

So I guess I'd open the floor for comments on the work plan and on the face to face meeting should we have it, and if so how should we fit that into the work plan? I have some - there are also some - I have some comments on the work plan too but let me see if we have anybody that wants to speak to this proposed work plan.

I should say that this work plan calls for us to have our final report out on November - after November - oh, November 9, which would be in time for it to be taken up at the GNSO Council at its November 19 meeting. So that's the bottom line on this.

So any - I see a couple comments in the chat and I see Kathy has her hand up so, Kathy, why don't you go ahead?

Kathy Kleiman: Hi, Steve. First, can you hear me? I'm calling in from Skype in Zurich.

Steve Metalitz: I can hear you.

Kathy Kleiman: Terrific, great. So first thank you to everyone who worked on the extended plan. I think it was a much more realistic schedule. Steve, I wanted to ask, for those who planned it, there's a lot of time spent reviewing public comment. Is this really all time about reviewing the public comment or really, you know, the first place about reviewing the public comment and the second part of that time is really about incorporating the public comment as much as possible into the work in the sections that we're looking at.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah (unintelligible) good point, Kathy. I don't know if staff has any response to that. But one my impressions of this is that, you know, at some point you move from review to drafting the report which is...

((Crosstalk))

Kathy Kleiman: Exactly.

Steve Metalitz: And I think that point may be said a little bit late here in this because it doesn't talk about drafting the report until - it contemplates that we won't have a draft report to look at, you know, in Dublin if we have that Dublin meeting. I think that's probably too pessimistic...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: I think if we - go ahead.

Kathy Kleiman: Can I follow - it would seem to me by the time we get to September 8 we should be iterating on incorporation because I know people are going to draft and I know people are going to edit and, you know, it's going to go back and forth I'm sure. So maybe September could be the incorporation process or at least we aim for the incorporation process.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you. Mary, you have your hand up so why don't you go ahead?

Mary Wong: Yes, Steve. Thanks and thanks, Kathy. I guess, you know, we are using the word “review” for shorthand and partly just to get the work plan and, you know, in as few pages as possible. What we’ve done in previous working groups and I think Amr is saying the same thing in the chat here, is that when we say “review” and if you look at the public comment review tool I think someone pointed out last week that there are a couple of columns for working group response and working group action.

So our expectation is that that process is something that’s continuous. So, for example, if we do subteams when the subteam comes back with its report it will already be suggesting what the working group response and action might be. And then the working group can agree or disagree or change that.

And one example of the possible action might be, you know, redraft section whatever to reflect this comment or change the word, you know, may to must. That sort of thing goes on continuously. So it’s not like we have a lot of discussion and review and then at some point we draft the whole report. And so that’s the explanation and hopefully that’s helpful because we found that to be very effective in other working groups.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, thank you, Mary, that is helpful. Now obviously some of the details of this report depend on our discussions later in this meeting about the subteams. So I’m not going to get too hung up on the far right column here and that’s going to, you know, vary anyway.

But the overall thrust here is - as noted, some members of the working group felt that the earlier timetable was too ambitious and others disagreed and thought we should stick to it I think I’m hearing at this point I’m hearing a consensus or non-objection to stretching out the timetable so long as we can get the report out in time for the November Council meeting.

And, again, yeah, some of these details are certainly going to change. And I think hearing some - we don’t want to simply still be just reviewing comments

when we get into September and we really should be drafting. But I get the - I agree with Mary that it's a somewhat - hopefully a somewhat seamless process in which the review and the incorporation is going on simultaneously.

So I see Vicky's hand. If anybody else wants to speak please raise your hand or if you're not in Adobe just speak up and we'll put you in the queue. Vicky, go ahead.

Vicky Scheckler: Thank you. Just I generally agree with what I'm hearing and the idea of having, you know, a decent revised draft by Dublin, if we have a Dublin meeting for discussion, sounds like a goal that we should be working toward and then have the final draft by whatever the date is - the November date.

Also to that end, as, you know, assuming that we're going to get the working groups moving quickly it seems like we can spend the next two weeks working hard within our subteams, which I meant subteams. And then, you know, be ready to present to, you know, back to the working group maybe in two weeks and see where we're at. I'd like to throw that out for consideration as well.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, let's get to that really when we talk to the subteams and what are realistic timetables for them. First one is just getting started and, you're right, it may well be they won't have a lot to report by next week but let's, if we can, defer that to that discussion.

