

**ICANN Transcription
GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP WG
Tuesday 07 June 2016 at 1600 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP WG call on the Tuesday 07 June 2016 at 16:00 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.

The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-nextgen-rds-07jun16-en.mp3>

Coordinator: Excuse me, the recording has started.

Michelle DeSmyter: Great. Thank you, Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening and welcome to the GNSO Next Gen RDS PDP Working Group call on the 7th of June 2016 at 1600 UTC.

In the interest of time today there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. If you're only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourself be known now? Thank you. I'd also like to remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Also keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

I'd like to turn the call over to Chuck Gomes. Sir, you may begin.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much and welcome, everyone, our weekly call. Appreciate everyone who's joined and all the work that's been going on the last few days. It's been rewarding to see how many people are following through on

their commitments to submit requirements on various documents or other sources so thank you very much for that.

Does anyone have an update to their Statement of Interest? Not seeing or hearing anyone, we'll go to Agenda Item 2 and that's to complete our work on the possible requirements list, which is Task 8 in our work plan. And the latest version and signup sheet was sent around earlier today. The first thing we're going to get is a progress update from Lisa. Go ahead, Lisa.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. And this is Lisa Phifer for the record. As Chuck noted, the latest signup sheet was circulated to the list a couple of hours ago this morning. At this point we have 28 documents that have been covered -- that is by covered I mean that possible requirements have been submitted to the email list. I would note that in some cases the people reviewing the documents actually identified that there weren't any possible requirements that were additional to those already identified. But that said, 28 documents have been covered thus far.

We have 23 assignments left on the list that are still pending so we're now at more documents covered than assigned. And of those 23 assignments that are still open many of you have responded to reminders over the past couple of days and so it seems like we're going to get a fair number of those pending assignments by the end of the day today. But of those 23 10 of those had previously been flagged as especially relevant to the work of this working group. So we're making fairly good progress but we do still have quite a few submissions to come in today.

I would like to remind you all that when you do submit your possible requirements please submit them to the entire working group list. A number of you have sent them to me individually and while I do appreciate that, that helps me get started on processing them. They do need to go to the full working group list so that everybody can see them and also so that they can be cross referenced and by hyperlink from our signup sheet.

I'd also like to ask the - all of you to remember to the best that you can, try to phrase the items that you submit as possible requirements. Sometimes that will require a little bit of paragraphing. It should not necessarily be your own take on what a possible requirement is unless you identify it as such. But when you can quote the source document and paragraph as needed.

The only other thing that I'd like to mention here is do please try to map your possible requirements that you pull out of these documents to charter questions. Most of you have been doing that but just a quick reminder to please do that.

And then to the extent that you want to focus your work on Phase 1, and especially the fundamental questions, that's the first 5 questions in the charter, if you're pressed for time that's the most important thing to get done as we complete this initial list of possible requirements.

And with that I'll turn it back to you, Chuck, and also to any questions.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa. And special thanks to Lisa for keeping track of all these things and updating the documents on I think a daily basis so - or more often. So thank you very much, Lisa, for that. This is Chuck speaking again. And the - so let's talk about our target. Our deadline was today. And that's end of the day today so some of you are still on target.

And I do understand, though, that Lisa has received some feedback that one or two people may need just a little bit more time. And so here's what the leadership team decided to do in that regard. We're going to cut off all requirements at this stage of our work by the end of your business day tomorrow. So those, for example, on the West Coast, like me, of the US, you'll have until the end of your day tomorrow, which actually gives a little fudge factor for those that are in other parts of the world that are ahead of us

so no later than, you know, 1800 or so Pacific Time. So some of you that'll actually be into Thursday a little bit.

That will give Lisa then the chance - so that's on Wednesday, okay, tomorrow. And then that will give Lisa a chance on Thursday to pull everything together so that we will be prepared to send out our second outreach message with the requirements list as it is at that time. And we'll talk about that later in the agenda.

So please, if you can get them in today, which was our previously set target, please do so. But if - for those that may need just a little more time please do it by tomorrow. And then we will have a list that we will be able to send out to SOs and ACs and SGs and Cs and see if they have any new requirements that maybe we missed. So hope everybody understands that target. And thanks, again, for all of you who are working so hard on this.

So any questions on the target date? Target time? Okay, so we have then the next sub-agenda item there under Number 2 is the outreach message. So if that can be put in Adobe we'll take a look at that and show the working group that particular message. I think that was also sent out earlier this morning so you may have already reviewed it but we'll bring it up in Adobe so that we can talk about that and certainly any input you have on that is welcome as we talk about that right now.

