

ICANN Transcription Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP WG Tuesday 28 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:

Graeme Bunton - RrSG
Val Sherman - IPC
Kathy Kleiman - NCSG
Alex Deacon -IPC
Stephanie Perrin - NCSG
Phil Corwin - BC
Terri Stumme - BC
James Bladel - RrSG
Todd Williams - IPC
Paul McGrady - IPC
Vicky Sheckler - IPC
Volker Greimann - RrSG
Lindsay Hamilton-Reid - RrSG
Griffin Barnett- IPC
David Cake - NCSG
Sara Bockey - RrSG
Don Blumenthal - RySG
Dick Leaning - Individual
Roger Carney - RrSG
Susan Prosser - RrSG
Kiran Malancharuvil- IPC

Apologies :

Frank Michlick - Individual
Michele Neylon - RrSG
James Gannon - NCUC
Holly Raiche - ALAC
Steve Metalitz – IPC

ICANN staff:

Mary Wong
Amy Bivins
Stephen Miller
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: The recordings have been started. You may proceed.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Luke). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the PPSAI Working Group call on the 28th of July, 2015.

On the call today we have Graeme Bunton, Volker Greimann, Val Sherman, Dick Leaning, Alex Deacon, Sara Bockey, Todd Williams, Don Blumenthal, James Bladel, Roger Carney, Lindsay Hamilton-Reid, Griffin Barnett, Vicky Scheckler, Kathy Kleiman, Phil Corwin, Terri Stumme, Susan Prosser and Stephanie Perrin.

We received apologies from Holly Raiche, James Gannon, Michele Neylon and Frank Michlick. From staff we have Mary Wong, Marika Konings, Amy Bivins, Glen de Saint Géry and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

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

Graeme Bunton: Thank you very much. All right, ladies and gentlemen, nice to see you all again. I was on vacation last week and had a good time catching up over the last day or so on the activity and it looks like there was quite a bit and that's great, lots of good discussion going on.

So today, if you're looking at our agenda, a little bit of administrative work and then we're going to dig into what subteam on 1.3.2 has to say. Actually before we get there any updates to anyone's SOI? Going once. Going twice. Not seeing anything.

Moving on ahead. So the first thing that we've got in our administrative work to do is have a little bit of a discussion about how to make sure that we're documenting the work of each subteam appropriately. That's relatively - Kathy just asked if we're - excuse me - posting the membership of each subteam. We can do that. It's on the wiki page. Maybe Mary can find that link for me quickly please. Thank you, Mary.

So we have a couple of subteams, they are working I assume, diligently and we're going to hear back on one of those today. But I have a gentle concern that the work being done in those is not being archived publicly in a way and I want to make sure that we do that and we're transparent in our effort.

So one of the things that we could do to solve that problem is set up a mailing list for each of the subteams. The other option might be just to make Mary sad but ensure that we CC staff on all of the emails that go in - that are going on in each subteam and then Mary can put those into a mailing archive.

But I think it's important that we capture those discussions and there's a balance there that needs to happen around ensuring the group is up to date on what's going on and that those are transparent but also, you know, it's a subteam; we don't need everybody chiming in the whole time. So I would like to hear from people currently in a subteam whether they would find another mailing list for that subteam to be unwieldy or if that would be welcome or if there's any other suggestions for how to make sure that we've captured that work effectively.

Well, all right but don't all chime in at once. Would anybody be opposed to using mailing lists for the subteams? I see Val is typing. All right so that seems to be - there we go, all right, thank you all.

So Mary, if we could look into doing that for the subteams so that we can capture all of that work and make sure those discussions are transparent that would be awesome. Thank you kindly.

The only downside of that is that it could be that, you know, people sometimes forget which list they're emailing and that's okay. Just remember to use it and we will be fine and be able to move forward. Thank you all.

Next up is additional volunteers especially for Subteam 1.3.3. If you click on the links that Mary put in the chat you can see the subgroups. And I can read it out if you're curious. It seems to be there was some 1.3.2 has Alex Deacon and Lindsay Hamilton-Reid as the co-conveners, also Val Sherman, Volker Greimann and David Cake.