Okay are there any other comments?

Jim Bikoff: Steve, it's Jim Bikoff.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, Jim, go ahead and then Mary has her hand up. Jim, go ahead.

Jim Bikoff: I know there's a proposal to (unintelligible) by a half hour starting next week. I, and I'm sure others, have some problems with that. We have other - we

have conflicts with other calls and other matters. And I would like to suggest that especially because of (unintelligible) going on between calls that we keep it at one hour only and not go to 1-1/2 hours.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Thank you, Jim. Yeah, that's - I think that's certainly appropriate here for discussion within the work plan. I guess there are two points there. One is that because people have other commitments, if we are going to extend the calls I think we need to give people probably need to give people more than one week's notice of that if we can.

The second point is, you know, does it make sense to extend the calls? Or is more work going to be going on in the subteams? So I think that's a valid, you know, a valid concern. And I'd like to hear other people's views on that. I see some support for that in the chat from Kathy and Val and Kiran.

So, Mary, please go ahead.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Steve. And I wanted to address the proposed face to face meeting because obviously people will already be making their travel arrangements if they're going and if not presumably they would need to block out that time on their calendars. And so two things, one is that this would be very much in terms of duration and objective like the one that we had in Los Angeles a while ago.

Secondly, though, we would, from the staff side, urge that a decision be made very quickly partly for the travel plans for people of course but partly also for scheduling in Dublin because, you know, obviously we would need to be sure that we get the room, get the staff support, etcetera.

Also, the GNSO Council meeting next Thursday - I'm sorry, this Thursday, is the place where Marika and I plan to mention that if they're going to select a working group that they do it soon and that it might most likely be this group. So if we can get some indication by Thursday morning East Coast time or,

you know, preferably actually even some indication from folks on the list between now and Thursday if they have any sort of violent objections or any serious problems that would be very helpful to staff. Thank you.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, thank you. Okay, on the face to face meeting - this is Steve speaking again - I guess a couple of questions. One is - if that's an all-day meeting how literally are we taking that? I know some flights arrive in the morning in Dublin and so is this something that you'd have to come in Thursday morning in order to make the Friday meeting? Or is it more likely that we could run this from, you know, 10-5 or 11-5, something like that so that people could arrive on Friday? That's one question.

The other question is, is there going to be any travel support or lodging support provided? There was some - one day of lodging support provided to a limited number of people for the LA meeting, as I recall. So is that - would that be - do we know if that would be part of the package for this face to face call?

And then the final question I would have, and I see Mary has her hand up to answer all these questions, is at the LA meeting we attempted to have a professional facilitator that didn't work out because he fell ill. We did have a facilitator or a - we had Thomas Rickert help us in that meeting to in effect chair portions of that meeting and help summarize what was going on, which I thought was useful.

So what would be the plan as far as facilitation for this meeting? So let me just ask - Mary has her hand up so she can respond to that. But let me just ask also of others have views on the face to face meeting, good idea, bad idea, or comments on how it should be structured please raise your hand or speak up if you're not in Adobe.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Steve. I'm just going to start speaking while folks are typing or thinking about it. And obviously I think the full day is something that we would

just, as staff, you know, kind of book the rooms for sort of better to do the max in case we do need it.

But in terms of the actual scheduling I certainly don't think that the working group is tied to a full day so it would certainly be up to the group in terms of how much time it thinks it will need and that obviously will depend on the progress we've made until then.

In terms of the travel support, our anticipation is that it will be very similar to what was offered in Los Angeles which would be hotel only rather than air fare. We found since then that, you know, there are some groups that may not send their full complement so the chairs of that particular working group that's being, you know, having its meeting have some discretion and flexibility as to maybe you increase the number of people for one night across the board or maybe even increase the number of nights for the people who are able to be there.

The whole idea of obviously being to get an adequate diversity and representativeness at the meeting, which I should also say, you know, even though when we first started this plan it was, you know, not thought that we would need so much remote participation. That's obviously something I think people expect and we would offer that as well.

I don't recall - Steve, I think you had a third point. I'm sorry, it's completely slipped my mind.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: ...third point was about facilitation - professional...