Now, as we explain in the message itself, this outreach is happening while the first outreach is not finished, and that's intentional. And we're going to do this one differently as the message says, and you can all read the introductory paragraphs there. Whereas the first one was a formal outreach and we asked for input by the 16th and in that regard I would just throw in a little caveat, or a little footnote that says, you know, any of you that can facilitate the groups you're in and their response by the 16th of this month that would be greatly appreciated.

And I know I'm going to try to do that in the Registry Stakeholder Group in my case. So if you would do that in your groups that would be great. And it doesn't have to be a lot of response. And in fact on some of the questions that were asked there may be no response, that's okay. But we would like to know that the various groups did review the request and gave us any feedback that they had.

Now this outreach that's in front of you right now we're going to do an informal way, and we're going to do it through those of you who are representatives of the various groups. And the primary thing we're asking for in this message is for the groups to take a quick look at the requirements list that we've developed and see if they think we missed any and then communicate those to us.

Now, so the way - logistically the way we're going to do this one is we're going to have a representative or two from each group that will take this message, once we finalize it and I think hopefully pretty close to final right now, depending on input in this call. We're going to ask you to take this message to your group and ask for feedback. And our target for feedback is going to be our working group meeting in Helsinki, not that you have to be there in person to give feedback but that's our target date.

And we will actually provide time in that meeting as well as the cross community meeting the evening before for people to add to the requirements list at that time. Make sure you read the context and guidelines carefully and make sure the people in your group understand those. We're asking the various groups to do the same thing we've done and that is come up with a list of possible requirements, cite a source if there is one, but don't pass judgment on whether you think it really should be a requirement or not or whether you think it's in Phase 1, or Phase 2 or Phase 3 or whatever. This will just give us our base for starting our deliberation when we get to Step 12 in our work plan.

Again, I'm not going to read through, you have scrolling capability so you can glance through the document.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Did someone have a question? Okay. So and then there are two annexes, okay, that will be with it; the requirements list that Lisa will finish on Thursday after everybody submits theirs, and then Annex B which is the charter questions and outreach - and an outreach response templates. Real simple template. All we're asking for in this really is if you have another - a requirement that you think needs to be added, reference the question using the code and the table just on Page 2 there, and then if there is a source document, cite it. And then state the possible requirements.

Let me stop there and see if there are any questions with regard to the message itself. Or suggestions, possible edits or anything you think is missing. Okay, so then, Chuck still speaking, okay, so then the key is how do we make this happen? Okay? And before I talk about that let me turn it to Jim.

Jim Galvin: No, I'm sorry, Chuck. Somebody is typing and it's really hard to hear you and there's a lot of chatter going on in the chat room, somebody needs to mute please so thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Jim. Yes, please. Everyone, please mute your phones if you're not talking. I don't hear the typing anymore. I should have addressed that earlier. Thanks, Jim, though for jumping in.

Okay, the - so no questions or comments on the message itself. So the key thing for us to do is to figure out how we make this happen. Now in outreach message Number 1, we ask SOs, ACs, SGs, and Cs, or any other groups that respond, to identify a point of contact that would kind of serve as a liaison

or points of contact that will serve as liaisons between the working group and the - their respective groups.

Obviously that response isn't due until the 16th so we don't have those yet. Now if you know that you're going to be the point of contact or you know who the point of contact is going to be for your respective groups and that person is able to take the lead on this task, that would be great to know.

If not, we need some people in the interim that'll take the lead in getting this request out to your group and facilitating a response and then returning it to the working group. So what we need to do, and if we can do it on this call it would be really great, is to see if we can - if any of the groups that you represent have identified some - a contact or contacts that would be willing to assume this task, and if not then we'll need some volunteers to at least do it for this particular effort until the group decides on a longer term liaison to the group.

Now the liaison doesn't have any official capacity, it's a functional capacity, okay, to help make sure information flows to the group and flows back into the working group. So I would like to - if anybody - if any of the groups that are you are a part of have identified a person who can assume the leadership on this particular outreach effort, would you raise your hand in Adobe or let us know in the chat? And I see that Fabricio has volunteered.

So it looks - I see your comment, Scott, is there - the ability to mute microphones has gone away. Anyway, if that can be checked that would be great. So if staff would work with the support people on that I'd appreciate it.

Nathalie, go ahead. Are you on mute, Nathalie? I'm not hearing anything. And I'm trying to keep up - Vaibhav - what are you - you're volunteering for what group? Or is that - okay, you were volunteering, just let the know the group please that you're - I don't have a list in front of me where - some people I

know, some people I don't, what group you're volunteering for so please let us know what group you're volunteering for so we know where the holes are.

