ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Next Generation RDS PDP Call
Wednesday, 22 June 2016 at 05:00 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-22jun16-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: Excuse me, recordings have started.

Woman: Thank you very much, (Veronica). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the GNSO Next Generation RDS PDP Call on Wednesday 22 of June 2016. In interest of time today, there will be no roll call as there are quite a few participants, so we'll take attendance via the Adobe Connect room only.

                So if right now you're only the audio bridge and not connected to the Adobe Connect room, could you please make yourself known over the audio?

(Daniel):   (Daniel) for the record. I'm currently on the phone bridge, not yet go into the Adobe Connect. Thank you.

Woman: Thank you very much, (Daniel), noted.

I'd also like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background. Thank you ever so and I'll hand it to Chuck now.

Chuck Gomes: Well hello everyone. It's still Tuesday for me, a couple hours left on Tuesday, but for most of you it's Wednesday. Appreciate you joining us and many of you at no-so-desirable times. But - (Holly) doesn't have any sympathy for us.

(Holly): Nope.

Chuck Gomes: She gets those most of the time. So I don't blame you, (Holly), so -- and others that are from that in the Asia Pacific area, so.

Well we have a full agenda today I think and some very important things to go over. So let's move right into it. Does anyone have an update to their statement of interest? Not hearing or seeing anyone. Are there any questions or comments about the agenda that posted in Adobe and was sent out yesterday I believe, or earlier today for me maybe? So. Okay.

Let's jump right then to the second item and just get a quick update on our first two outreaches. And I'm going to ask Marika if she would give us an update on outreach message number one.

Marika Konings: Hello everyone. So this is Marika. So what you see on the screen is - I see some of you may be familiar with the public comment review tool. It's a tool that we've used in other working groups for the purpose of analyzing and reviewing comments submitted. What we've started doing is for those comments that we've received to date in the (unintelligible) outreach and message one, and that was input that was received from the SSAC Registry Stakeholder Group and the GAC and the ALAC, we started putting into the public comment review tool.

The advantage of this tool is that allows you to kind of separate out the comments on all the questions that we've asked in the outreach message and hopefully will facilitate the working group's review of those. What you see in the first comment is basically, in the first column, is basically a copy and paste from the actual comment related to the specific question one, that you can see at the top, calling to highlight who is, which entity made that comment. And then in the third in some case we're ready to provide a draft working group response.

And the idea being as well that this both serves as a tool for the working group to remember and recall what information or what action you decided to take in response to the input received, but also for those that have made those submissions that they can see how the working group has considered and addressed the input provided.

I think there are a couple of areas where the response is maybe not as clear cut and that's why we've left it blank and that may require some further conversations, although at least at the leadership may actually be looking at those and providing some draft responses for your review. But at least we hope that this is a starting point, which the working group can use to work through the input provided in a systematic way and record how you reviewed it what action you took as a result of the input provided.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Marika. This is Chuck again. And special thanks and appreciation to Marika for getting this started, and it's actually in pretty good shape. I think there are four items. If you scroll down through the document, you'll find four of them I think that have the orange, red, green, and blue choices there that haven't been chosen yet and no responses.

But the first action item out of this is for the leadership team, as Marika indicated, to prepare some draft responses and have this ready to go, assuming we don't get any really late inputs, have it ready to go for our

working group meeting in Helsinki. So hopefully the working group can approve it and we can post the responses.

So two action items out of this then, one for the leadership team to this week prepare responses, and I got something started on that earlier today, and ask the other members of the leadership team to review that and suggest edits and add things or delete things or whatever they like so that hopefully be the end of the week we can have a response that we can send to the full working group before our meeting on Tuesday of next week in Helsinki. So the second action item would be to include on our agenda in Helsinki some time for the working group meeting on Tuesday A this particular item, review and approval of the comment tool from outreach number one.