1.3.3 right now just has Kiran Malancharuvil, David Cake and Terri Stumme. And that is one that we need more volunteers on. So - and that is also the oft-debated, very exciting commercial use of privacy and proxy services so I would think it would be - there would be people piling in to get in there. And if you're interested in volunteering for that please do so asap. And let Mary know and we can get you added and onto the new mailing list.

What else have we got? We have Annex E currently with Phil Corwin, Holly Raiche, Todd Williams, Darcy Southwell and Vicky Scheckler. And then I think we have the last one which is the identification and allocation of additional topics which I've heard referred to as No Comment Left Behind, which is great.

And that's got Paul McGrady and Kathy Kleiman as the co-conveners, also James Gannon, Stephanie Perrin and Amr Elsadr, Frank Michlick and Vicky Scheckler on there. That's where we're at for subteams currently. Lindsay Hamilton-Reid is a glutton for punishment signing up for 1.3.3.

So that's great. Please if you're interested get in there and help us wade through all of these comments and we can give them what they're due. So that's about where we are for volunteers.

We haven't come to a decision around the face to face for ICANN 54 in Dublin. I know it was talked about a bit last call. I know that staff would love us to make a decision very shortly on whether we think that's going to be a worthwhile effort for us. And I - it was asked for by the end of the week which we can try and do so. I don't think I've seen any conversation about it directly on the list. And if I have I missed it, my apologies.

But perhaps I'll try and - I can kick that off myself so we can have a little bit of discussion and Steve and I and - can have a chat about whether we think we're going to be in a good place for that. My initial impression is that that might be a worthwhile thing to do at that point in our work.

So if anybody else feels strongly about it let's have a bit of discussion and we can make a choice asap so that people can do travel arrangements and work out any conflicts sooner rather than later.

The also thing that came up on previous calls was whether we do hour and a half or longer calls in the future. And there may be some sense that we need to do that and the goal is to give everybody a week's heads up prior to extending a call-out because people have conflicts. So we will endeavor to do that.

I'm not sure at the moment whether we're going to need to do that for next week's call but maybe we can carve out a little time at the end of this one to see where we're at and what we need to cover. So that is all of our administrative details.

Doodle poll? I think it's more, as Val, around how much work we've got not whether we want to do it or not. It's - I think it's just a volume of work that

we've got in front of us. And then so if we're going to try and get through say, you know, one or two subteams or a subteam and some of the other recommendations in a meeting that maybe we do that.

For instance I could see us doing an hour on a subteam and then half an hour on some of the other recommendations and the less contentious stuff. And we'll see if we can - we'll see if that's necessary.

So with that - actually I didn't check and see if there's anybody who's on the call but not in the Adobe room. If you want to speak up and that's the case just please do so and I'll get you into the queue.

So I think that brings us to the place where we need to hear from Alex Deacon and Lindsay Hamilton-Reid about Subteam 1.3.2 and where they've got to and an update from them. Lindsay or Alex, you ready to go?

Alex Deacon: Yeah, hi. This is Alex. I'm ready. Can you hear me?

Graeme Bunton: Yeah, we can hear you just fine. Take it away, Alex.

Alex Deacon: Thank you. So before we start I just wanted to mention that the subteam has not had a chance to be on a call all at once to kind of discuss and debate and finalize a finding so I just wanted to state that up front. We hope to do that sometime this week but we're scattered across the globe so that's a challenge. But so keep that in mind as I go through that - go through kind of the process here and knowing that there's still work and decisions and debate to be had.

What we did in the subgroup was split the comment for 1.3.2 into two. Question 1 is around relay; Question 2 was around the law enforcement aspects. I took on Question 1 and Lindsay took on Question 2 with some help from Val.

And what we've done is taken the - each - using the great tool created by staff we've created a Google doc which there's links to and you should have the ability to see - just to use as a working document to be able to sort through the comments and, you know, with the hopes of distilling kind of the essence of what the community sent our way.

So you'll see just regarding Question 1 what we did was I created several columns to analyze the specific questions that we actually asked in our - the community to opine on. And for Question 1 it was things around escalation and then costs.