Klaus, thanks for the - we got the NPOC covered. Thanks for fixing the technical problem. So all right, and Beth for the BC. Thanks, Beth. And Nathalie for all three - which all three are you talking about? I'm seeing - having trouble keeping up. So the IPC is covered along with INTA and COA. Watching this - go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. This is just a note that we're looking for those entities that we are doing formal outreach so that our SO/AC and GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies. Of course there's nothing wrong if, you know, you also liaise with other groups but of course we're not, at this moment, involving them in formal outreach.

And also to know that of course it's important that those that are volunteering have the agreement of those groups. It may be something where you may need to go back but I think we want to make sure as well if someone is stepping forward as being a liaison or facilitator for a certain group we do want to make sure as well that that group, and probably that needs to go, you know, at least agreed by either the chair or the ExComm team, to make sure that, you know, we don't get any conflict there between people that may have volunteered but where the leadership may not be aware or whether it may be other volunteers. So this is just what I wanted to note.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg, for volunteering to liaise with the GAC. The working group there, that's great. And notice Lisa's comment there. Now she says, "Please note, volunteers must be formally affiliated with the group they do outreach to." Now what formally affiliated means is probably open to discussion and probably varies by group. But make sure you are affiliated with the group in some way and that they would recognize you as a representative to present their positions.

I think that probably goes without understanding for most of you but it is a good reminder. Yes, Lisa will - Lisa or Marika - one of them will give us a summary list of who we have. And we'll cover - try and cover all the SOs, ACs, and then the GNSO groups, constituencies and stakeholder groups. So that will be circulated.

Now, I don't think I've seen anybody from the Registry Stakeholder Group or the Registrar Stakeholder Group. Do we have any volunteers for one of those? Obviously I'm associated with the Registry Stakeholder Group but it'd be a lot better if someone other than the chair of this working group was the liaison there. I certainly will assist but if we could get another volunteer.

And, let's see, we've got the BC, we've got the IPC. What about - do we have anybody on the call from the service providers - the ISPs on the call that would be willing to liaison with the ISPC? Not - so we haven't got those covered. How about ALAC? Did anybody volunteer for the ALAC? Vaibhav, go ahead.

Vaibhav Aggarwal: Yes, this is Vaibhav Aggarwal for the record. Chuck, thanks. I just have a small suggestion. Instead of us wracking our brains, we're all part of so many groups and represent constituencies so many times, it's just a suggestion that if staff can actually - if Lisa can actually come up with a list of groups we could pick up and identify when there is a list in front of us, we could always remember, okay, these are the SOs and ACs we are working with, and these are our stakeholder groups, part of our group. And, you know, we could just simply give our interests, and based on our affiliations, and the chair can recommend and then the process can be on. That's just...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much. And notice...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...notice that at least part of your request has been posted in Adobe, okay. What you see in front of you, and you can see - you can all link to this document, okay, it is a public document, it's an attendance log for our meetings. So you can each see your own attendance records, if you see any errors in that let us know, we'll fix it.

But notice that it's organized by group, okay. So that if you scroll down you'll see the first group there is the Registrar Stakeholder Group and these are members, okay, not observers, these are members, and you can see the attendance. It would be helpful if the liaison is someone who attends. Okay. But if somebody is planning to attend and hasn't so far, obviously they could still be a liaison if they start participating.

The Registry Stakeholder Group is next. And the one after that is the NCSG followed by the CSG. Now notice the CSG and the NCSG have more than one constituency that are identified as the group, okay, so I think it'd be helpful in the case where there are multiple constituencies, unless the SG itself wants to submit feedback, that's okay to have one for each constituency.

We have the ALAC and the GAC, ccNSO and then we have another category there. And for those of you in the other category, if you are a part of a group that's not one of the GNSO groups or one of the ICANN groups, and you want to submit input from that group, that is certainly welcome. So please do that.

Vaibhav, is that an old hand or a new hand?

Vaibhav Aggarwal: That's a new hand. I just wanted to suggest, this is Vaibhav for the record. So perhaps there could be once we gather a list of liaisons with the respective SOs, ACs, SGs, and Cs, if there are people - if there are gap areas that are left I may take this opportunity to suggest that if one of us - if

some of us are willing to volunteer and have some time at hand, we can actually get them - and if you're not formally a part of other group that we want to liaison with, they could work in this group, we could always present our volunteer request to the chair and the chair could actually recommend to the chair of the other group whom we want to liaison with and get some information.

So that way we'll be able to bridge the gap, if any, for any volunteers that may not, you know, volunteer for everyone.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Lisa.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I think so. Lisa?

