ICANN
GNSO Next Generation Registration Directory Services (RDS) Policy Development
Process Working Group
Tuesday, 12 July 2016 at 16:00 UTC
Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or
inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to
understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an
authoritative record. The audio is also available at: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-nextgen-rds-
12jul16-en.mp3

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar
page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

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

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to

the GNSO Next Generation Registration Directory Services, RDS, Policy

Development Process Working Group call taking place on 12 July, 2016.

In the interest of time today there will be no roll call as we have quite a few

participants. Attendance will be taken by via the Adobe Connect room so if

you are only on the audio bridge could you please let yourselves be known

now? Hearing no names, I would like to remind all of you to please state your

name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your

phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any

background noise.

With this I'll turn it back over to Chuck. Please begin.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Terri. This is Chuck Gomes. And I apologize, I understand there is some noise coming from my line. I am supposed to be on vacation. And I'm in a small motorhome so some of that is unavoidable. Anyway, apologize for that.

Welcome to everybody to the call. And you can see the agenda in front of you. Take a look at that and while you're looking at that agenda let me see if you have any comments or questions on that let's go ahead and see if anybody has an update to their statement of interest.

Not hearing or seeing anyone, I don't know if that's…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Andrew Sullivan: I thought that - it's Andrew Sullivan. I did, in fact, update my SOI last night and just for the record ICANN is paying my employer for some of my time so I wanted to make sure that you're aware of that. It's not related to this topic but there is a relationship there that there wasn't before.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Andrew. Much appreciated. This is Chuck. Anybody else? Okay. Let's then go ahead and start our agenda. Oh, Mark.

Mark Svancarek: Hi, can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Mark Svancarek: Okay, yes, ICANN is also paying a portion of my time, not on this directly, but on something else. So I don't know if I captured that in my statement of interest or not.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Mark. If you could update your statement of interest when you get a chance that would be great.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: And just a comment to everybody on the statement of interest, we don't - we're not overly concerned about conflicts of interest in the sense that all of us have them. Okay. But it's very important that we make them - make everyone aware of those so that if it is a factor we can take that into consideration. So we appreciate everyone updating their statement of interest. And thanks to both of you for communicating that.

All right thanks again for that. Let's go ahead and go to Agenda Item Number 2 which is the Helsinki meeting action item progress. And you can see the items are outlined under Agenda Item Number 2. The note, please, that the deadline for input for working group members is July 15, three days from now. So if you haven't already taken a look at the comment tool please do that. And if you have any input on that before we finalize it please communicate that on the list. Or if somebody wants to provide any input on this call you're certainly welcome to do that right now.

Item B then under 2 is the status update problem statement drafting team. And, you know, I'm not quite - I need to flip over to my email, James had said he was going to try and send an update but I confess that I had to go run an errand in preparation for this meeting. I don't see anything from James though since I looked at my email. I do see a couple messages from Lisa that I haven't looked at yet. So, Lisa, you may have to bring me up to date on those as we go through the call.

So okay getting back over into Adobe. So David, go ahead please.

David Cake: I just wanted to say I believe James has been having some terrible travel disasters in the last…

Chuck Gomes: David, I don't know if it's just me but you're coming through very, very softly.

David Cake: Is this any better?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, is it just me? No, I see Marc said it's also just barely -I can't even make out what you're saying, it's too low. If you - go ahead. Yes, it's still really low, David. If you need a dial-out they can provide one. And if you can type in the chat that would be great.

Now while you're doing that, Susan, can you give us an update to the best of your ability on the small group that's working on the working group problem statement?

Susan Kawaguchi: Sure, Chuck. Susan Kawaguchi for the record. But a lot of discussion has gone on back and forth and there is a draft statement but I don't think it's truly in the problem statement format. So I know that several were still working on it and discussing issues on the thread, the email list that was created for that. And James I know was going to try to bring everyone together and get a short problem statement drafted this week. So hopefully - I'll reach out to James again and see if he has time to respond. But, yes, last Friday he did mention he was traveling a lot so.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Susan. This is Chuck. Appreciate that. And keep in mind that we're not stopping our work while that group does its task so we didn't expect that group to be done at this point in time but hopefully in the next couple weeks or so they will be able to provide to the full working group their suggested problem statement for the working group. So thanks for that.

And if anybody on that group wants to say anything you're welcome to, otherwise we'll go on in the agenda. Okay so Item C then under 2 is the possibility of a face to face meeting at ICANN 57 in Hyderabad in early November. I'm going to turn it over to Marika to talk about that please.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Chuck. So this is Marika. So just to note that the GNSO is currently in the process of thinking ahead to ICANN 57 as most of you may know, that is expected to be a seven-day meeting. And the current thinking is that Day 1 of that meeting, which is - was traditionally the Saturday of the GNSO weekend session, but due to the difference in days I think it's now actually a Thursday so Day 1 is likely going to be carved out for PDP face to face working group meeting times.

The Council is still discussing whether that would be in the form of a full day meeting for one group or potentially that time could also be split up in two four-hour blocks to allow for two PDP working groups to meet.

But in order to assess, which groups might be interested as well as available to do so, we're proposing to circulate a Doodle poll amongst the membership of this working group to get an idea of, you know, if such a meeting is organized in Hyderabad on the first day of the ICANN meeting which - who of you would be available and interested to participate in such a meeting and noting of course that, you know, it's not a commitment you're making at this stage but just intention to participate. So we hope to get that out shortly after this meeting.

And then the GNSO Council has, as an item on its agenda next Thursday, to talk through this schedule and hopefully a decision will be taken relatively shortly after that as, you know, everyone is aware that many people are looking already into travel arrangements as well as the deadline approaching for ICANN funded travelers that needs to be submitted I believe somewhere in early August.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Marika. Stuart, your turn.

Stuart Clark: Hi. I was just wondering in terms of obviously it's the long one now which is longer than any of the - they have ever sort of been. If sort of there's only

going to be the chance for such a small amount of time because for the meeting we've just had it was, in my mind, very good having the face to face. And to some degree by the end of it I felt that actually it would have been great to continue because it was quite an early morning start so everybody took a little while to get - wake up and get going.