And then for each comment we received we went through and determined, you know, did the commenter address those specific questions and if they did how did they, you know, what did they say?

And in the case where the comments didn't have to do directly with the questions we asked it was perhaps the comment on some other aspect. We tried to pull that out and put that also in this Google doc document.

And we did the same for Question 2 although Question 2, because of some issues with Google docs, you'll see we ended up with a Word document kind of describing and outlining and, you know, how we - how we analyzed all the comments. I'll let Lindsay talk about that in a second.

But - so the idea is to - we're at the point now where we've done the initial and analysis and we walked through all the comments. We have some very high level initial findings which you could read in the document in front of you. You could scroll down.

And the next step now for the subteam, as I mentioned to meet as a group and start nailing down exactly what the findings are and making recommendations for those findings as to how to proceed whether it requires

an update to our reports and additional comment on the report or perhaps there's some comments here that will be dealt another way, still TBD.

So that's kind of a high level overview of what we've done. And you could read initial analysis and findings in the documents. As I mentioned those are still under discussion.

And I think what I'll do now is pass it on to Lindsay to maybe give us a little more information and detail on Question 2.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid: Okay thanks, Alex. Can you all hear me?

Alex Deacon: Yeah.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid: Okay great. Great, sometimes I have connection issues. So basically I think it was user error that I couldn't use Google docs, not entirely sure. So for the summary for Question 2 I put it in a Word document and all I did was kind of split out all the comments under the four questions and did a kind of summary at the end with a lot of help from Val just to go over - because this is, I think, slightly more involved and there were a lot of comments on Question 2.

Not all of them, I have to say, was particularly answering the questions. But for me I think - and for the others as well who looked at this the sort of key issue seemed to be an erosion of privacy. If you kind of read through the comments if any of you have had time to do you'll see that that seems to be a key issue about all of the questions whether it's to do with frameworks or anything else.

And basically, as you see from the Word document I've done, you'll see where comments are split out and then there's a summary at the end. As Alex said we still have quite a lot more work to do to come up with

recommendations but I think we've come a long way in the last week and certainly have a good understanding of what the community thinks about this.

Does anyone have any questions?

Graeme Bunton: I can see Kathy's got one there.

Kathy Kleiman: Yeah. First thank you for all the work that you're doing, it's incredible. And going through these is difficult so thank you. Question, a number of the comments might be viewed as somewhat ambiguous but they did talk about law enforcement and due process and court orders. And I was wondering...

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid: Yes.

Kathy Kleiman: ...how you evaluated those?

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid: Basically we kind of looked at using applicable law, national law, local law, however it was put, we kind of looked at those and thought right, okay, for a lot of people those comments meant rather than putting anything else in place use due process and local law instead of putting in another framework or trying to put in another process to make things different.

Many people seem to think that trying to make changes would give law enforcement either more rights than they already have and would be, again, an erosion of privacy.

Kathy Kleiman: So can I follow up? Are there counts on that? I mean, that sounds like a fair way to handle them. Are there counts on how many of the comments involve that type of processing?

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid: We haven't completed that yet but we will do in the next week I hope.

Kathy Kleiman: I know it's a huge task but thank you very much, it's...

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid: No problem. Anyone else?

Graeme Bunton: Stephanie Perrin is there. Go ahead, Stephanie. If you're going ahead, Stephanie, we can't hear you.

Stephanie Perrin: Sorry, Graeme. Can you hear me now?

Graeme Bunton: We can.

Stephanie Perrin: Can you hear me now?

Graeme Bunton: Yes.

Stephanie Perrin: No you can't. Oh, very good. Sorry, I realized I hadn't hooked up my microphone, which is terrible. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I did discuss this on the list a bit and there was a pretty healthy debate a couple of weeks ago.

I just wanted to ask a few questions. One of the issues, of course, is the difference in national law. And do we have any indication of where the comments are coming from so that we could sort by nationality? So that's my first question.

]

((Crosstalk))

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid: ...that we have. It wasn't in some by company. We certainly could find out geographically where everyone is based. A lot of the comments seem to take it from that whatever jurisdiction the privacy and proxy provider was in that was the law or jurisdiction that should be taken.