Lisa Phifer: This is Lisa Phifer for the record. And just to note that in our outreach message Number 1 we did actually ask SOs, ACs, SGs and Cs, to identify their formal point of contact. So we will actually be getting some feedback from the groups themselves with respect to who might server as their formal liaison. So I think we're working a little bit ahead of this trying to get outreach Number 2 started, but to the suggestion that was just made I do think we will also get some feedback from the groups themselves about who they would like to designate as their contacts.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa. And as I indicated in my introduction to this task, is that we're going to kick this off before the 16th when the feedback is due from the SOs and ACs. So we're jumping the gun a little bit but on that part. And that's why we're going through this exercise right now. So those of you in the groups that - where we've had no volunteers, if you could reach out to your groups or volunteer yourself that would be great.

Sara, thanks for - Sara Bockey - thanks for - we'll count you as a volunteer. Now if you find somebody else wants to do it just let us know who it is but if you would do it that would be fantastic for the Registrars. Appreciate that very much.

And notice that Lisa has identified some groups where we don't have any volunteers. And one of those I think is still the Registry Stakeholder Group too unless I missed a volunteer somewhere. So I certainly will work on that one on the side. But okay Farrell for NCSG, good. And we'll just take a few more minutes because we're going to try and - we're going to ask you to probably kick this thing off with your groups on Friday. So that way we have a little bit of - enough lead time going into the Helsinki meeting so that we can wrap it up there.

And again, it's not a big task we're asking. We want them to take a look at the requirements and the list that's under development and a current version of that will be kept posted on the Website. And there's a link to that in the message. Steve, yes, I'm aware of the two constituencies covered. I haven't looked through the attendees to see if we have anybody from the ISPs here, but we may have to reach out to them.

In fact let's - for anywhere we don't get any responses let's take an action item to reach out. And I'd be glad to reach out. But let's - an action item for us will be to reach out to those who we don't have an individual taking the lead on this particular task, even if they're not the longer term liaison.

I see - so somebody volunteered and they're not identified as an ALAC member. Okay let's - so that was Nathalie. Okay. As was suggested earlier, I, you know, please check in that case, please check with the other members that are from the ALAC in this working group and see if that can be - if that would be okay.

And what you need to do to become a member of the ALAC. And actually it should probably say At Large instead of ALAC. Well, I guess I should let them determine that. But the ALAC is just the At Large Advisory Committee. People can be a part of the At Large in a broader sense and not be part of the ALAC. But you probably should coordinate with the ALAC in terms of how you represent the group.

Sorry for a lot of you, I saw quite a few messages that you have to leave early. I understand there are conflicts. So all right well let's not take any more time on this call for that. Lisa is going to - I think took the task to summarize and she'll do it either in the notes and/or the - probably the notes might be a good place to do it to see where we have representatives and where we have gaps. And then the action item is to reach out to those.

Is there anybody that doesn't understand the task that we're asking each of these people to do? Any questions on that? You don't want me to mute my line, Fabricio? Might be a problem huh? Okay so let's move on in our agenda then and go to Agenda Item 3. And so before - just before we do that, though, understand that Lisa will do all the work to finalize the requirements list in its current state on Thursday. And then that will be - and then we'll finalize the outreach message that each of you who volunteered will use.

Now any of you that are in those groups I encourage you, please, to help the person who's taken the lead, reinforce what they're trying to do and make suggestions, do anything you can to facilitate a response. And it may be that they don't identify any requirements but it'd be nice to know that they at least looked at them, at least some key people in your groups and stated that fact that they didn't identify any new ones at this time. Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer:

Thanks, Chuck. This is Lisa Phifer for the record. Just to point out when Chuck says finalizing the possible requirements list, please know that the possible requirements will be a living document that will continue to grow as we do our work and begin our deliberations.

What we're talking about finalizing at this point is simply the snapshot that goes with the outreach message Number 2 that allows the other groups, the SOs, ACs, SGs, and Cs, to look at the list and identify any big gaps or omissions that they might want to suggest and have us add to the list. So it will continue to grow and what we're finalizing is the snapshot that goes with outreach message Number 2.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa. This is Chuck again. And let me call attention to Item 6 under the context and guidelines of that message. It says pretty much what Lisa said. It's understood and expected that possible requirements may be identified at any time throughout the working group process. So there's no absolute deadline for identifying additional possible requirements. And it goes on.

So, again, make sure you're very familiar with the context and guidelines, the seven items there. That'll help you answer people's questions. And towards the end of the message we encourage people of your groups to reach out to you to - with questions that they have. But they can also reach out to any of us on the leadership team as well and our contact information is provided there.