And so I would like to maximize the amount of sessions, not necessarily have an entire day but being able to have a couple of sessions throughout the week to - so you have a little bit of time between sessions to think and come back to it rather than just having a very small amount of time on the very first day.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks very much, Stuart. And I'll get back to you. Marika, let me respond, first of all. I agree - I personally agree with you. I thought that the face to face was really valuable. And it would be great to have another one. And of course that's why staff is going to send out to the Doodle poll because the value of face to faces if we have lots of people that are face to face. If that doesn't happen or it doesn't look like it's going to happen it may not be a lot of value in planning on that. Hopefully it will - it can happen. And we will be able to do that there. But the poll will help us.

Now let me tell you that the - let me tell you that the - hold on. Okay so let me tell you that the seven-day meeting - this is the first time it'll actually be seven days if you don't include the GNSO stuff that usually happens on the weekend. But it's really a packed schedule.

I mean, there were some conflicts in Helsinki. In a regular meeting there are many more conflicts. So squeezing something in during the week, although we can try, it couldn't be a four-hour one I'm sure. And I'll let Marika respond to that. But we could try to have, for example, a four hour on the first day, which happens to be a Thursday this time. And then try to get a two-hour meeting.

And often time working groups do that in these kinds of meetings. So it's not a bad idea. There will be more conflicts, we can pretty much count on it. And let me turn it to Marika to comment.

Marika Konings: Yes, so this is Marika. So I think basically adding to what you already said, Chuck, I think the idea or the hope is that the face to face meeting on Day 1 would be largely unconflicted so that's something where I think the struggle may be during - having meetings later throughout the week it's definitely possible to request such meetings but it's very likely that many things are going on at the same time.

So I think it's something that the working group can look into but I think we've seen from past experience and also, you know, recognizing that in Helsinki there were many meetings that didn't happen as the focus was on policy and we expect that many of those meetings will probably come back to the schedule in - at ICANN 57.

So I think indeed, you know, the first day meeting is likely going to be unconflicted time while later in the week it may be much more difficult to find a time that works for most members in the working group. But as, you know, Chuck said, it's definitely something you can look into.

I'm also seeing Stephanie's comment, are we allowed to add a day? That was the initial consideration but I think (unintelligible) thinking is to try and, you know, as well allow for the seven-day meeting already being long enough having concerns about adding another day either front or end may be complicated. So I think the - the desire is at this stage - but again it's open to more discussion - to carve out the first day of the meeting for PDP working group so there wouldn't be any other GNSO sessions or Council sessions taking place at the same time so it shouldn't prove a conflict from that perspective.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Thank you, Marika. This is Chuck again. And before I go to Marc, one of the things I'll throw out to staff on this point is, is that maybe we could do two things on the Doodle poll. One of them whether they tentatively plan to be there in person at Hyderabad. And secondly, would adding a day to make it an eight-day meeting be something that you would consider. And again, if that's not appropriate to do via Doodle poll we can work that out on the leadership team as the best way to get that information out but I'll just throw that out and let me go to Marc.

Marc Anderson: I just wanted to agree that in the universal acceptance steering group, Helsinki was there first time we didn't do this and that was because they had a bunch of work items that had been completed. But we had always been meeting on the Sunday before the meeting - the major meeting started. They had half-day workshop or an all-day workshop. The amount of work that we got done was incredible and of course there were few if any conflicts. So that's definitely an approach that I support even though it's, you know, it makes the, you know, burn one more day of the meeting.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, marc. Appreciate it. Greg, your turn.

Greg Shatan: I think this was briefly touched on. But if by Day 1 we're referring to the first day of the GNSO meeting I would not be in favor of that. You know, at least while it may appear to be a GNSO Council meeting I always think of that as an actual GNSO meeting and sucking up, you know, a good number of people from that meeting in favor of a working group meeting or causing a conflict like that would be an issue. And I'm sure we have some councilors here for whom that would be an absolute conflict. But there are, you know, others who view that as a, you know, part of their GNSO obligation to be there. So I would caution against that approach if at all possible. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Greg, this is Chuck. Just a clarification. Are you cautioning against adding a day to make it eight days or cautioning against adding a short follow up meeting later in the week? Or both? Greg?

Greg Shatan: I'm not cautioning against either of those although an eight-day meeting, you know, starts to be absurd. I was cautioning against scheduling a working group face to face directly against the GNSO weekend but not on a weekend prep session.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Okay, that - I just want to make sure I understood it. That's appreciated. Thank you. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. If I can maybe just clarify, and I probably wasn't clear in my intro. But what is currently being proposed by James, the GNSO chair, is that Saturday would just be - well no it's not Saturday, Day 1 would just be GNSO face to face working group meeting. So the traditional Day 1 of the GNSO weekend session would be fully dedicated to PDP working group meetings.

So there wouldn't be any conflict for Council or other GNSO community members, you know, apart from participating in the PDP working group sessions because I think the sentiment is or was after the Helsinki meeting that, you know, some of the PDP updates could potentially be collapsed or done in a different way so they wouldn't need to take up the whole Day 1 which has happened in the past.

And I think also the realization of the value of having indeed, you know, dedicated blocks of time whether it's four hours or eight hours for PDP working groups. And also adding to that, and I think several people in the chat have already commented as well, adding another day may make it really difficult to achieve that goal of their, you know, the meeting becomes very long and there are also other conflicts I think that have been identified.

So the proposal is that Day 1 of the ICANN meeting would be fully dedicated to PDP face to face working group meetings and Day 2 would be more the traditional Sunday Day 2 approach where there would be PDP working group

updates as well as the meetings with the ICANN Board, GAC and what you traditionally see happening on GNSO weekend session.

And I can maybe refer you to the Council list where a draft schedule has been circulated. But as said, this is still on the discussion and is expected to be reviewed during next Thursday's Council meeting.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marika. And I'll get to you in just a second, Greg. I do notice in the chat that there are pros and cons on the extending to an eight-day meeting so, which is for a group this size we're going to always have that. So I'm not ignoring those, okay, and the leadership team won't ignore those. So and then I want to comment to respond to Ayden's comment.