((Crosstalk))

Mary Wong: Oh yes. And I think that that would, again, depend on the working group, you feel that it would be helpful. I think that ties in a little bit to Kathy's question in the chat as to whether this meeting would be needed. And obviously this is up to the group and the chairs. From the staff perspective, because we've observed a few, we believe that this could be very helpful even if it's not an entire day.

It might also be that at this stage in the work, you know, having a facilitator come in might be not too helpful if you guys are going to be diving into the substance and it would be difficult for a professional facilitator to really be part of that. But if it's really trying to find consensus on clear proposals that might be, you know, total opposites, and I'm, you know, speculating here, then a facilitator may be more helpful in that scenario.

So I know I'm not giving a yes or no answer but I think most of this really is up to the working group except for the travel support, which would depend on how many people are able to be there and the chairs may have some discretion there.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, thank you. I'm going to - Paul has his hand up and then James. Before I do that let me just note in the chat several people are saying there are things that conflict with this. ICG, CCWG, may have a conflict on Friday and Amr is indicating the GNSO councilors may have a conflict on Friday. You know, conflicts are inevitable so, you know, we can't totally avoid that but that's just something to take into account.

So let me ask Paul and then James for their comments on this.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, Steve. This is Paul McGrady for the record. This comment is just about the facilitator. I would encourage us not to bring in a third party facilitator who does not have the background on what's been discussed of the last many months.

I didn't find the facilitation in Los Angeles to be helpful and that I found us going back and rehashing old issues that had already been thoroughly discussed in great length and settled amongst us. So if - for what it's worth I would prefer that the co-chairs run the face to face meeting in Dublin and that we stay on task with finalizing the handful of issues that remain in front of us. Thank you.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you, Paul. James.

James Gannon: Hi, James Gannon. And so on the topic of the independent facilitator, I suppose I somewhat agree with Paul actually. I don't think bringing somebody entirely independent out from the outside would be useful.

But I would suggest possibly, and I know that he is obviously going to be very busy at the time, but if we possibly invite Thomas back as he may have a little bit more of an insight into the goings on and might actually be a little bit more useful than somebody who is entirely independent. I think if he comes back to us with a no then possibly trying to get somebody up to speed even if they are a professional in the area is going to be possibly a little bit too much of a disruption to the proceedings of the day.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Let me see if there are any other comments on the face to face meeting. The impression I'm getting is that people want to think about this a little bit. There is some support for it but some feeling at it may be so late in the process that it would not be that useful. I think there's not a - any much support for an independent facilitator. There's some mixed reviews on Thomas's role. We can - obviously we can kind of deal with that a little bit later I think.

And then I think you've answered the question on travel support. And also Mary has answered the question we have a little - we have some timing flexibility, we don't have to have it - be a full day meeting, it could be a bit less than that if that's more convenient for people as they're arriving.

So - and I see in the chat that apparently there is not a conflict with the GNSO Council on that day but as James pointed out he thinks there may be some conflicts with other groups like the CCWG. So again, we can't totally avoid conflicts but if there's too much conflict then that's a big problem.

So I don't think we've got a clear signal on this but I think it's probably in line for Mary and the staff to tell the Council on Thursday that there is some interest but not necessarily a commitment to do so.

And I get the impression, Mary, that there is not any other working group that would be competing for this slot if there is one, is that correct?

Mary Wong: Steve, from the staff perspective that's correct because the other existing working groups are not at the same type of stage. And of course it first has to be a PDP working group. And I think the other big ones that are coming down the pike might not have been formed yet or at best would be at a very early stage.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, thank you. So I think the echo problem - at least I'm not hearing an echo right now, hopefully others are not. So everyone please mute your mics if you're not speaking.

Okay so I think that's about where we're ending up on the face to face, interest but no definite decision. Please, folks, check your schedules and think about this as to whether you would like to have this face to face meeting. And as Paul - as we will be late in the process and I think we will be focused on the final report at that point. It could potentially be useful. A little hard to say right now. But please think about that over the next week.

Just to tie up one loose end here, I think there was general support in the chat and in the comments that came in not to go to 90 minute meetings, at least not to go to one next week. So I think the two points I would draw from

this discussion is that if we - that we won't go to the 90 minute meeting next week. If we do go to a 90 minute meeting we should try to give some advanced, you know, more than a week's advance notice of that.