Stephanie Perrin: Okay. And then the second question is, these are complex issues. I wouldn't expect someone who hadn't deal with matters of jurisdiction or law enforcement to really understand what they're saying. And I know I've been accused of being patronizing and I think it's a fair accusation. I am perhaps, you know, being a bit patronizing in wanting that filter.

But it's hard to evaluate a question like this when we don't have any idea how well it's being understood. Now did you find that when you reviewed the comments? Is it clear that people know what they're saying or suggesting? So let me give you an example, in Canada, because all of our people watch American TV they're under the impression that they have Miranda rights, which they don't, you know?

If you tested the population you'd find 85% of people believe they're under a regime of law that actually doesn't apply to them with quite different constitutional protections. And I suspect that's a common problem even internationally. Thanks.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid: Thanks for that, Stephanie. Yes, I would agree in some respects that there were certain comments where I would say it was quite apparent, whoever made the comments didn't necessarily either understand the question or understand the jurisdiction issue. However, I would say there were other comments where there were quite obviously some understanding.

There was one comments which claimed that ICANN oversaw everything which I'm sure they wouldn't like to take that on board. So I would say some of the questions I don't think people necessarily understood particularly within context. But on the other hand, I would say that there were several comments where it showed the clear understanding of the issue.

Graeme Bunton: I see Mary's got her hand up.

Stephanie Perrin: Yeah, people care about this issue deeply and we need a more fulsome discussion of it in my view because even in our reports I'm not sure they would get an inkling of the complexity of the issue from the point of the service provider. Thanks.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid: Thanks, Mary.

Mary Wong: Graeme - this is Mary. Actually that was Stephanie. I just - that's fine. I just wanted to follow up on that Lindsay said, having looked at quite a lot of the comments. First of all for both public comments generally in the forum, and secondly for the template of questions that we used, we don't obvious - for obvious reasons ask people to list where they're from.

Some commenters do do that voluntarily either up front or as part of their comments. And in other respects, again having gone through quite a lot - as Lindsay said - it's quite apparent sometimes when a commenter may not understand either the origin or the gist of the question but in other respects there has been some experience and there are some comments particularly the ones that came in as responsive to the template questions which were quite fulsome.

And so hopefully in totality as each subteam and as the full working group goes through all of these templates where we've tried to drop in as many direct quotes as possible that we can get at least a fairly good overall impression of what the commenters are saying and why. Thanks, Graeme.
Thanks, Lindsay.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid: Thanks, Mary. Anyone else have any other questions? Bear in mind this is, at the moment, a very initial report. We're going to come up with something much more in depth in the next three weeks.

Graeme Bunton: Kathy's got her hand up.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid: Right. Fair - I mean, this is a great initial report and it was done so quickly. So question to both presenter, which is let's say someone wants to find out whether a particular comment was taken into account, you know, whether law enforcement comments were taken into account or whether certain stakeholder group comments were taken into account.

How can - is there a way to kind of cross map that and see whether, you know, let's say you want to see whether you think all of the aspects of something were evaluated. How would we know?

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid: Oh thanks, Kathy. I know in the Google spreadsheet it listed, along with the comments, whoever had made them whether it was individuals or ALAC or whoever, what we have tried to do is take on board what everyone has said regardless. And I hope that will come across in the final report and any recommendations that we make.

Alex, I don't know if you want to add to that?

Alex Deacon: Yeah, this is Alex. I think that's right. If you remember the initial tool that staff sent out had a column for, I forget exactly how it was worded, but there was a column that - where we could indicate how we dealt or if we dealt with the comments. And I suppose if we decided not to there would be a reason. So I think all of that would be - or could be easily documented and preserved for transparency sake.

Kathy Kleiman: Terrific. Thank you.

Graeme Bunton: All right, I think that's really good progress, Alex, and Lindsay and others working on that subteam. And much appreciated. Do we have any other comments on the work for subteam for 1.3.2 either on what they've produced or their process? Seeing nothing we get to move on. Fun, I thought this bit would take a little bit longer.

Which mean we get to dip into commencing the review of the preliminary recommendations 1-9 which Mary sent out a bit previously and I think she's collapsed a bunch of yes and nos into yeses and nos rather than giving every single one, is my understanding.