Any questions on outreach number one and the comment tool? Okay. Let's go - let's talk then about outreach number two. I appreciate the good work that our liaisons are doing on that. Do any of the liaisons or for that matter anybody from different groups have any questions or comments with regard to outreach number two?

Please note that we're asking that the responses for that, which are for additional requirements, be submitted not later than our working group meeting in Helsinki on Tuesday, before that if possible, but it'd be okay to submit things. And in that meeting, as well as in the cross-community meeting, we will give opportunity for visitors as well as members to suggest requirements at that time.

Hopefully everyone saw the change in direction with regard to outreach number two, and that is that we don't expect people to review our huge list of requirements. It's perfectly okay for them to just submit requirements. We will - if the liaisons can catch them as duplicates, fine, that's even a big thing to ask of the liaisons, so don't worry too much about that. We will catch the duplicates later on. And I think that makes this particular task a realistic one for people to get done by next week.

Keeping in mind that it's not as if we can't add new requirements after that working group meeting, and I think everybody understands that. So, any comments or questions on outreach number two? Okay. So then let's go to the next agenda item.

And again, maybe one more comment on that. Again, certainly ask the liaisons to encourage their members to respond. If they don't, it's okay, but make sure they're aware of the request and get a chance to respond. And then of course anybody in the various groups is welcome to encourage others to respond in your groups.

Let's go to agenda item three, which is to - and this we're going to spend quite a bit of time on. You'll recall that last week in our working group call we had quite a bit of discussion on work plan task 11, which is to identify or to agree on how we're going to reach consensus in our deliberations. And so the document in the screen now is the latest version, in fact it's the tenth version if you saw the file name.

So the leadership team has been pretty busy on this trying to come up with an approach that hopefully the whole working group can support. There was a suggestion made last week by Kathy Kleiman that we seriously considered, and we kind of incorporated part of it, although we're - as you'll see, we're only going to add one issue report to the work plan, not three like I suggested might be desirable last week.

So what we're going to do on this because I doubt that very many, if any, of you had time to go through this, and again like I said in the message I sent about four hours ago, we decided not to send a redline because there are a way too many redlines and it would probably have been more confusing. So the - what I will do as we go through this is I'll particularly highlight areas that there were a lot of changes made, okay?

So I don't think we need to go through the background. That is pretty much the way it was originally. On section one, there are a few changes in there, but the - the main change from the original version of this is that we are not going to add a third, excuse me, yes initial report. I've got get my GNSO terms right. The - so we're sticking with just doing adding an initial report, a first initial report after we deliberate on the first five questions, but we're definitely going to deliberate on the big three, if all of you know what I mean by that, the three questions related to users and purposes, privacy and data elements.

And we will not go on to the other two questions on accuracy and I wanted to say tiered access. I'm dating myself there. Anyway, so that we will be going - we will do those after we deliberate on the first three. And if we think that an outreach is useful after we do the first three and before we move on to gated access and accuracy, we can do that. We don't have to use an initial report to do that, but we can do whatever we decide at that point in time, a formal outreach, an informal outreach, or whatever, but there's nothing to prevent us from reaching out if we want to do that and test our thinking before we move on to the next two questions.

And then as originally in the work plan, we would do our first initial - we would add an initial report after those first five questions and not wait until we do all 11 questions. And we would do a public comment period, incorporate the public comment and so forth. So we'll have to update our work plan to reflect that if the group supports this approach.

So let me pause there on section one. Hopefully you've had a chance while I'm blabbering here to take a look at section one. If anybody has any questions or suggested edits or comments on section one of this proposed approach. Notice that we didn't change anything with regard to C other than any just administrative nonmaterial edits as far as determining consensus. We would not take a consensus call, a formal consensus call, but rather we would try to reach rough consensus and communicate that to our groups, and

we wouldn't take any formal consensus calls, as discussed in the charter, until we have gotten feedback from the community. So.