Ayden, the ICANN 58 will have the same kind of issues as ICANN 57 in that it's - although it's not the annual meeting - I don't recall whether it's a full seven days or not, it is longer than the four days for the policy forum. But some of those same things and for right now let's focus on the next meeting and see what we can do on that. Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Chuck. And Greg Shatan. And, thanks, Marika, for clarifying that. Sounds like we wouldn't need to add an eighth day since Day 1 is now going to be like Day 0 has been for some recent past meetings. And I'm glad to hear that the Council is looking at ways to shake up schedule a bit and maybe learn some lessons from ICANN 56 in terms of how much or how little time is needed to get through Council business.

If we are in fact are talking about, you know, what is Day 1 then I would be all in favor of using that subject only to the caveat that for those of us who are attempting to participate however foolishly in more than one working group if there are multiple face to faces we'll just have to deal with that as well. But that's unavoidable.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. And thanks, Maxim, for your comment as well. Most of us keep really busy during that week of meetings so I think he's right that sometimes even if we had a second meeting that week the chance to do any preparation or homework or anything after the face to face meeting would be awfully limited for a lot of us. But we'll take all those things into consideration.

So what I want to ask everyone to do, please, that Doodle poll hopefully will come out later today. And I'd like to give about a week for people to respond to that. And again, we - like Marika said, we know that you may not know for sure but if you think there's an indication you would be able to participate if we had a face to face meeting - now there will be remote participation as always, okay.

But to take full advantage of the face to face meeting it's really nice to have people there face to face too. So please let us know and within a week. And the reason I say a week so in other words by next Tuesday, is it will happen a day or two before the Council meeting next week so that feedback could, you know, Marika will be able to provide that input into the GNSO Council on that Thursday of - two weeks from Thursday of this week.

So okay so I think that's enough time on that. Greg, is that an old hand?

Greg Shatan: Sorry.

Chuck Gomes: That's all right. We understand very well. So let's go on then to Agenda Item 3 which will probably take up the bulk of our time today. And I appreciate the discussion that's been going on on the list. And notice one of the things - and I think all of you recognize this, we're going to - and we've already experienced this on this call just with regard to the possible meeting in Hyderabad.

With a group this size and this diverse, which is - those are both good qualities, okay, we're going to always have differences of opinion and we're

going to have one or two or a small group of individuals that disagree with maybe what most everybody else does. The challenge for the leadership team will be as we try to lead this group indefinitely into the future, I guess I shouldn't say indefinitely, but a long ways into the future, we're going to have to make decisions without unanimity because we will rarely have unanimity, okay. So I just ask all of you to be patient. We'll try to make the best decision possible.

When we find out a decision didn't work we'll switch gears. And do that so bear with us. We want you to share your viewpoints and so forth. But if we keep going back and forth and changing decisions after quite a few in the group have supported a particular area, this task that we have before us will take much longer than what we need it to.

And we expect it to take a long time specially to do all three phases but even the phase 1 of our work, but at the same time we want to manage it as efficiently as possible so that we don't stretch it out any longer than we have to.

Now, just a little logistical warning, I see that I've lost - oh got it back or at least maybe it's coming back. My Adobe Connect went out - connectivity went out for a little bit. Hasn't come back yet so if I miss something in the Adobe please understand that I right now don't have that so if somebody else still has it - one of the leadership team if you see somebody raise a hand or something that I don't please help me out there. Hopefully it will come back.

All right, the - so the next thing then in our agenda with regard to is - our task is to try and take a stab at least at finishing Task 11 in our work plan, which is to agree on the method for reaching consensus in our deliberations once we start those.

And so we've already talked - got a brief update on the problem statement for the working group. That doesn't have to be - we don't have to hold up on that to finish Task 11.

I sent around to the list I think it was on Friday a revised - I think it was Version 13 - of the proposed approach. And the first two parts of that have pretty much stayed the same in the proposed approach. Where the major changes have occurred is in Section 3.

So I will, at this time, entertain any input on Sections 1 and 2 and if there is none, I will then - we'll focus on Section 3. So does anyone have any input on Sections 1 and 2? I don't think it's necessary to go through those again because they have changed very little other than just little tweaks to bring it up to date without making substantive changes. Anybody have any input on Sections 1 or 2?

If not, then one of the things that we - one of the results of our face to face meeting was the idea at least in the near term to take a look at use cases. Now, I sent a message to the list and I think I responded to Stephanie's post but it wasn't really just for Stephanie, it was really for everybody that's been discussing the idea of use cases.

And I want to reemphasize the things I said there. The plan isn't to try and discuss every use case possible. Nor is there any intent to get into controversial use cases and thereby, you know, maybe favor one particular position over another. And to illustrate the use of, I mean, the possibility of use cases helping us in our deliberation, whether you agree with that approach or not, what we're going to do next is go over the use case that was given - that's attached to this statement that you have in front of you, and hopefully you can scroll, I can't yet.

But and so, Lisa, I don't know, why don't you do a brief introduction and then we'll go through the one use case.

Lisa Phifer: Sure, Chuck. This is Lisa Phifer for the record. I had actually reached out to Rod Rasmussen who was instrumental in helping the Expert Working Group understand the use case methodology. And Rod is on the call now and I think I'll turn the mic over to him and let him talk a little bit about this approach and the way we used it and how it helped us get past some of the early stumbling blocks. Rod, are you on the call?

Rod Rasmussen: Yes, I am, can you hear me?

Lisa Phifer: Yes, go ahead.

Rod Rasmussen: Okay great.

Marika Konings: One second. Chuck, Stephanie is still in the queue actually on your first point on comments on Items 1 and 2. Sorry to interrupt you, Rod, but just wanted to note that.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, thanks for that. Again, I'm in - I'll go back to Stephanie right now. But I'm going to be trying to get back in Adobe and will be on mute after we do that. Stephanie, go ahead. Sorry, again, I'm trying to get back in Adobe. Go ahead, Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much, Chuck and Marika. I just wanted to put on the record, and this is Stephanie Perrin, that this Phase 1, Phase 2 reporting consultation approach I mean, we have to move forward so I'm fine with it. My concerns and caveats would be we have to make sure that when we go out to consult, if we don't have enough detail for people to meaningfully weigh in, we will need to think about coming back and consulting again.