So why don't we - so there's a lot of pieces here or there's a lot of comments that we can go through. What I think is probably best is get Mary to talk again just to reinforce how she built this. And then we can go forward and see what we need to do with this input that we've got on these particular questions.

And as a piece of process for going forward what I really think we should be doing is that everybody needs to take a look at this document before each call as Mary continues to update it. And so that we can get through some of these questions and then some of the comments on each of the questions we can discuss so we can dig into the bits that people think need more discussion and that requires everybody to be up on these documents and be prepared to work through them going forward.

So we're going to start off at the top of the definitions provider status labeling section. And really Number 1 is, "Do you agree or disagree with the working group's recommendation definitions for the following terms: Disclosure, publication, person, law enforcement authority, relay and requestor?" Which is 1.3.1 recommendation one. Mary? Do you want to give us a brief overview of how you put this together, just to make sure everybody's on the same page?

Mary Wong: Sure. Thanks Graeme. And again it's probably to reinforce what folks already know, especially folks that starting working in the step team and those who have been in other recent GNSO PDP working groups. So, the idea, as Alex said in response to Kathy's question earlier is that we are able to demonstrate as a working group that we have taken on board and considered the totality of the public comments received.

Obviously, one challenge that we have in this group is the sheer number and volume. And so what I've done in this particular version, as Graeme noted, and this is in response to a suggestion, I think one or two calls ago, is that where we had temperate responses that basically said yes I agree or no I disagree, that did provide an additional comment or any further suggestions, those have been collapsed into, for example if you look at this question one and you go down a few pages to basically row number, I want to say 30 something or something like that you would see that I've got, you know, instead of a name of a person, I would have, you know, how many template responders.

And that would give you an indication of the number of people who said either just yes or no in a straightforward fashion. For everyone else where they've either provided just one additional comment to a yes or no answer, or where instead of saying yes or no they've provided a comment. Their comment has been listed as its own row or column, and they have been identified across from that.

For example, again in this question one you see the BC, the IFP constituency and a few other commenters. So, this template would include both the comments that came in directly through the forum, as well as the responses to the template that we also provide as an additional avenue for everyone. What I would say is that by collapsing those yes and no response what I've managed to do is reduce this document, which is just our first nine recommendations from 116 pages to 85 pages, so I guess that's progress or improvement.

And so, I just wanted to reinforce what Graeme said, which is that it's probably not realistic for us to use these calls to go through every comment one by one, so it'll be really helpful if prior to the call if you could take a look through whatever questions or recommendations are designated for that call and highlight those comments that you think we should discuss as a full working group and perhaps suggest a response that will allow us to make

good progress while ensuring that not only are the comments recorded, but we've all had a chance to go through them.

So, Graeme I don't know how you want to proceed with this, if you want to take these questions one going forward or allow people a few minutes to scroll through and see if there are any questions?

Graeme Bunton: Good question Mary. I think probably we just sort of plow ahead and people can read along as we move forward. There was something in there that I think we need to reinforce, is we want to make sure that, and how I think it's going to work is that individually we need to, you know, read all of the comments that end up in these. And then we can bring back to the group as a whole the pieces of that that we think were really important, need to see the light of day.

And then we can work on that all together on our calls. But, it's not necessary that we as a group read through all of these so long as we're individually doing that task. If anyone disagrees with that, that's fine. We can talk about that but that's I think going to be the most efficient way to go forward. Right.

Okay. So, having been on vacation I'm probably not up to date on this document as I should be, and my apologies for that, which means I think that we need to, I'm going to need to anyway, in particular to lean a little bit on Mary around understanding what's being put into each one of these questions. I think for question one it's line six, seven, and eight that give us the collapsed the numbers for the template responses.

So in terms of agreement with our recommendations, 58 out of 144 individual respondents to those question templates agreed with all of the recommendations. And what is the note here? This row represents all of the template responses that answered the question without providing further comment. And I'm going to assume that if they put in further comment those

comments are captured in this document somewhere on one of these rows.

Thanks Mary.