Any questions on section one or concerns? Anybody on the leadership team wants to jump in and comment on something I missed, please feel free to do so at this time. And I'd better look at the chat, huh? Thanks, (Lisa) for answering that question. So (Stephanie), I see your -when do we figure out the purpose of the RDS and whether we need a new one. I think there's two questions in that and I think (Lisa) answered one of them. But I'm not sure you got an answer to the first part of that question is when do we figure out the purpose.

Well that's when we deliberate on the purpose and users thing, and then of course we're really not going to probably even try to reach rough consensus on that until we've looked at privacy and data elements as well. So we're going to kind of do all of those in sync and we'll probably do some jumping around, which is okay. We will do exactly what we need to do to try and cover that.

So I don't know if I missed anything else in the chat. If I did, help me out on that. But go ahead, (Holly).

(Holly):   I was going to point out a really helpful addition to the discussion was an e-mail from (Jim) who actually -- I know (Stephanie)'s question is about RDS data -- but the way he's broken it down today in the e-mail that (Stephanie) may not have had a chance to look at would be very useful in actually dealing with that question. So just to add, we've got some more information to read about, but it's very useful in that context.

Chuck Gomes: And thanks to (Jim) for doing that. I just barely glanced at what he submitted the last probably the last hour or two. So - but that is very helpful. Thanks, (Holly), for pointing that out. That's much appreciated. Any other comments

or questions on part one of this approach? Okay, then let's go -- and this of course is Chuck speaking again -- let's go to section two.

And so the next step would be to organize the possible requirements, and as all of you I think know by now, we have a ton. Okay? I don't even want to say the number. But, you know, even if we trim that list down considerably, even if we cut it in half, which is probably optimistic, overly optimistic, it's still going to be very difficult to just go one by one and go through them all.

So the idea of step two is to organize the possible requirements in a way that will allow us to attack them not one by one but possibly in groups and order them according to prerequisites and dependencies and so forth. So step two, and the thing that has changed in this particular step is the leadership team decided to go ahead and let (Lisa) and (Susan), who volunteered - (Lisa) was probably forced into it as staff support, (Susan) literally did volunteer, but if (Lisa) wants to say she volunteered that's okay.

But the two of them have been spending I think incredible hours starting to do both A and B in this task. And we'll take a look at that while we're on this section, section two. But before we do that, let's make sure people look at the - what section two says now. There are two things that they're doing. You can see what A is there. This was primarily in response to Greg Aaron's comments with regard to triaging the list, and we're going to come back and you'll see how that's actually going on in just a minute.

And so (Susan) and (Lisa) are taking a first crack in that in A. They're also taking a first crack at Part B, which is to try and find requirements that are similar or interdependent that will hopefully facilitate our order of deliberation and so forth later on. So they're doing both those.

Now the working group will then get a chance to respond to comments to tell (Lisa) and (Susan) where they totally blew it or you can tell them thanks they did a good job, or some combination thereof. So - but understand that it's a

really big effort that they're going through so it's going to take a while. It's not going to be done in full before Helsinki. They're going to try to -- and I'm going to let them talk about that -- to get at least the big three done, at least as a first cut before Helsinki. If they don't make that, we won't hold it against them but - because it's a huge task.

So let's - we're going to come back to this document and talk about item three, but let's break away right now and pull up if we can the triage document to date. Is that okay, (Lisa)?

(Lisa Pfeiffer):   Yes, Chuck. Bringing it up right now.

Chuck Gomes: And I'll let you and (Susan), you can take the lead and (Susan) please jump in and share any lessons you've learned and experiences you've encountered. That's probably good insight for the working group as a whole to hear since the two of you have been digging down in it. So, (Lisa), I'll let you start and, (Susan), I hope you'll jump in and share some of the things you've seen as well.

(Lisa Pfeiffer):   Thanks, Chuck. This is (Lisa Pfeiffer) for the record. I've loaded in a document that's in progress into the Adobe Connect. It's also posted on the meetings materials page and you should have synchronization. You should have control to be able to scroll around yourself.