I would suggest that as we struggle going around in circles right now even in the working group it's hard to conceptualize this stuff. And if we go out for consultation and we get a handful of comments, mostly reflecting existing and

well known positions, that doesn't really move us forward from a consultative perspective.

So I think one of the - I won't call them an error but one of the unfortunate things about the EWG report was that we consulted on the high level approaches and when we got down to the details there probably would have been a lot more meaningful input once people saw exactly what we were thinking about. And for most people they have to get right down into the weeds to understand it all. So I just wanted to put that on the record. No objection but bear in mind we may have to come back and consult again when there's more detail. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stephanie. This is Chuck. And in full agreement with you. I bet we have to come back over and over again. And that's okay as long as we continue to make progress in that regard. And before I turn it over to Rod let me know that I have an email problem that I've been - that's been hassling me for several days that's reoccurred so I'm probably not going to be able to get back into Adobe but I will stay on the phone, I'll just need lots of help from the leadership team and all the rest of you, and patience with me while I try to cope with this.

So, Rod, sorry for the interruption. Please go ahead.

Rod Rasmussen: No problem, Chuck. Thanks, everybody. Rod Rasmussen here. So wanted to give folks a perspective on how we dealt with a lot of really tough issues in the EWG and the methodology we used in order to address trying to balance a lot of things all at the same time as we're going through all of the various aspects of what would be needed in a next generation registry system.

And these things included not just, you know, the data elements that were being used but the purposes for why'd you want to use them, what the constraints were on the system. And we're talking a system here too, in general, we've got a - it's whether a system is full of processes, a system

that's guided by policy or a system that's guided by technical aspects, we're still talking about a system that's supposed to be used to accomplish various goals.

So we turn to the, you know, the very modern and well established practice of establishing, fully describing and playing out various use cases which really got towards the various goals, one could think of goals as purposes in a sense, for what the system would do and how it would do it. And that types of issues, constraints, requirements, were needed both to make it possible and to constrain actions within that system. And to balance out various factors that would tend to compete with each other.

So the idea was we would come up with some primary goals and things you want to accomplish with the system, purposes for the systems to be used and then walk through those with identifying both who the primary actors were, are in those cases, who the stakeholders are in those cases, basically who all the actors and influencers and things would be as far as getting the thing done, whatever it is you need to do, and then adding in things like data elements, things that you need because we're talking about the data system, the things you actually need to enter in or get access to in order to accomplish your goal.

And then in the - and the - we have the - there's a formal language around this in software development that's also used in policy development and other just product development in general and it's the standard that folks use to build products and services and things these days is stories. And we - in the software development sense there's a very technical language that's used, it's very precise, but it's used elsewhere as well to kind of walk through scenarios, if you will, as to how things actually occur to expose things that might come up against technical limitations, legal limitations etcetera, so you can expose issues and decide how to handle those things.

It's also a great tool for exploring things that you don't want to have happen. We explored a few scenarios like, you know, spammers trying to get a hold of data. But it could be used for things, and we use it every day in the security field to do, you know, the kind of the scenarios around how somebody would try and exploit a system. So these are the kinds of things you can do to take a look at how an actor, in the case of a negative use case, in a way of how that actor - that their goals are so you can expose things within your system that would be used to stop that actor from doing whatever it is they're trying to do to determine they don't want them to be able to do with a system.

So in our case that might be a hacker trying to get into the database or it might be somebody trying to get access to the system that shouldn't, you know, gain access to the system or somebody trying to get a hold of data that they should not have access to because they don't have legal or authority to get a hold of that data.

So it can be used in a variety of ways to explore what actually all the requirements are and determine what your limiting factors are so you can address them either with technical solutions, policy solutions or other areas or, you know, in some cases in the use case of say travel to another planet, which is kind of one of the classical ones given, you know, the faster than light problem hasn't been solved yet because the laws of physics haven't been figured out yet to allow that.

So there's all these kinds of limitations that you can run into that by drawing out your use cases you will then run into and explore. Lisa, did you have in mind for me to run through this - the example that we had as well?

Lisa Phifer: Rod, I think if you want to run through the example that would probably help illustrate it. And just to point out there are a couple of hands raised that you might want to call in when you're ready.

Rod Rasmussen: Okay. Yes, I'm looking at the actual documents I have to sort through, the application. So well so why don't we address hands and then I'll run through the brief - the example use cases in here. So I'm seeing Marc from Microsoft is the first hand.

Mark Svancarek: Thanks, Rod. I just wanted to add one thing to your description and that's the concept of non-goals. So sometimes it's good to explicitly say, "This is something we are not going to work on," like it's against the overall strategy or it's merely nice if we can postpone it for a later phase. Or, you know, for whatever reason as we discuss the things that we might do, it's good to sometimes explicitly carve things off and say not going to happen during this effort for whatever reason either because it sounded good but it's not or we can't achieve it, it's too costly, too risky, whatever.

And so that's a good way of maintaining a list of things that were discussed without any risk of them sneaking back and having to be discussed again.

Rod Rasmussen: Great. Excellent point. That's - yes, there's a subtle difference but an important one between the negative use case and the non-goals. And that reminds me that in general you - when you're working with use cases you have some overall constraints that you're working with as well typically. So those could be physical, budget, policy, there's lots of different constraints that basically become assumptions that feed into your use case analysis.

And those are things that you typically want to have in some sort of at least overall overarching kind of framework captured in the discussion document of some sort to help guide those use cases as well because, you know, I mentioned the faster than light problem. There's, you know, are we trying to solve, you know, world peace here or we've got a certain set of things that we're trying to do. And that gets kind of to the overall, you know, charter of our group I think as where that might tie to.

Nathalie, I think you're up next.

Nathalie Coupet: Yes, I have a technical question. If we agree on certain use cases and then build this system and subsequently use case is being prohibited, is being bent in certain jurisdictions, what happens - I mean, how quickly can RDAP or RDS react to this? How can we just take out this use case from being accessed in the system?