I don't think we should rule that out. I understand that it's not ideal and that people have other demands on their time but it may be, since we have a lot to do, and even with the expanded schedule, not a lot of time to do it, we may have to go to longer meetings at some point but I think unless I'm - I'd welcome other views on this but I'm not hearing support for doing it next week.

And we can kind of play this by ear and if we need to give people a little advance notice on it. Is that a - does that summary sound correct? And a couple people mentioned 90 minute meetings are better than scheduling additional meetings of the working group.

Okay I think that - unless people have other comments on the possible face to face meeting and on the work plan, I think we can move on to the subteam issues. And we have - we talked last week and in the interim about setting up subteams to look at particular questions - thank you for putting that list up - looking at particular questions and how these are responded to in the comments that we've received.

Since then we've had a lot of discussion about whether there should be a broader look at - let me put it this way. These three subteams are kind of directed at questions we asked in the draft report, in the initial report, places where we specifically said, "What do you think?"

And I think the viewpoint was that there may be some questions that - there may be some comments that are responsive to questions we didn't ask that raise issues that we should be considering and that we need to identify those issues and figure out a way to analyze them.

Kathy had raised that concern and one way to deal with that would be to have the group try to come up with those issues and then figure out whether they need to be allocated to a subteam - an existing subteam or handled in some other way. Another approach would be for people that aren't, you know, that may not be as interested or as focused on questions that being looked at by the subteams, to form their own group and go through the comments and try to pick out those new questions or additional questions that we need to address. Those are two options anyway that are on the table.

And before I go to the queue let me just say that we have gotten started with this first subteam on 1.3.2 which is the questions about relay escalation and law enforcement. And Alex and Lindsay have agreed to co-convene that group. I'm sure they would welcome additional participants but we would need to know that, you know, soon. So if you want to step forward please do so in the next day or two.

And Mary has delivered to them a public - a matrix that kind of goes through all the comments and says here's what they said on these 1.3.2 questions. So that's certainly a very valuable starting point for their work.

Let me turn to the queue now on this question of sub teams and I've got Volker, Kathy and Paul. So we'll go in that order. Again if you're not in the Adobe room please just speak up if you want to get in the queue. Volker go ahead.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, Volker Greimann speaking for the record. I agree that these sub teams will probably be very helpful in analyzing the comments for the questions that we've asked.

However we should be very careful not to let it rest at that. I think the comments have been very broad. They have been to topics that we haven't asked about but that are in the report.

And we will need more and deeper analysis of everything that these comments state not just the questions that we've asked. So these sub teams are very helpful for our questions but they will not be sufficient if we wanted to draft and all inclusive...

Steve Metalitz: Okay, Volker are you still there? The screen has gone blank here. People - here we go.

Volker Greimann: (Unintelligible).

Steve Metalitz: Here we go. Okay we had a momentary glitch there I think. Okay thank you Volker. Yes I think there's I don't think people disagree that there are questions that we didn't ask that need to be addressed because they've been raised by the comments.

So the question really is how best to, you know, tease those out and analyze those. That's one of the questions before us. So Kathy please go ahead.

Kathy Kleiman: Hi Steve can you hear me?

Steve Metalitz: Yes I can hear you.

Kathy Kleiman: So with great respect I think we did ask both general questions and specific questions and certainly the sub teams are responding to specific questions that we asked.

But also asked the general question did people agree with the consensus that we were presenting to them and we got a range of different responses. And, you know, it's hard to deal when the public responds and they don't exactly use our vocabulary or our talking points.

But I think we have to try to figure it out. We know the U.S. Federal Communications Commission struggled with this when they got 4 million comments on net neutrality.

And, you know, not all of them spoke in (FTC) ease and our commenters are not speaking in ICANN ease. But nonetheless we kind of have to grapple with it and I really feel if we don't assign some additional sub topics to the sub teams and I like the sub team process.

And in fact I wouldn't even expand it, I'd recommend we not expand the sub team process because after other people who I think have been holding back to try to figure out timeframe and habit after everyone volunteers we should have a very diverse sub team engaged in this review.

So I'd like to recommend some additional sub topics or additional topics for the sub team and just say quickly, you know, where I got this. And so I circulated the email on it last night because I've been going through as I've been traveling, you know, on the planes I've been reading the comments.