Mary it would also be handy perhaps if this document had page numbers so that we can figure out not just which response number but the page number that response is on ? The next row number seven had six out of 144 agreed with some of the recommendations. And so they agreed with some but they didn't provide further comment. And then the last one was they agreed with none. And that was 50 out of 144 on the template responses.

And that's interesting. So we have agreeing with all and agreeing with none relatively closely split between agreeing and disagreeing entirely, and disagreeing entirely or agreeing entirely without a lot of further comment is going to be a challenge I think to deal with. Do we have any sort of initial thoughts on that collapsing given that this is also the first time we've sort of looked at those numbers?

I see Mary's hand, and I see (Todd's) hand; Mary I'm going to let you go first please and then we'll go to Todd.

Mary Wong: Yep, just a quick comment then. You know, I don't know how else to say this but, and I'm hoping I don't sound subjective or anything, but quite a few of the template responses were basically people who disagreed with most or, you know, said no to most questions. Now, going back to Kathy's question that may not be as evident from this public comment review tool.

It would be fairly evident if we had that full tool, which I actually have some where we could see, you know, comment and basically said no to question, two, three, four, five, six and seven. I don't know what to do with that. But I think one of the points to note is that because these commenters whether they agreed with all, some, or none didn't put an additional comment. Maybe all we can do is just note the numbers and see if those that did provide

additional comments have more substance input that we can use in our final recommendations.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Mary. It's interesting now that we've asked to collapse them to look at those numbers, and now we need to really ponder what those numbers mean to us and how they're going to inform our discussion. Todd go ahead.

Todd Williams: Thank you Todd Williams for the transcript. I guess I had more of a question as to how the document that we're looking at put together because I thought that this first question was on the specific definitions, and specifically do you commenter agree with how we are using these enumerated defined terms? But, then a lot of the 30-plus entries that are included under that first question don't really go to that.

They go to broader issues of do you agree with the recommendations broadly or not? And I just in terms of how we go forward on this specific first question of definitions, I'm not quite sure how we use those comments to answer that question. Does that make sense or do Mary do you have any kind of guidance on that?

Mary Wong: This is Mary. And thanks for the questions Todd. I think that's pretty much it, so but just to give you some background, because a number of the public comments that were sent directly to the forum didn't necessarily have headings or titles; whereas, others did. There were some comments that would, you know, let you know that they're answering this particular question or that they would name say recommendation number seven or 16, or something.

So, those are fairly easy to categorize whether or not the actual comment itself is directly relevant. Then there were comments that were sent directly to the forum, which didn't have those direct references or those headings, but in the substance spoke to it. For example, in talking about definition for these

terms, so those would be the comment that would also make it to this part of the spreadsheet.

With regard to the template, the template was actually organized by recommendation. And for each, the responder was given the option to say or nor, or yes to some no to some, or yes with conditions, et cetera, as well as a comment or text box where they could put in the additional comments. And so a lot of the additional comments you see in this chart from those template respondents came from the additional text box.

And again whether or not it's directly relevant would be something for the working group to determine. But whatever you see in this comment box here would come from the comment box that was related to that question. Whatever it was that the responder chose to put in that comment box. So, hopefully that's helpful?

Graeme Bunton: Todd? Does that give you a bit more clarity there?

Todd Williams: It doesn't. I think it might be helpful just for me to understand that you kind of walk through a specific example, if that's okay with you?

Graeme Bunton: That's not a bad idea actually. Mary I'm not sure if that's possible for you to fire up on the fly?

Todd Williams: Mary just what you were saying like at number 12 on the document that we're looking at, where it says agree with none, that means that this particular commenter agreed with none of the definitions in the initial report. And then added this additional comment about why he agreed with none of the definitions. And from that comment I guess it's our job is what you're saying to determine whether or not that comment would really go into the definitions or perhaps to some other segment of the initial report?

Mary Wong: Todd this is Mary again. That's exactly right because in our staff we obviously cannot make that judgment call before the working group to do. At this point, you know, maybe I should have said this before to especially some of the sub teams and the working group, I apologize for some of the rather strong language that might be in some of the comments.