Rod Rasmussen: So that - the answer to that is going to be "it depends." And I think that kind of conflates a couple of things. A use case is something that which is a way - is a description around getting a task done or getting a purpose done, getting a goal done.

As it becomes - so a couple things you'll want to do on this. One is, as you're developing various - as you're bringing a list of goals or things you want to get accomplished done, and then putting together a use case around supporting that, you'll want to note that there may be issues, and this gets into the kind of the review and this is why it's useful to do a use case in the first place - is that in, you know, one of the things you'll want to expose is that you have a possibility of different jurisdictions having different constraints. Right?

So part of what that drives you towards is as you're designing whatever it is you're trying to design, software system, a legal framework or whatever, is that you need to have some flexibility and be able to account for that in the future.

So in other words, you want to try and anticipate the fact that you are going to have different constraints in different areas, which may or may not allow particular thing to happen. Typically, the goals that you would have would be things that would be things that you would want to have happen in the norm, and there be exceptions to that rule. All right?

Now, that being said, something, you know, a large policy decision could be made on a large scale worldwide that would say hey, we're not going to do X anymore because X is now been decided that was something we don't want to do. Now that's where you need to, you know, those kinds of extraneous or large scale events mean - typically mean redesigning or repurposing or rethinking whatever it is that you're doing in the first place.

So that's why I get back to it depends on, you know, exactly what kind of thing you're talking about. But in general, what you want to be able to have is a series of tasks, goals, purposes, uses, etcetera, that drive towards things that in general are what is desired for this system or product or set of things to get accomplished and that will, you know, will still have meaning and use in at least a portion of the area that you're working within.

So - and this actually and if you think about this in the terms of you have different users that want to accomplish different things, an example might be you have a corporate holder of domain names versus an individual user of domain names. We exposed several different use cases that only applied to one or other of those groups.

And that meant that you had different things that you were trying to accomplish. One of the things you want to do with use cases is kind of bring them together to say hey, we have these common elements within all of these use cases. That means we need a data structure or a process or a policy that allows this thing, that's common between these cases to happen.

So when you start thinking about different jurisdictions, which was one of the things we did on the EWG, that's when we started looking at well we need to be able to move data around in different ways or have - provide different access to that data in different ways.

We kind of anticipated where there might be differences based on legal jurisdiction. So those areas - that would be one of the things that you would

go through and flag during your use case scenario processes, areas where these different legal jurisdictions may impose different restrictions so that you can modularize how you approach that so that you could still accomplish this for certain kinds of users in certain areas and this allow for other users in other places.

And that's a very long-winded answer so I'll stop there and make sure I've got that question answered there for you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Rod. And I'll let you go through the particular use case in a moment. But and this is Chuck speaking. The - Nathalie, hopefully that answers your question. But let me reemphasize to everybody that our task in front of us is still to develop requirements. The use cases are just - it's a way that we can maybe narrow down or focus our work in developing requirements.

We have a list of about 800 plus requirements right now and to go through those effectively and efficiently we're going to need to come up with ways to organize our work. Now Lisa and Susan have been working on something that we'll talk about at the end of the meeting today that will be distributed and will help us organize that work and identify dependencies and priorities and that'll help too.

So keep in our mind our goal is not use cases, use cases were just suggested as a means to kind of bring some of our thoughts together. And that'll work in some cases; it won't work in others. Our ultimate objective in Phase 1 is to develop requirements for an RDS. Okay? And if use cases help us do that in some cases great.

In other cases, we'll probably have to look other directions, and that's okay. But I just want to reemphasize that. And let me - I see Nathalie, is that - did you want to respond?

Nathalie Coupet: No, thank you, that was perfect.

Chuck Gomes: Oops, I was on mute. Thanks. Lisa, go ahead before we get - and we can give it back to Rod after that.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. This is Lisa Phifer for the record. I just wanted to sort of build upon a point that Chuck just made that the relationship between possible requirements and the use cases that the way that the EWG used use cases was actually as a way to talk through the problem. But if you look at the EWG report you actually won't find a complete set of use cases. There were about 50 of them, and I'm sure we could dig them up from the archives and share them with this group.

But what they really did is let us look - step back and look at what should be the permissible purposes. What should be the malicious uses that should be actively blocked or at least discouraged with compliance. What should - what data elements were needed by at least one of those permissible purposes?

So it was really a way for us to think through the process and then come back to what in the EWG report were principles but what I believe this working group will strive to end up developing as consensus policy requirements. So that's the linkage between the activity.

Another thing that Rod mentioned that I'd just like to reemphasize is use cases also let us more explicitly call out some of the constraints that will also become possible requirements as we move down further the line. So hopefully that gives a feel for how these things fit together.

Rod Rasmussen: Okay great. Thanks, Lisa. And thanks for the mind around that too. And, you know, nobody who uses use cases in product development strips a use case. Right? They ship the end use - and the end product and the end service or the end policy or whatever they're developing out of it. It is a tool. It is an extremely useful tool because it brings together all the things that you need to accomplish a goal, a task or a purpose into a coherent story that you can

actually work through with a group of people who may normally not have similar knowledge or technical background or legal background or what have you.

It allows you to bring together people who have different skill sets to work to bring their expertise to an issue and fully explore it. It's not an - it's not the goal of the process itself. It's in fact part of the process for getting to your goal. So and that's really important to remember and understand. But it's extremely useful.

Okay so the - there's a one-page example use case. It's kind of in the - and if you scroll down it's on your screen there. It's kind of set aside with a big blue border and an off white text.

And the - this use case is an illustration of a couple of different formats of how you can actually present these things and work through them. There's actually a very formal use case format that is not shown here, which could take up many pages and be very useful for, say, an engineer or somebody to take that and write code from it or create specs from it or from a policy setting start, you know, citing various laws. It's a - we didn't get into that level.