And so due process, we're getting a lot of calls for due process and that is not necessarily or exclusively for court orders. So how can, you know, what do the comments say and how can this call for due process and this call for balance and fairness be incorporated to each aspect of our work.

But I would say particularly those who are reviewing Annex E the illustrative disclosure framework. So for example you might say, you know, due process should be, we should analyze the appeal.

The idea of unlimited appeals and who participates in that and the standards of the appeal when a proxy privacy provider declines a reveal. How do we bring due process into that appeal?

Even, you know, so this kind of analysis due process where does it belong in what we've been working on and some of the additional issues that are part of what we're doing.

The second issue would be the use and abuse of proxy privacy registration in (tools). There is a lot of new data on there and a lot of new information about how people use, how legitimate users use proxy and privacy registration that we should be capturing some of that.

I think it's really critical we've got a new record here and that can help inform as we understand better some of the abuse of Whois data that may help inform some of the recommendations that we're drafting now.

And then a miscellaneous category what is it where (unintelligible) people talk about anonymity and chilling effects and also some other things that I know people can fill in the blanks on.

You know, where is the miscellaneous category for what issues are being raised that we better need to address in our draft recommendations. So let me present those three additional topics that I would love to see a slide also to the sub teams that are reviewing some of these bigger topics of (unintelligible) as well. Thanks so much.

Steve Metalitz: Okay thank you Kathy. Again yes I think we need to identify the topics and figure out how we're going to deal with those additional topics. Paul is next in the queue and then James.

Paul McGrady: Hi, Paul McGrady for the record. I think Steve, I do think that some of the additional questions raised in the comments that were not anticipated by our questions are very important.

And I think that we should consider forming an additional sub team to look for those, to ease them out, to find out whether or not they can be assigned to the current sub teams.

Whether or not they're sort of independent but that need further evaluation and then move from there. And I think that that is probably the most efficient

way to make sure that the sub teams are looking to things that relate to their specific topics.

But also that we don't miss an important comment just because it doesn't fit into the three squares that we've drawn as they (unintelligible) and so anyways I think we should do that and I would like to volunteer to be on it. Thank you.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you Paul. James go ahead.

James Gannon: James Gannon. So I'm going to be pragmatic here. So the issues which where we're classing is not that we didn't directly ask in questions. I think there are possibly some of our most divisive issues within the group.

And I think that this is something that we should address as a whole. I think that these are some fundamental questions that not all of us may agree on. Some of us think that, you know, we should be revising certain things, some people think that what's done is done and we should keep moving on.

And others think that it may not be relevant to our work at all and I think this regardless of what way we classify them they are fundamental questions to both the work we've done and the work we're going to do going ahead.

And I missed the start of the call so I'm very supportive of the extended timeline by the way. But I think that the questions that are possibly the big questions that have come in through the thousands and thousands of comments that we received and also we've received some extremely substantial comments content wise and all so due to the groups that submitted them.

And around basically some of the fundamentals of the group and I would suggest that we don't put that off into a sub team because the sub teams are supposed to be very focused.

They're supposed to be addressing a specific topic and a specific issue. So that was the genesis of the sub teams and our use here came from the CCWG and the CWG and large fundamental issues were not supposed to be discussed in sub teams in the way that we used them back there.

So I would suggest that the larger questions that we have to address as a group we address those as a whole because they are going to be something that we need strong discussion over and at the end of the day we need to come to consensus on this.

If we're to have a final report to convey that's going to be productive and is going to pass the counsel and become, you know, good ICANN policy we need to have a substantial discussion on it.

And I think the place for those more fundamental style questions is within the working group as a whole rather than the sub team.

Steve Metalitz: Okay thank you. So between Paul and James we have two different approaches suggested to this. Paul is that a new hand or is that the old hand?

Paul McGrady: Yes it's a new hand.

Steve Metalitz: Okay Paul and then Todd and then Phil.

Paul McGrady: I'm not suggesting that by forming a sub group to locate these issues that all of these issues will be dispatched by that sub group and settled. I think that we've got to identify the additional questions and comments first.

Find those homes and then maybe work a little bit on the substance of the comments but I agree with James that some of these will need to be addressed by the whole.

But the organization of those, finding of those, ranking of those for discussion that can be handled by the sub team. And some of them we may find that while they, you know, they raise new and novel issues they may not be the ones that we have time as a whole to deal with.