The beginning part of this document should look very familiar because it is the draft three of the possible requirements list that we all stared at length in the previous meeting. What we have been doing actually starts on the third page of the document, where in the section on users and purposes we've been basically organizing the possible requirements that were already there.

So in the process of what we're doing here, we're not changing the requirements, we're not adding or deleting to them, what we're trying to do is organize them in two ways. The first way is what Greg Aaron had suggested

as a triage approach where we take all the possible requirements and we put them in a table and we add a column for prerequisites or dependencies and then a column for what phase that item probably falls into.

We're doing our best to identify the interdependencies between the possible requirements that are on the list. In some cases, especially when we have nested requirements, we're trying to make sure that the nested requirements actually refer back to each other so that if the table gets sorted in a different order, we don't lose the context of the requirement. But the idea of identifying the dependencies is to help us roll back to the possible requirements upon which other possible requirements depend, and that hopefully help us when we get to the deliberation stage to home in on those underlying possible requirements, if you will.

The phase column then refers back to the process framework, and for each question what we've done is include just a little bit of the process framework to help us understand what the three phases were and then to help categorize the possible requirements as possibly falling into phase one, two or three. Not a lot of them fall into phase one, but the idea is that we could park some of the things that are potentially phases two and three until the work group has had a chance to think about the ones that fall into phase one.

The other thing that we're doing is then trying to group the possible requirements that are either outright duplicates, in some cases the same requirement appeared in more than one document verbatim or it appeared in more than one question verbatim, so we're trying to flag those. But then also, (Susan)'s actually been taking the lead on this part, trying to group the possible requirements that are very similar and probably would need to be deliberated together.

And why don't I turn things over to (Susan) to talk a little bit about the groupings, which you'll find in this document here on pages 26 and 27. (Susan)?

(Susan): Thanks, (Lisa), that was a really good synopsis of this. And I'm trying to sync my document down to - there we go. It seems to not want to load. So first of all, none of this is set in stone, so if we see some of the groupings that I selected for one of the possible requirements, I really, especially the first time through, what I did was whatever just jumped out to me first and made sense, then I would categorize it that way.

So it might be a purpose, it might be accurate data, or data accuracy and - or it might be contact, technical contact. So there's lots of different groups that I just sort of made up as I went along. Okay this is what this reads to me. But then I did find, and especially in a user purposes, I've probably been through these - that section three times.

And tonight, (Lisa), sent me an email saying, "Well there was a duplicate and you assigned it to two different groups." You know? Because it there was two times and each time I read it a little differently, which just is a good example of how you can read the language with one thing in mind and the second time around read it and it sort of speaks to you differently. So there's no intention to create artificial groups out of this. It was whatever - sometimes it was just a key term in the language itself that I would realize I'd pull out.

The part that I am finding really difficult now is I am almost through with data elements and only - and I've finished data accuracy and gated access. I just was going through the possible purposes in the report from each one working my way back. It might have made sense for me to jump to privacy, which seems to be the biggest group.

And as I'm working in a group in a, you know, core area like data elements, then all of a sudden I'll remember something from user and purposes and go, "Oh I probably shouldn't have categorized that that way or grouped it that way." And so sometimes I've gone back and give it an extra grouping. So it might be purpose of (van) policy, or. So you'll see eventually there could be

three different groups. I think that's probably about the max that is assigned to one of these possible requirements.

And - but I do think that in privacy, by the time we hit privacy there's going to be a lot more duplicates. And I haven't really pulled out duplicates. (Lisa) has done that from - but I think by the time, because that's the fifth grouping or the fifth category, that we will find that yes we've already seen this in purposes or maybe in data elements, not that it doesn't belong in privacy too but to make sure that we categorize those or group those all the same and sort of look back to see what the rationale was in user purposes and data elements for example and then make a choice for privacy too.