I think that does attest to how strongly people feel about certain topics. But we have not, you know, sort of interchanged or downplayed any of those comments. But Todd that is exactly right. If you look at row 12 after recommendation one, as you've done, that's what you see.

Todd Williams: Thank you.

Graeme Bunton: Yeah. That's helpful I think Mary. So, in the tool they said that they agree with none of them, they've provided another comment. But we do have some responsibility there to look at that comment and have to think about what it is that they're trying to tell us. Okay. That's interesting. Do we have any other comments on the process of building this and what it is we're looking at? Or other thoughts on how best to work through these? I can see Stephanie's got her hand up, so Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much Stephanie Perrin for the record. Again I'm not trying to dismiss these comments, I'm just trying as we, I mean (unintelligible) trying to take a solid no answer and say okay so they don't believe in the definition, so does that mean that the way they figure out questions through this? You know?

There's a method level of conjecture and sort of what we ought to take on board from the fact that we got this many comments. And this is that people care deeply and that we need more discussion I would suggest because it does seem to me when somebody says no to everything, are they really saying no to your whole process, just leave it the way it is?

Because several of them did say just leave it the way it is, right? Don't mess with this. Don't interfere. Is that what they were saying? I don't think we can be, as was correctly said on the chat, I don't think we can substitute our own opinion in there. But there should be a bigger analysis that we take out of this and easy it that we need a fuller public discussion about this before we go forward with the results of this PET.

Because several of them have said it's not up to you insiders, I'll leave out all of the language, to figure this out. And I think it's a valid point. ICANN has a little accountability problem claiming they speak for everybody. Hey?

Graeme Bunton: All right Steph. Your mic might still be on. I was getting an echo there. I take your point, and I think let me reinforce what I was saying earlier is we have a real responsibility to read as much or all of these comments. And, you know, we've collapsed them in a way. And we're sort of working through this process. But, we all need to make sure that we're reading ahead on this document week-to-week and that we can be ready to discuss the comments and pieces of it that we think are pretty relevant going forward.

And we sort of dropped that on you a little bit this week, but going forward it would be my expectation that we're ready to pick the pieces out of the questions that we found really relevant, interesting or worth discussing. (Unintelligible) raises the question in chat that if we can't figure out what their problem is specifically, how are we supposed to address concerns?

I don't have personally a good answer for that. Perhaps looking at all of the rest of the other comments we can get a sense for what people are upset about. But, you're right there's going to be some comments that are sort of devoid of context and they will be a challenge. So we've got about ten minutes left, we haven't really discussed the actual content of the comments on section 1.3.1 recommendation one.

But we've worked through a little bit of the process here. I'm not sure that we're going to be able to discuss this a bit further without people actually having gone through the comments already to make sure we're up to speed. And so I don't want to waste anyone's time. It would be good to get a sense if anybody has done that and they're sort of ready to go on this particular comment section of the report?

Paul McGrady: Hi. This is Paul McGrady. I am not at my computer (unintelligible). Can I raise my hand?

Graeme Bunton: Okay. Yep. Go ahead. And you're the first in the queue.

Paul McGrady: So I'll be the first to say that I've not had a chance to get through it because of pre-arranged travel. And I always like to be ready for stuff, so unless somebody feels strongly that we're going to, you know, get through these issues and (unintelligible) over the next nine minutes, I vote that we take a side at the beginning, be ready (unintelligible).

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Paul. I think that's probably a reasonable way to proceed. Let me express a bit of my own personal anxiety that we've got a lot of work to do. And getting time back is nice, but we really need to be ready for future calls to work through this stuff, and let's make sure that we've done that myself included. So perhaps now we can have a brief chat about whether we think we need more time next week, whether we want to try and do an hour and one-half call next week.

So, next week we have, I don't have the schedule in front of me, Mary do which sub team is doing an initial chat next week?

Mary Wong: Yes because when we built this work plan, which I'll pull up in a sec, you know, I basically just went in order of the recommendations, not necessarily in order of anything else. So it would be the sub team for one through three, and really all four sub teams have gotten going now, so we can change them

around if one or more sub teams is ready before their week, or one or more sub teams needs more time.

We see that up here that yes it is one through three, followed by n, x, e, followed by additional questions. And then we come back around again to one, three, two and the final report.