Okay we're going to have a lot of these outreaches throughout our work and they'll be designed to relate to things that we're currently working on so that they will be timely in terms of contributing to our work.

Going now to agenda Item 3, and we're going to talk about preparation for the Helsinki meeting. And so if we can switch now in the Adobe to the agendas for the Helsinki meeting. Those were also distributed today before this meeting so we have a - there's two meetings. The first one is a cross community meeting on Monday afternoon. And that's designed, as the name implies, to be one for the whole community to participate, learn about what

we're doing and contribute to what we're doing, okay? We have 90 minutes in that meeting.

And take a look here at the description. This is posted on the meetings page. And we really want to encourage participation in this meeting from those who are not members or even observers of our working group but people who normally don't get to participate. At the same time, we're going to do that by asking some of you to very briefly make contributions that will hopefully generate questions and maybe even new ideas and so forth in that session.

So I won't go through the overview and who should attend. You can read that for yourself. But let's take a look at what to expect from this session. The - notice that the second sentence says - oops - okay thank you. Back to there. Appreciate that.

So what to expect from this session. Okay the second sentence - take a look at that. During this session working group members will draw from their own experiences to share examples and invite attendees to join in a lively conversation about possible requirements which they believe should be supported by the next generation RDS and so forth.

Now so our plan there, and we're going to spend some time drilling down a little bit into this in our working group call next week so that we're well prepared. And so I'm looking at the top paragraph right now, the middle of it, okay, on the screen. And so what we're going to ask for, and what we'd like you to be thinking about is an example of a possible requirement, one that's on our list I presume, because all of you have contributed there.

And to share that in the cross community session and then see if that generates discussion or see if they can think of another requirement. Now, we're not going to give you a lot of time to do that. You probably have about a minute to do that because if a lot of us, we have a large working group, if all of us were to take even a minute we would run out of time probably in the

session, and we want to generate contributions, questions, etcetera, from those who are not part of the working group and take advantage of the cross community session.

So be thinking about, you know, how you or whether you would like to contribute one. And probably just pick out one requirement. We're not going to cover all the requirements on the list. As you know, that's way too many. But we want to generate discussion and pick one that you think may generate good discussion. Be thinking about that because we will probably be asking for a few volunteers to do that in our call next week if you're going to be in the Helsinki cross community session.

You can see the draft agenda there. There will be a very brief introduction of the PDP. And a little bit more time spent on our work plan with a focus of very briefly what we've accomplished but more importantly where we're at and where we're going to go in the next few weeks and months. And then the bulk of the time is going to be spent on the possible registration directory services, and that will be an interactive session where we're asking some of you to contribute.

And keeping in mind that we will be able to participate as a working group the next day. We'll have all morning in our working group the next day. So to the extent that we can facilitate newcomers' participation and not monopolize it ourselves, that will be good. Now if we're not getting very much we'll of course generate more from working group members who are present. But hopefully everybody understands the purposes there.

And let me pause, first of all, to see if anybody on the leadership team wants to add anything with regard to the cross community session. Yes, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Just to share a little of feedback on the intent behind these community - cross community sessions. Because I think as you all know this is a new concept as part of the Meeting B and this is one of the

topics that was chosen as being of, you know, broad interest to the cross community. So maybe this is also something where, you know, the liaisons that have just been identified as part of the previous discussion can maybe work with their respective groups and see if they can, you know, encourage people to come, attend, you know, prepare.

We're working on the, you know, the latest edition of the monthly update where we will provide information on the background information. So again that may be helpful to share. There's going to be a policy update webinar I believe next week that, again, will try to brief people on what the objective is for this meeting as well as helping people to, you know, find the relevant material so they can prepare accordingly.

So again, I think this is, you know, we need to see this as well as a joint effort in trying and testing this out and hopefully making this successful as, you know, it is a new concept and that we haven't really tried before in this format with no other meetings taking place at the same time or no direct conflicts. So hopefully we'll be able to convince a lot of people to come and participate in the discussion.

And to that end it probably will be important as well to make sure that, you know, we are able to capture that information and be able then to demonstrate after the session how that information will feed into the working group deliberations and, you know, at a later point in time we'll be taking, you know, similar questions back again to the broader community for their feedback and input.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marika. This is Chuck again. And if you could scroll down on the screen just a little bit so that the annotated draft agenda title is at the top, at the top, little too far. Come down just a little bit more. I wanted to see - that's good. Okay notice that under - in the second page that's showing there, that we focus on the first five questions. Now we don't have to restrict ourselves to

the first five questions in our charter, but because that's where we're going to be working intensely over the next few months. There is a focus there.