So, you know, it's not an exact science and I'm sure, you know, each person could read the same language and sort of pull different meaning or different importance out of each one of the possible requirements. But that's just the way we - I've been going at it. It does take a lot of time, but we're working it through.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, (Susan) and (Lisa). And I'll let you jump back in as you need to while we're talking about this. But I want to first of all point that one of the nice things about the table format is we can do sorts, you know, primary and secondary sorts. So for example we could easily sort through - sort it by phase and take a look at what they have identified as phase two or three and ask all of you to see if you concur.

And then if, in cases where there's agreement with that phase, we can move those requirements out and put placeholders in for phase two and phase three and we'll need to deal with those requirements in phase one. But again, the working group will have a chance to review the phases and weigh in on that.

Now I have a question for - with regard to the groups and I guess, (Susan), you're probably the one to answer this. Now will each of the question areas

have a different definition of the groups or do the groups - are the groups the same - I haven't looked through them in real - oh, no it looks like they're probably the same across all five questions. Is that - or all 11 questions, actually. Is that the intent?

(Susan):   Yes.

Chuck Gomes: And that's probably why you did A to J and then Z backwards. Is that right? To allow some in the middle? Oh no, I'm just not looking down below. I see it.

(Susan):   Yes, they just went down instead. So in actual - yes. So, you know, there was nothing scientific about how I came up with the groups. I just, you know, the first thing that hit me is purpose and so that was number A. And then, you know, the next possible requirement brought to mind contact data for technical resolutions, so that was defined B. And so literally as I worked this through I had my sort of cheat sheet of the group with the keys and I go back and when I can't find something that really pertains to that possible requirement then I realize, oh, there's another group here that we should be thinking about. So I will add that and actually I think I'm pretty much through - I didn't have time to get this to (Lisa) tonight because I was working on it this evening but I think I like now have something through A-Z so there's over 50 groups at this point. That doesn't mean that we might, and as other people look at this, might look at it and go, you know what, you really divided this up way too far. You know, we need to group this, sort of get rid of the groupings I created and group them into more of a concrete or a larger group; put it that way.

                So these are just - this is what comes up as I review the possible requirements and then I assign them a code.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much (Susan) and as I think it was you that said at the beginning when you were first talking, that this isn't in concrete. In fact, it never will be as we're deliberating even after we've kind of finished this step

and the working group has supported it, we may find that we group things differently and that's okay. But, I really think that this will help us at least to take a first cut at different groups of requirements and so forth so I sincerely appreciate all of the time that has gone into this.

(Lisa), did you have anything else to add?

(Lisa Pfeiffer):   The only thing that I had wanted to mention, well I guess two things, one you've already mentioned but I just want to reiterate that, you know, the real utility as a group is that it does let us sort and filter. So, for example, we can say what are all of the Phase 1 possible requirements that deal with purpose, different kinds of purposes or the (deed) to define purpose of different things. So it just lets us hone in on that subset of this huge long list that might then be deliberated on, you know, in some more focused fashion.

So coming out with the groups is obviously subjective and can be changed over time as we find the different groups are coming into being useful. But, it gets us a starting point for just breaking down this big list into small pieces and looking at it in different ways without losing anything from the whole big list.

The other thing I wanted to mention, and (Stephanie) has pointed out that she still has some outstanding requirements coming in, in fact, I wanted to make sure that everybody knew we haven't forgotten. Thank you to the people that have been continuing to submit their assignments. I think we have five or six new documents that came in in the last week and we will get those added to the list. Right now we started with draft three as a basis for triage and then we'll add those additional draft four requirements on as we go and there are still a number of outstanding assignments and, of course, the list is never done. So even after we get the draft four and we start working on this, if there additional requirements they can be added to the list and hopefully some will be added from the community during our cross-community session in Helsinki.

Chuck Gomes: And even - this is Chuck. And even in the working group there may be new ones added. So, that will all be accommodated. So, let me open it up to anybody on the call to questions, suggestions and I see (Stephanie)'s got one there and so I'll let (Lisa) and (Susan) respond or at least take that suggestion in consideration.