Graeme Bunton: Okay. Thanks Mary. So, I see 1.3.3 was still a little bit under subscribed. Well I think we've had a few more people sign up today, which is fantastic. So 1.3.3 you've got quite a bit of work to do between now and next week to give us that initial feedback, so be aware. And then, so we don't have any conveners I think for 1.3.3, and I could do it as enjoyable topic on process and nominate people to be our conveners.

Or we could have some people volunteer, which is probably the preferable option, so who is there currently? Karen, David Cake, (Terry Stoon), so if one of those people or any of the other people that have volunteered want to be conveners for that that would be great. Mary go ahead?

Mary Wong: Yeah. In addition to Karen, David, and (Terry) we now as of today also have Kathy, Stephanie, Susan Prosser and (Olivia Hamilton-Reed). And I'll put their names on the weekly and we will get those mailing lists up and running. But each one who signed up for a sub team before today, should've gotten an email from me the then current members of the sub team are linked to the weekly page in the initial template. That would've gone out already.

Graeme Bunton: Excellent. I'm not seeing any hands up to volunteer to convene. I suspect Alex or Lindsay will tell you it probably is not a wildly arduous job and Karen's happy to coordinate, but can't leave the discussion, so maybe someone else on that team can lead the discussion and work with Karen to coordinate. But Mary will send out an email and we'll see if we can get you guys doing that nice and organically on your own.

So next week we are going to be talking about 1.3.3 and the initial report from there. And then I think having looked at that very first of the other responses today, and we've talked a bit about that process now, and I think we should all be relatively clear on how that document is built, that we should be able to go through the first, I would hope two recommendations, maybe even three.

So everybody should be reading at least that far ahead in the tool. And it's relatively difficult to predict here how long our discussion of the initial work from 1.3.3 is going to take and whether we want to do an hour and one-half call. I'm happy for any thoughts on that. Karen was hoping for, or suggesting a doodle poll if we need to do a longer call when that call would be. And I'm happy to take that forward. I don't see any responses on whether we think we need another hour and one-half, but we need to decide relatively shortly, today I would suggest whether that's something that we're going to do so that people can respond appropriately.

So maybe what we do is a sort of two-part doodle poll where we think we think we need another hour and one-half or an hour and one-half call to get through this, and if so what time? So we can hopefully get that sent out and that will help us move forward on that relatively quickly. And I see Don's typing, oh and I see Kathy's hand as well. Kathy if you would?

Kathy Kleiman: I have a favor to ask in this. It's kind of related overall. On the Wiki page when there's talk about the sub teams and the sections would it be possible to include in the titles an explanation of what that section is because there seems to be a lot of confusion of what these sub teams are working with. It sounds odd but there is. So I think making it really clear in the titles what exactly, you know, in clear English what the sections are addressing? What the questions are addressing would be really helpful?

Otherwise, everybody has to kind of cross-reference back.

Graeme Bunton: Yeah. That seems reasonable to make sure we've got the text of the question or quick summary, you know, it's commercial use of privacy and practicing services or something like that.

Kathy Kleiman: Right or a financial transactions. Exactly. Thank you.

Graeme Bunton: Okay. And Don's mentioning that we do a doodle poll for the face-to-face. So, I think that's good. We're going to send out a doodle poll as to whether we want to move forward with an hour and one-half call. I'll try and have a discussion with Steve and Don about that as well. And if so, when? And then we may also do a doodle around the face-to-face, but that's also another discussion for Steve, Don, and I.

And with that I think that brings us to the top of the hour. We've got about two spare minutes unless there's anything else. And Kathy I'm pretty sure that's an old hand.

Kathy Kleiman: Yes. It is. And thanks for the call today Graeme, and everyone.

Graeme Bunton: All right. I think that's where we're at. Thanks everybody for coming. I think we got through the process and let's really figure out and thanks again to Alex and Lindsay. And we'll get to some serious work next week with 1.3.3, and then hopefully some of the other responses to our report. Thanks very much all. Have a lovely day. And I think that's it for our call.

Man: Thanks Graeme.

Mary Wong: Thanks Graeme.

END