So as those of you who are thinking about a possible requirement, you might want to share in that session I encourage you to focus on those first five questions. Doesn't mean we have to restrict it to that but that would be a good guideline. Stephanie, I saw your hand go up and go down. I guess you - I don't know if I answered your question but if you want to speak feel free. Go ahead, Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much, Chuck. Can you hear me? Stephanie Perrin for the record.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Stephanie Perrin: Far be it from me to sound whiny on a beautiful summer day, but this is sounding a wee bit like a free for all, and sort of like asking the entire alliterate assemblage and I realize I am sounding snarky there. Gee, what would you like to do with domain name registrant data? And this is truly a privacy advocate's nightmare particularly when none of our questions are addressing that root question that to us is fundamentally important is why is ICANN creating a registration data service.

So can we ask that question? I see Andrew in the chat saying maybe we should just to ask one provocative question. Well that would be my one provocative question so everybody has got a couple of weeks to figure out the answer. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: So let me try to address your question, Stephanie. This is Chuck. Can we - you could raise that issue in that session as long as you can keep it brief, keeping in mind that we're not at deliberation yet, okay? To get very deep into your question we're going to have to get into some deliberation. Now could

we be in deliberation by the time we get to Helsinki? Maybe, it's probably a long shot but we might not be deliberating on that particular issue.

And you're right, we are opening it up for all possible requirements. Some of them will be - we will decide that they shouldn't be a requirement, and some we will modify. But it is pretty much open right now for anyone to suggest a requirement so that we can do a thorough job of vetting all possible requirements. It should not be assumed that we're going to approve all of them as requirements. Nor should it be assumed that we're going to reject ones that are of a particular mindset. So that's work we have to do.

Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. This is Lisa Phifer for the record. Just pointing out that actually I think we're all on the same page but we may be using different words to describe it. The first five charter questions are really the provocative questions that we're setting the stage for discussion in this cross community meeting. You know, who should have access to registration data and why? That is Stephanie for what purpose. What steps should be taken for gated access? What steps should be taken to improve accuracy? What data should be collected and disclosed? And what steps are needed to protect data and privacy?

So those, to me, are the provocative questions we're putting forward and what we're asking working group members to do is just lob out their answer really briefly just to kick off the discussion of each of those questions. And then no doubt it will become somewhat of a free for all but at least we'll set the stage and the scope of this PDP that we're trying to solicit some feedback and input to.

Chuck Gomes: And it will - this is Chuck - it will be dependent on me as chair and the leadership team to make it a productive and managed free for all, okay? So the pressure will be on us to do that. So okay let's go on...

Kathy Kleiman: Chuck this is - Chuck, this is Kathy Kleiman, can I join the queue too? I'm not on Adobe.

Chuck Gomes: Oh sure, Kathy. Jump right in.

Kathy Kleiman: Terrific. I want to go to what Lisa just said because it scares me. She just said that the uses, the secondary uses to which anyone and anyone - everyone and anyone might want to get to the gate are the purposes of - I thought I heard her say the data. And that couldn't be further from the truth. The purposes of the data under the laws - the data protection laws of the majority of the world is the reason the data is collected. So domain name registration is the purpose of the data.

What we're trying to figure out is what secondary purposes we can put it to in the directory. So purposes and secondary uses are not the same thing at all. And so we're still starting with the wrong questions. Why should we be talking about who gets access for secondary purposes until we've decided what, you know, what are the data elements, why are they being collected, what do we need in 2016. That - we've talked about for a long time is the starting point.

Then who gets access for other reasons that are compatible with those purposes, that becomes a different issue. But I still think we're putting the cart before the horse. And Lisa just kind of comingled the idea is how do we help break it down, how do we go out to people and talk about the primary - what do you really need for domain name registration data? I don't think we've gotten at that question yet.

Chuck Gomes: We have not.

Kathy Kleiman: When do we do that? But don't we have to do that?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Step 12.

Kathy Kleiman: Step 12.

Chuck Gomes: In that work plan. We're going to be spending months on Step 12.

Kathy Kleiman: After we already decide how many people want to get through the gate then we go back and reconsider what it is we're...

Chuck Gomes: I don't understand what you just said, decide how many people want to get through the gate.

Kathy Kleiman: According to Lisa we're talking about gated access as the second question. Shouldn't the second question or even the first be what is the data we actually need to collect and to what purpose?

Chuck Gomes: Kathy, this is Chuck again. As you'll recall we spent a couple meetings and a lot of time on the list talking about what should come first. There was not unanimity in terms of what should be discussed first. Certainly there were quite a few who advocated what you're saying. But there were others who thought that other things should be covered first.