                 (Susan) do you want to respond to (Stephanie)'s suggestion there since it's a group adding a group is what's being - I don't know if she means by section a group or not but is that what you're suggesting (Stephanie) that maybe there be a legal group in that list of groups? There is a legal research group I see, but you're saying something, I assume, different than just the legal research group?

(Susan):   Yes, this is (Susan) so I would expect us to have more groups that pertain to what (Stephanie) is talking about once we get the privacy so I think more of that language is there. But I did struggle as I went through especially with all of the - like our little Article 29 and Article 18. Does that - is that a purpose or was it something that should go in policy? So it could be (Stephanie) that we looked at everything that we've, you know, I have selected, to put into policy and then call out or pull out the, you know, legal and constitutional rights and due process and all of that and make - so maybe it's a subsection of policy and that was something that (Lisa) and I discussed. It felt like policy was going to be pretty big and should we start making, you know, subgroups within the policy group.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Susan). (Holly), go ahead.

(Holly):   I guess I have a little bit of a reservation with having separate group calls, legal, and constitutional because there are going to be bits and pieces in there that refer to purpose, that refer to privacy, that refer to data retention and so the grouping that we've got now will then be fractured in different places and I guess I don't - I guess I'm saying to (Stephanie), could we keep

the category (from start) and within those categories maybe we can say, okay, if it's in (any) direction, that's not a law, per se, because national rules are what apply. We've got the (LECD) which is not a law but it's a set of principles but it's all about one particular thing and I think I'd rather have maybe the document (subcategory or) something but if it's all about one topic I think I'd rather have it in one place then a bunch of places. I hope that helps.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Holly) and one of the advantages, this is Chuck, I see to the ability to primary and secondary source is that for example, on the legal category that source could actually result in possible requirements that are across the five questions but they would all be legally related so if we felt like it was useful to focus on those, and that would facilitate what we've said we're going to do, the iteration back and forth across questions, so that would actually facilitate that. But that's for that comment and, again, none of this is in concrete so we will refine it as we go and as best meets my needs, or best meets our needs, excuse me. It's late for me.

So, the - any other questions or comments before we move on because we're quickly running out of time? But I didn't want to cut people off either.

(Susan): So this is (Susan). So, we do - I did create a (unintelligible) group and like I said a couple of minutes ago it was as I was deciding was this policy and the way I viewed something that want into policy, it was not a requirement that resulted in a purpose necessarily but that would guide that, how that, what the purpose was. That's not a very good explanation but as I went through it, it was not going to be like a concrete function of a directory service if we go that way. It was going to be the part of the policy that guided everything.

So I think the task at hand will be once we get this all done is to go back and look at that big policy group and break it out, add group. So, you know, maybe for several possible requirements we might have three different - it might land in three different groups and we would want to look at it as

applicable law or legal or constitutional right, whichever, whatever, grouping we decide to call it or call them all, you all those (tags).

So I agree that we need to look at it that way, it's just in this first go-round it was hard to make all of those distinctions.

Chuck Gomes: I'm glad it's you doing this and not me. It is hard. Thanks this is Chuck. (Lisa), go ahead.

(Lisa Pfeiffer): Thanks Chuck, this is (Lisa Pfeiffer) for the record. Just pointing out that also because we uniquely numbered all of our possible requirements including the source document, it's actually fairly easy to do that (sort) that you mentioned Chuck. Looking for, let's say, picking out all of the documents that are either national laws or things like the European directive. We can do that with the sorting without even having to assign a separate group in order to get the possible requirements that come from those sources.