We kept it as kind of as brief use case level, which is basically the use case is the goal, one of the purpose or whatever you want - how you want to think of that. And then a description. And then there's this casual format which gets you into the things that you do care about which gets into actors and stakeholders and, you know, limitations, scope, etcetera and the data elements. And then kind of a little walk through of how it actually works.

This particular example is - was purposefully chosen at the time because it was the original purpose, if you will, of the Whois, at least according to many, which is the reason I want to have information in the system in the first place and contact information was to resolve a technical issue with a domain name on the Internet.

That could be many different things but it's causing some sort of technical problem and I as a third party want to get a hold of somebody who can help me resolve that issue because it's affecting me or some other constituents out there.

And so that was, you know, we could talk about how much that has changed or morphed or expanded since then but this is kind of one of the original reasons for having this contact information put together in the first place was to resolve these kinds of issues.

And I won't read the whole thing for you because I'm sure you can read it if you haven't read it already. But the idea was to fully describe what the goal here was, who was trying to do the actions, who the different people or systems or roles, as it will, would be used or affected by having this thing happen.

So for example, in the case of somebody trying to - you have somebody who's affected by a technical issue, you have whoever is the technical representative, if you will, for the domain name. You also have whoever is operating the system that provides the contact information and how you get a hold of it. And there's a whole, you know, the process is there. You have - and this thing is - if you look at this it looks - assume a lot of things we did in the EWG around people who - people or system that validate users or contacts for things.

And then, you know, if you have the privacy proxy service involved, etcetera. So those were the other stakeholders, kind of looking at holistically of who might be involved or what entities might be involved in resolving this particular use case.

And then data elements would include the things that you actually need in order to solve your problem or get your - the things you're looking for in order

to do this. And then the story basically runs through the whole process at a very high level obviously here of how you would interact with the system and get the information you need in order to accomplish this task.

And that - the story can be very long or very short depending upon how much data - how much you want to get into. And this is where you also might include things that would be limitations - limitations or constraints on the ability to get things done. And those limitations may also show up in the stakeholders as well.

There are - this allows you to kind of, as you're filling this form out here, it allows you to realize who the affected parties may be and the information they or others, various entities may have that's needed to accomplish the task. So that exposes the areas in our, you know, deliberations or exposes the areas of who, what and when, the why of kind of the use case itself.

And I think that pretty much covers it as far as the example goes. I don't know if there was any other desired discussion on that. But it's - I think it's pretty straightforward to understand this from this particular use case how this works as far as being able to document this and then from this you can explore commonalities across use cases.

For example, you can take a list of data elements across use cases and see where there are commonalities, you can take various factors that may be affected by various use cases to see where there are interactions of the system. And, you know, various steps along the way may indicate things you need to do from a systems perspective, etcetera, for being able to support a use case. Or I'm sorry, to support a set of use cases with a common framework system policy, etcetera.

So I'll leave it at that and if see if there's any questions on that.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Rod. This is Chuck again. Any questions on the use case? And while I'm waiting for that, how - and this is a question that Rod can answer or someone else can answer that's on the call. But how would use cases help us in terms of developing the requirements that we're tasked with doing in Phase 1? Anybody that wants to respond to that is welcome. And you can use this particular example as an illustration if that's helpful.

Rod Rasmussen: So this is Rod. I'll just reiterate that, you know, by using the use cases you expose many of the things that we need to consider, many of the things in the charter, things like data elements, who has access to data, all those things across multiple uses of the - of the system, of the process.

                 So that you can both get a comprehensive list and get a commonalities across various things, you know, what the important things we need to deal with are. And you also know if you have a use case, for example, only a single use case you can think of where a particular data element is needed that puts it into kind a special class, right. So that now becomes a question of do we really need to support that use case or that data element or could we solve that some other way, or is that use case even that important?

                 If we're talking about collecting and distributing, maintaining, etcetera, a data element for one single particular use case, those kinds of things get exposed where you have the kind of the well I wish we had this data but it really doesn't serve that much of a useful purpose. So I think both from a figuring out what's most important and what you really need to do and also exposing things that really aren't all that potentially necessary to collect or what have you in the system. I think it's useful for both of those purposes.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Rod. Andrew.

Andrew Sullivan: There we go. That's better. Pressed the wrong button. Thank you. I agree with Rod but I want to put this in a slightly more abstract way in one sense in order to try to answer your question, Chuck. The purpose of use cases is to

force people who want some behavior to say what they're going to do with that behavior because the purpose of designing a system and saying what the system has to do is a practical purpose.

And so if somebody says, well, I have this use case, I want to do such and thus. The question is, you know, what does it take in order to satisfy that requirement? And also what does that impose on everybody else? This is the point that Rod was just making about a data element, for instance, that only satisfies one use case.

Because the other thing about use cases is that frequently what it does when somebody says, well, I need X, actually what happens is they've got in the back of their mind they've got something they want to do with it. And frequently it turns out, when you're designing a system, that when somebody says they need X, they don't actually need that. What they need is to satisfy some other behavior. And it turns out you can satisfy it another way.

So by specifying what it is you're trying to do rather than specifying what elements that you want in the system, you force yourself to talk about the things you're going to achieve with this system and the things you're not going to achieve. Those are the anti-use cases.

And then you - and then you can design the system, you can specify the data elements in the language that you just asked. You can specify those requirements that conform to the set of things that people say they want to do. And I think that that's the reason that a use case approach is really the only way to do this. Otherwise we're just going to argue forever about whether a certain data element is needed or not.

Whereas if you come up with a list of like what is it that people are trying to do when somebody says, well I really need this data element, you can say well what do you need it for? You know, which use case here is that it satisfies? Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Andrew. Very helpful comments. And, Mark, you're next.

Mark Svancarek: Yes, I just want to pile on to what Rod and Andrew were saying. And let's remember that at the stage we're at right now we're still not actually designing the system or a system or a collection of systems. Right now we're still working on the policy, you know, what are we trying to accomplish and things like that.

And so just as we go through this I don't want us to get immediately hung up on which data elements are in a protocol or where a database lives. All of those things will be resolved during the development process. So we keep them in mind, but, you know, they're not blocking anything yet.