My concern about James approach is that if we do this by the whole then we're back in the three sub team days of all of us looking through all of these comments and discussing all of the comments one by one which defeats the purpose of the sub teams in the first place.

So I'm closer to James position that it appears that I am but I do think that the additional question sub team is the vital one if we're actually going to get to those comments and give them the due weight that they deserve. Thank you.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you Paul. I've got Todd next.

Todd Williams: Thanks Todd Williams for the transcript. Just if it looks like we are going to an additional group to look at these additional questions and I agree with everything that's been said so far that that is worthwhile.

Is there a way that that group can report back to the bigger group relatively soon in that process with a kind of a enumerated list of these are the additional questions that we identified that we are looking at.

And the reason that I say that is to the extent there is any overlap with the three sub teams that have already been formed we wouldn't want to duplicate efforts because that would defeat the purpose of doing this process.

My hunch is that there are discrete issues that would fall under that additional questions definition but I would just want that sub team to confirm that before we go too far down that road. Thanks.

Steve Metalitz: Okay thank you that's a timing issue. Let's see I've got Phil and then Kathy.

Phil Corwin: Yes thanks Steve, Phil Corwin for the record. I'm going to - on the topic of an additional sub team for additional issues I'm agnostic on that if the group thinks it will be helpful I'm fine with that.

What I wanted to speak on is slightly different but related and there was no other place in today's agenda to discuss it. But having reviewed all the back and forth on the email list over the past few days about disagreement, about what to do about the many opposition emails, comments that were submitted which some people feel were based on misinformation or one-sided presentation or whatever.

I want to take a slightly different approach. I think for the good of the final report we should presume that we should do everything possible to address those comments to create a record showing that we took them seriously in some way and perhaps even did something unusual.

Some type of proactive outreach to the groups that generated the comments explaining where we think they are wrong, creating a record to show they were taken seriously only because we can presume that the groups that generated over 11,000 comments on the initial report if they are not happy with the final report they will generate that many or more and perhaps direct to ICANN board members and that could seriously hinder the adoption of a final report.

So I think we should, you know, there's an old saying politics keep your friends close and your enemies closer. I don't want to say that those who commented are enemies but I think we need to create a record going forward of taking that opposition even if among us those of us who may think it's misinformed and create a record saying that it was seriously considered by this working group taken into account in the final recommendations.

And, you know, some of that on the due process goes into various sub groups. I think that's fine because the working group is going to, the full group is going to review and pass muster on all of the sub group reports.

So I hope that suggestion is somewhat helpful for facilitating a final report that has a chance, a decent chance of getting adopted by the board. Thank you.

Steve Metalitz: Okay thank you Phil. I mean I guess my only response to that is that we know that some of the groups that generated many of these comments are very well represented on this working group.

So I don't see outreach to them as a problem but some groups are so I think your point is well taken. Kathy you're next.

Kathy Kleiman: Thanks Steve. I find myself agreeing with just about everybody but in particular I like Paul's idea. Initially I hadn't really understood the idea of creating a new sub team but that would run in parallel with the other three sub teams which everyone wants to be on one or more of them I'm sure because they're doing a fundamental issue that we're working on.

But if this as Paul has suggested a sub team is created to rapidly review remaining topics that need to be addressed and then in culling with the comments just with that specific goal of culling through the comments helping not exclusively there are still issues that will come back to the working group as a whole but culling through all these comments.

There are existing issues that commence feedback into existing sub teams or maybe as Mary suggested rapidly upgrade a new sub team or two that may emerge. I think that makes sense to create a dedicated group of people in looking at the issues and so I will of course join Paul in volunteering for it.

Steve Metalitz: Okay yes thank you Kathy. So yes as I hear that proposal that's a team to identify these additional questions, you know, and to propose an allocation of

them whether it's to the full group or to an existing sub team or to a new sub team.

And this is obviously something important to do. We don't want to get too far down the line on this. It's also a big job because you really have to look through everything.

But I think we've already had a couple of volunteers for that, Paul being one and I think Kathy was volunteering and I will say Kathy raised this concern and is the one who has brought forward a couple of issues that she thinks fall, you know, fall into that category.