So what we decided to do in the work plan is to look at user purposes, data elements and privacy kind of iteratively so that we can bounce back and forth and not spend months just deciding what order we're going to do. So that's - and it's not Lisa that stated these things; this is from our charter. Okay. These five things, and then the cross cutting questions are the other six questions, okay, for those of you that didn't note that.

And so these are from our charter. Now it's up to us to decide what conclusions we reach for each of those questions and that's what we're going

not do in Step 12, which, I mean, the bulk of our work in Phase 1 is Step 12.
Okay?

Kathy Kleiman: Okay, so I'm confused...

Chuck Gomes: We're on Step 8.

Kathy Kleiman: So user purposes, data elements, privacy, where does gated access come in on that?

Chuck Gomes: Well...

Kathy Kleiman: Or another way to phrase is why are we - if we're focusing on those three kind of shouldn't we get to gated access later then?

Chuck Gomes: So that's the way we've mapped it out right now in the work plan is to focus on users purposes, data elements and privacy first and then go to gated access and data accuracy. The way they're shown on the screen right now is the way they're listed in the charter. Our order is going to be a little bit different in terms of our deliberation. That make sense?

Kathy Kleiman: It does. In that case when we're informing - and I apologize that I can't see the screen. When we're informing our constituencies and stakeholder groups, do we ask them to focus on user and purpose, data elements and privacy? Or all of the questions that I think are posted?

Chuck Gomes: It can be all of the questions, okay. And some groups are probably going to want to zero in on certain ones. That's okay. The main thing we're trying to do in this outreach is really fairly simple; what we want to do is let's get all the requirements on the table and some of them - some of them we're going to reject, okay?

And, you know, I don't know if we'll get anything from abusers of the DNS or something but some of the things they might want to do I'm sure we'll reject. But, yes, let's get them on the table and then we're going to deliberately go through. And see one of the big steps we have to take care of, and we're going to probably start this next week, and probably continue it the following week, is talk about okay how are we going to reach consensus?

The charter gives us some guidelines there, but we're going to have to make some decisions, okay, how do we make a decision when we come up with a possible requirement, who do we determine whether we have reached consensus? Okay so we're going to start talking about that relative to the charter hopefully next week in addition to zeroing in on our plan for the Helsinki meeting. Nathalie, please go ahead.

Nathalie Coupet: Can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Nathalie Coupet: Can you hear me? Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Nathalie Coupet: Just a question, I'm new at this so bear with me. I feel that we're already engaged in developing this new platform with new service, just, you know, like working on the details. I would like to understand if there was a study made that actually changing things would be better than the status quo since I see very important obstacles, for example, the name of the registrant seems to be a huge issue whether it should be outside or inside the gated access.

I mean, are we - do we know that is going to be better if we actually do change this? And should we know this before we move on so far into the details? This is my question. I'm new at this.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Nathalie. Excellent questions. Now first of all if we knew we'd be way down the road from where we're at. It's actually our responsibility as a working group to come up with what we think is the answer to your question. Is a new system needed? And what are the requirements of that? So we have to, after we - and this is part I think what Lisa was getting at, after we really deal with the first five question areas, we have to, you know, come up with - we answer the question, do we think a new system is needed? Or could the existing system be modified to accomplish the requirements that we think should be in place?

So, no, I mean, there are studies about Whois, the GNSO did - had three studies done. There are - there's a ton of work, much is in the resources that people have been summarizing and looking for requirements in, and the reality of the matter is there are large differences of opinion on a lot of these issues. And we get the privilege, as a working group, to try and bring some closure to all of this. And it's going to be hard work to do that. But we're tasked with answering the questions you're asking. Did that make any - hopefully that doesn't sound discouraging...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...but that's our job.

Nathalie Coupet: Okay thank you.

Chuck Gomes: You're welcome. Okay let's go to the - let's go next to the working group agenda. And let's see, scroll down a little bit further on the screen please. Okay, yes, so there it is. So the working group meeting - and fortunately we have a lot of time to work as a working group on Tuesday morning. We pretty much have the full morning to work on that. And, again, I won't read the overview or who should attend and why. Certainly we hope all of you who are working group members will either participate in person or remotely in the session.

But, like always at ICANN meetings, public meetings, we welcome anyone to attend our working group meeting and we allow them to participate in our meeting. In the meeting we're having right now we only allow working group members to actively participate. In Helsinki, and I apologize for repeating this because I know I've said it before, but for those that maybe haven't heard it, we want to not only welcome participation from visitors in our working group session, we want to encourage their participation.