You could theoretically come up with an entire system that is done on paper and fax machines, right? I mean, that would suck and we wouldn't want to do that. But as Andrew says, there are sometimes other ways of accomplishing things. There are workarounds, and stuff like that. And let's just keep in mind right now that as we determine what we want to enable, what we want to block and the priority of those elements, you know, in terms of what do we work on first, what can we cut, don't get hung up on actual computer architecture yet.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Mark. And I want to also comment on something, and Andrew said this pretty well in the chat. I don't know if everybody got it. But keep in mind when we're talking about design and architecture and so forth, we're not talking about designing a protocol. Okay? That has been done.

The IETF has done that. They spent a long time doing that. And they've given us a protocol that has the tools that allows a lot more flexibility than we ever could even dream about with the old Whois. So it's not our job to design a protocol.

Right now, our task is to define requirements and put - and then ultimately in Phase 2, develop some policy that fulfill those requirements. But I want to make sure everybody understands don't think about we're going to have to design a protocol, that is not our task. And we're not going to be able to - we're not going to have to do that. And so I just want to make sure level set everybody in that regard.

Now what I want to do next, because our time is quickly going by, is go to a - to the approach that's on the screen. And I'd like you to scroll down if you haven't done so to Section 3 of that. And I just quickly want to call attention to some things in Section 3 of the approach.

I want to reemphasize that - to Point A there. We've already decided that we're going to start with questions related to users and purposes, privacy and data elements and that we're going to look at those iteratively. We're not - that's a decision we've made as a working group. I don't see us revisiting that. Let's move forward and realize those are the three that we're going to look at iteratively.

Now, if something comes up with regard to gated access or something while we're doing that, that doesn't prevent us from looking at that if it helps us. But we've already decided that. So I don't think we need to do that again.

And in that regard, Lisa and Susan have been spending tons of hours on taking that list of requirements and grouping them and doing lots of things. And you're going to get the latest version of that just after this call.

And the second part of the task then under 2b, or excuse me, in 3, then where I made a suggestion before we went into the face to face meeting and we don't need to revisit the suggestion. It didn't - it didn't result with what I thought it might. But the good thing is out of that we came up with the approach that we should again, take a look at use cases and also develop this problem statement that we have a team doing.

And that's Part B under Number 3. So we basically discarded my idea there, which is fine. I just threw it out to kind of get us moving forward. And where we're at now is 3c. And that's where we - the problem statement, that's being done and while that's being done the idea was, and you can see this in 3c(2), that we're going to take a look at a few use cases and see if they help us while we're finalizing this list of requirements and getting it ordered and organized so that we can tackle it and start deliberating.

So the - and then it talks about you can see the blue font and the red font and so forth in there that shows the updates to the approach that were put there. And ultimately we get to Step 6, small Roman numeral 6 there, to review and refine the triage group of possible requirements.

And we're getting closer to being able to do that. Lisa will be sending out, after this call, a - the results of the work that she and Susan have done with that long list of requirements. And the purpose will be for the group to look at that as a whole and provide feedback on that to improve upon it and so forth. And hopefully that will help us organize our deliberations in such a way that we can effectively go through them without literally going one by one and that could take forever.

So once we do that then, and we have that triage list, we can start deliberating on the requirements. In the meantime, we can start talking about use cases like the one we looked at this morning to help us prepare for that deliberation. And keep in mind when we get to actually deliberating on possible requirements we'll be trying to reach rough consensus, not formal consensus, where we're going to like the charter says, but we're trying to reach rough consensus with the requirements first of all on the first three questions, and then on the other two questions on gated access and accuracy.

And it's after that then that we'll be doing our first initial report. And like I think it was Marika pointed out on the list, the term initial report isn't going to work very well for us because we're going to have at least two of those in Phase 1. And of course more of those in Phases 2 and 3. So but it is a - it is a term with specific meaning in the GNSO PDP process so that's why we're using it.

Now, let me stop there on particularly with Section 3c and see if there are any questions or comments. Lisa, please go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. This is Lisa Phifer for the record. Just to elaborate on one point that Chuck made regarding the triaged requirements list, what we'll be sending out to you all is a cut at organizing the - what - all the requirements that were in Draft 3 in the triaged format. That means suggesting which phase they might fall into, suggesting some possible groups that they could be considered usefully together and so you'll get both the document that does that as well as the spreadsheet that allows you to filter on let's say all the requirements associated with data retention, just as a way of example.

So that the group - the working group can make - can then consider all the possible requirements that might be relevant to that particular group. Now the groups that Susan has actually suggested, she's been through a couple of times and they seem pretty solid but that doesn't mean this working group can't change them as you move forward, it's really just a starting point.

The other thing I wanted to mention though is several of you have been continuing to work on your assignments and submitting additional possible requirements. And just wanted to let you know that those will be added to Draft 4 of the possible requirements list. So first you're going to get Draft 3 organized this way. And then in parallel with your review of that we'll go ahead and start adding the additional requirements to produce Draft 4. But that way we can work and try to parallelize our work.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Sorry I was a little slow but I'm trying to mute myself when I'm not
                 talking and it takes me a while to get off of mute on my phone. So Stephanie,
                 please.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks, Chuck. Stephanie Perrin for the record. This is just a question about
                 the last counter-example in this document here. The one referring to the
                 requirements - possible requirements that may not apply in all circumstances.
                 Now, it seems to me there's a policy decision wrapped up in here because if
                 you examine the possibility that an EU citizen could be registering a domain
                 name in pretty well any jurisdiction around the globe and that the European
                 data protection laws would apply, regardless of whether they're using, you
                 know, an African registrar or a US registrar, then there's a potential for this
                 always to apply to all registrars.

                 So there's a policy decision wrapped up in that whole phrase, "applicable
                 jurisdiction." So I think we need a better example that doesn't apply or at least
                 a caveat in there pointing that out.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stephanie. This is Chuck.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Let me first all say let's not get hung up on the examples. Okay? You're
                 absolutely right. We could make a policy decision later on that makes that
                 apply to everyone. Now, just to follow on your line of reasoning, we could also
                 decide that it applies to all European citizens but if somebody is not a
                 European citizen it doesn't apply.