And I think if more folks would participate in doing that we would come up with a pretty good list of identified and recommended allocation for topics. So I guess whether you call that a sub team or whatever you call it, you know, there's some people that are willing to devote some time over the next week or two to doing that and reporting back to the full group with their list of identified topics.

Hopefully fairly well designed and their recommendations on how we ought to deal with them I think that would be worthwhile. So I see James volunteering I think for this. I don't know if that's what you're volunteering for.

Okay thank you okay now I'm reading further down in the chat and (Stephanie) volunteering. As I said Paul and Kathy on the list. Omar has put his name on the list.

So is that a - we can call it a sub team or whatever we want to call it but it's basically the identification and allocation task force. And as I understand it this would work in parallel.

We're still going to start our three other teams. We've got one up and running. I'd like more people to jump in on the other two and it's possible that

these teams would be asked to take on some additional topics that come out of the identification and allocation process.

That's why I say recommending allocation because I don't want to have a bait and switch here. I don't want people stepping forward to be part of these sub groups and then finding that they have a lot of issues they didn't even anticipate.

So we'll have to negotiate that perhaps but does that sound to folks like a reasonable way forward? Omar is calling it a spinoff team and maybe that's good.

Anyway that's one that's kind of out there on the table now. I see some support in the chat and among the - okay so let me ask I've got Kathy and James in the queue.

I had Kathy and James in the queue but they seem to have taken their hands down.

Kathy Kleiman: Old hands Steve okay.

James Gannon: Hi James Gannon. I'm just putting it out there there's a lot of on commercial side on that additional topic. So I'd welcome people from the other side of the field shall we call it to come onto that team as well just to have some balance.

Steve Metalitz: Yes we do want that and again people not on this call or people after this call may be in a position to step forward. James Bladel go ahead.

James Bladel: Yes thanks Steve. And I think to James' point and what Mary has put in the chat it would be great if we could circulate this list of sub team membership to the greater mailing list after this because I know there's a couple of folks we probably want to get assigned that aren't currently here today.

Steve Metalitz: Absolutely I think we should list all these sub teams and encourage people to step forward and I think in Mary's message Mary does that go to the full list as well your message to the 132 group?

You mentioned that you could provide, the staff can provide some support in terms of Wiki pages or obviously you provided a template I mean you are providing the template.

And there are other help, other support that you can provide but we need people on all these teams. And again I think if we can do this in parallel we may be able to make a good, make some good...

Okay let me just see if there are any other comments or questions on this.
Okay I'm sorry James Gannon is that a new hand?

James Gannon: Yes just very briefly. I know Mary had suggested it on our last call because she had a lot to do during the CWG meeting and so there is a lot of I won't say experience but a lot of background on, you know, organizational methods for what we called the design teams on the CWG.

So if Mary I think she might already but if Mary wants to reach out to the team around the design team on the CWG side there is a lot of possibly things around Google Docs and support services that were (unintelligible) might be useful (unintelligible) just from a process and efficiency point of view.

Steve Metalitz: Okay that's a good suggestion I'm sure Mary will be in touch with them. So Mary has put in the chat that what she will circulate we will ask for volunteers.

And in terms of next week's meeting we've already decided it will not be a 90 minute meeting. The question is whether we will have, you know, anything from any of the sub groups that we want to work on then or maybe any questions.

We can at least evaluate where the different sub teams are in terms of organization but I'm not sure that we would, you know, not quite sure what the call would deal with beyond that because I think if we're successful here we're actually getting a lot of work done in the sub teams and we not have output from them next week.

Hopefully we will have something from the 1 point (unintelligible). But we'll at least have progress reports on where we stand with all the sub teams and obviously we can also see if we can come to a decision on the face-go-face which we asked to think further about.

Okay, are there any other points that people wish to raise on this call? Okay if not then we'll give you back 7 minutes for other productive uses. Thanks everyone for your participation

Please keep an eye out for what Mary is going to send around and please step forward on these sub teams and we will by the way we'll also designate co-conveners, you know, for each sub team to kind of be the people in charge of getting the ball rolling and making sure that there is forward progress.

And I want to thank (Alex) and (Lindsay) for volunteering to do that on sub team one and we will have something similar on these other sub teams as well.

Okay if there's no other business thanks everyone.

Kathy Kleiman: Thank you.

Mary Wong: Thank you Steve, thank you everybody.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you (Cindy) you may now stop the recordings.

END