Now we'll manage that so that hopefully it can be productive and so forth. And we want you as working group members to participate as well. Don't monopolize, but this is going to be a live working group call and we want to get work done during it. So I hope that expresses what it's supposed to be. Okay?

So hopefully when we finish this meeting not only will we have involved visitors but hopefully we'll have made a little bit of progress on wherever we're at in the working group at that time. Certainly we want to finalize the requirements list at that stage of the game realizing that it's a living document.

And so hopefully one of the things - let me reword that - one of the things we hope to accomplish is to finish the requirements list for that point in time and I don't know whether we'll be able to do any deliberation that session or not but hopefully we'll get a lot of feedback. And we're going to be refining that agenda next week further in for our working group. And you can see, if you scroll down to the agenda, again, we'll do a brief introduction for those who are in the - please scroll down the screen to the annotated draft agenda, the full agenda. Thank you.

So we have - notice just 10 minutes for introductions. Now that's an important 10 minutes. And, again, for those of you that have heard me say this before, I'm sorry for repeating but everybody is not on the same call, so this will be a

time for those of us that are there in person to meet one another if we haven't met one another face to face. I find that really valuable, okay?

So we're going to - a lot - 10 minutes at least for people to introduce themselves so we can oh, that's who I've been talking to on the working group calls or on email or whatever. We're going to go over the work plan, especially focusing on Tasks 7, 8, 9, we may even - and then you'll see in agenda Item 3 looking at Tasks 10, 11 and 12. Now I hope we have 11 pretty well decided by then.

But we might not, we might be deliberating on Task 11 how we reach consensus in that call. And that'll be okay because we're going to pick up whatever our last working group call is before Helsinki, we're going to continue where we leave off there in this working group session. And including Task 12a, which is possibly deliberating on the first batch of possible requirements in that session. So if we're that far along.

We do want to allow for Q&A. and people who are visitors probably will have lots of questions about what we're doing. They're going to ask some of the same questions that you have been asking in our work so far, and that's good. And hopefully we can briefly give them some clarification on that.

So I don't think I need to say any more about the agenda but I do want to open it up. Does anybody have any questions about the working group session, which will be Tuesday morning in Helsinki or any comments?

Okay all right I think that ends Agenda Item 3. And actually brings us to just a discussion of our next meeting which is Agenda Item 4. It will be next Tuesday the 14th of June and same time. The meeting after that will be at the alternate time, okay.

So I've already kind of indicated what the leadership team is talking about for next week. One of them is to - one key item is to drill down a little bit deeper

in terms of working group member participation in the cross community session in Helsinki so that we've got that fairly well mapped out, doesn't have to be finalized but pretty well mapped out.

And then the second thing to actually start working on Task 11 and start talking about - we'll look at the charter itself and what it says, and you may want to do that yourself between now and then, I know I'm going to do that. And we'll start grappling with that issue. Okay, when we get to a particular requirement and we have disagreement and we've worked through that and some compromises, how do we determine whether we have strong enough consensus to recommend a particular requirement? That's going to be a key preparatory step for our deliberation step which will start in 12 - in Step 12.

Any questions or comments about that? Leadership team, did I leave anything out that I should have covered in this entire meeting, but in particular what we're looking at for next week? Okay. All right, well we won't have too many meetings going forward where we get to end early so appreciate it when you can because once we start our deliberation I'm sure we'll be using every minute we can to try and work together to reach some conclusions.

All right well thanks, everybody. And those of you that still have requirements to submit, please try to get those in today if at all possible but if not today by tomorrow. Nobody asked this question, what happens if you don't get it in by tomorrow, well it won't go out - it won't be shown on the list - the first list that we post for the second outreach, okay.

Now, it will be added, they will be added as we get new requirements on the site, but it won't be in the outreach message. So please try to get them in today and if not today by tomorrow by the end of your day. And that'll give Lisa Thursday to pull everything together and finalize our outreach message and in the meantime the leadership team will be working on reaching out to those groups that we didn't get a volunteer for today.

And, Lisa, did you post on the - either in chat or in the notes a list of where we have volunteers or is that going to come after the meeting?

Lisa Phifer: Chuck, I think that Marika did include it in the meeting notes that she's been taking on the right side of the screen.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Let me scroll up, I've been way too much talking today and so I haven't followed those. Oh here we go, that's Item D I think up there right? There's a list of volunteers. So good. Okay so we've got that there. And let's send out a message too in that regard showing where we have volunteers and where the gaps are, okay, to the full working group. All right thanks, everybody. Have a good rest of the day.

((Crosstalk))

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you. Today's meeting has been adjourned. Operator, please stop the recordings and disconnect all remaining lines. Enjoy the remainder of your day, everyone.

END