                 Now I'm not suggesting either one is right or wrong, okay? But you're
                 absolutely right, we can make a policy decision either one of those ways or
                 some other way. But let's not - I don't want to spend more time coming up
                 with other examples. We're trying to get people to see what - I was trying to

get people to see - to see a little bit maybe more clearly what we're trying to illustrate.

And that example was really for that approach I suggested when we're looking at a possible requirement that apply across the board. We're not going that route anymore. So I say, you know, the example wasn't perfect. It isn't perfect still. But let's not get hung up there. Let's instead focus on moving forward. Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. I think Lisa may have covered that in the chat but that final page actually represents a deletion from the middle of Page 4 that was just too long to fit in the marginal deletion. So it's - that's deleted material that was being discussed rather than something that's in our draft going forward. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. And thanks, Lisa. And we'll clean this up again. What I'd like to get - I'd at least like to get the sense of the room today that there's reasonably good support to move forward as we're doing right now understanding that we'll refine it and improve it as we go forward and understanding that there are probably some individual objections.

So anybody want to strongly object to a conclusion that we can clean this up and we'll eliminate that example totally and get rid of all the redlining and so forth and move forward as this is going right now. And if you'll look at Item D under Number 3, there's two items there. If there's reasonable support for moving forward in this direction, we will do so.

If not, then we as a group need to readjust the approach to our deliberations and adjust that. And I'm going to count on anybody that objects to provide very concrete discussions because I don't want to spend all of our time deciding on how we're going to approach these things; I'd like to start getting into the discussions. Now any comments or questions or strong disagreements with alternative suggestions that anyone wants to make?

Greg, is that a new hand?

Greg Shatan: Ancient hand.

Chuck Gomes: Greg's been good at that today hasn't he? So okay I can give Greg a bad time, we've worked together for many, many years on many different efforts. So I feel like I can get away with that. So okay that - I'm going to assume that we can clean this up then and at least for now call Task 11 kind of done. Realizing that we're going to continually react and adjust so that we get better at what we do.

Now, with regard to the triage work, what I'd like to do is to ask all of you when that comes out, and it's a huge document. You're probably going to have to skim it from a point of view of looking at groups and so forth, don't - try not to be overly intimidated by it. But see if the sense of organization and so forth looks reasonable or if you have some suggestions for improvements and so forth.

My guess is, and I confess I have not talked about this with the leadership team so they could disagree with me on this. But my thinking is that probably in our call next week, which will be at our alternative time, and I think Holly won't even be able to participate but there are other people from the Asia Pacific part of the world that will be participating, and I think a big part of our agenda likely will be to entertain questions on the triage work that Lisa and Susan have done, suggested changes and so forth.

It may be unrealistic to think we could get that done in one meeting or in one week. In fact, I highly suspect it's not possible. But we'll - and we'll always be improving it and so forth. But probably the next couple meetings will focus on that. And so let me let Lisa jump in on that. Go ahead, Lisa.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. Lisa Phifer for the record. So I believe that probably we also in addition to just confirming that that format and organization is going to be useful, we also then probably want to look at some of the other items on our approach such as identifying some use cases and maybe getting some volunteers to try to draft some of those and also getting a report back from the team that's working on the problem statement and discussing that as well. The problem statement will help to set the stage for all that we do.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much. And hopefully we'll have - this is Chuck again - and hopefully we'll have between now and our next meeting an update on that problem statement. Hopefully they'll be getting closer to delivering something for all of us to consider. And you're absolutely right, we need to look at that while we're also refining the triage effort.

And what about use cases, okay? Lisa, maybe you can help people out. What use cases? Again, we're not going to try to create a comprehensive use case list but what would be some good use cases to help us fit things together from especially the first three areas of users and purpose, users and purposes, privacy and data elements? Do we - it would be good if people would think about that and suggest some use cases. It can be use cases that were used by the EWG but it's by no means restricted to that.

So between now and our meeting next week it would be helpful if people made some suggestions. And let's put out a call to the whole list of all members requesting that. And, Lisa, how would you phrase that or you can phrase it after the call but maybe you want to comment on that?

Lisa Phifer: Yes, I think that if you look at the list of possible requirements there are, for example, some permissible purposes that are enumerated in there. Those could form the starting point for some use cases for people that, you know, have some experience with that scenario and want to help describe it. Along the same lines I think in the data elements section there are some possible requirements that could also help identify possible use cases.

And so the way that I would suggest going about it is for working group members to take a look at the list, see if a possible requirement jumps out at them as suggesting a use case, and then volunteer to try to write it up. We can certainly make - I saw in the chat a few people suggesting that we start with some of the EWG use cases and we can certainly make that available to the group to reuse any of that material that's helpful.

But also want to empathize this working group is not at all limited to those use cases or required to look at all those use cases. It's just resource material that this group can use.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa. The - so good suggestions. And again, we're not trying to create this really long list of use cases to start going through. But to the extent that you can pick out some ones that you think would be particularly helpful for us as we start deliberating on the first three areas, and constructively help us focus on those, that - those are the kind of things we're looking for. So everybody, please think about those.

Now our time is just about up. I think we accomplished at least to the extent we can right now what the main objective was, was to kind of get somewhat of a finalization of Task 11 on our approach to deliberation. And we did a couple other things as well.

So glad my Adobe Connect lasted for the rest of the meeting. And so again sorry for the interruptions on my part. So that's what I get for trying to have a little vacation here. So and that's what I'm going to do after this call. So anyway anything I've missed, anything else we need to cover today? Anybody on the leadership team or on the working group as a whole want to bring anything up at this point?

Okay, thanks, everyone. I hope we have good lively continuing discussion on our list. And keep in mind that triage information is coming out. Again, try not

to be overly intimidated by it but to kind of look at it at a high level. And pick out anything that you think might be improved or questions that you have and we'll certainly spend time on that in probably our next two calls along with a couple other things that we've talked about.

Thanks, all. Not seeing anything else, I will adjourn the meeting. Have a good day and a good rest of the week. Thanks.

Terri Agnew: Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines. And have a wonderful rest of your day.

END