Along the same lines, we can do that with all of the documents from SSAC or all of the documents that happen to be current (to his) policy because we have the document number buried in that unique identified for each possible requirement. It's going to be - we're going to be able to look at these, this list, in a lot of different ways.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Lisa), I think it's going to be really helpful and we'll change things as we go. We'll get better as we go but this, I think, is going to greatly facilitate what we have to do. Let's go back to the previous document and look at Section 3 on the proposed approach for reaching consensus. And you're going to find that this one is largely attributed to me and it's not because we just didn't have enough time to fully - I came up with an idea and we talked a lot about it but I didn't feel like I could fairly say that the whole leadership team was totally behind it but I don't think they're opposing it. So that's why if you scroll down to Section 3 in this you're going to see, you know - okay, so we've got all of this, now how - when do we start deliberation? As you can

see, it's going to take (Susan) and (Lisa) a lot of time to get that Step 2 done all of the triage and grouping and etc., and then for the working group to review that. In the meantime, I'm proposing an idea that would allow us to go ahead and start deliberation on something sooner which I think we really need to do as a working group. We've been doing all of these preparatory things and I know there's frustration because when are we really going to get to it, right and I understand that. So, I'm proposing an approach that would hopefully allow us to do that maybe even as soon as, if we have time, a little bit of it in Helsinki, that remains to be seen based on time but - so, 3A, of course, really is… The work plan is already designed to cover the three areas of users, purposes, privacy and data element questions and that's work plan Step 12A. Part B then to begin that step I'm proposing and I want your feedback today and for those that are on the call we'll do it the next, the rest of, this week hopefully get some feedback by the end of the week so when we go into Helsinki we have a pretty good idea where the full working group is.

So the first step would be to use the list of possible requirements that the workgroup has developed and is still being developed and use that to identify a subset of possible requirements that would apply to an RDF in all circumstances.

Now, I found in discussing this with the leaders that every term I use was not clear and this probably isn't either so that's why I'm going to share some examples. So, the first thing the working group would be asked to do would be to go through the requirements for the three areas. And then individually, each of you as individuals, propose any of them that you think would fit that bill, in other words, the requirement wouldn't change as circumstances change. There might not be any exceptions. It would apply to the RDF whenever, wherever.

And then after just proposing those, we as a group would collectively debate and refine any such possible requirements and try to reach consensus that

they are indeed requirements that would be constant across the whole RDF. Now, to illustrate that and we'll entertain questions on this and comments but the - I gave a couple of possible requirements to illustrate what I'm talking about and understand that I may be wrong, don't worry too much about what I'm proposing. I'm not really trying to advocate these as those requirements, the working group needs to do that. But in my mind at least, they illustrated what I was trying to get at here.

So, one requirement, and this is from - you can see the source, it was a data element requirement from Document 7, the second requirement and it says the RDF, and I modified it a little bit, or I talk about it with a little bit of modification, but the RDF must collect, validate, store and display the domain name and registrar name for all second-level gTLD domain names. So to me, and I may be wrong, we're not going to debate it now, but to me that's a possible example of the kind of requirement we're going to look for at first, one that maybe would apply regardless of what jurisdiction you're in or regardless of a variety of circumstances.

Another example there is the RDF must be in compliance with applicable international law. Now, this one I made up. I glanced through the list of requirements, I didn't find it but I could have missed it too. But, this really comes from register and registrar agreements because we're required to actually follow any applicable law, it doesn't necessarily have to be international but in the GNSO, and this particularly became very obvious in the new gTLD program, because the Internet is global, the focus was on international treaties and so forth. That doesn't mean that you don't have to follow local laws but in terms of a requirement that would not have any exceptions or not have any special conditions like jurisdiction, to me that kind of requirement would fit the bill of what I'm talking about.

Now, the other thing I did - so if in fact the working group, these two requirements or something like them were proposed, then we as a working group would deliberate on those, refine the wording, debate pros and cons

and see whether we can come to rough consensus at this stage as to whether they are possible requirements that would be broad across the RDF. Now, and so we would deliberate on that and so forth.

Now, going down then a little bit further you'll see I give a counter example, a possible requirement that may not apply in all circumstances. And, again, I don't know if I'm - if this is a good example or not but it's one I found that I thought might illustrate and it's another data element one since we did a data element one above and you can see the reference there. The data retention limitation principle, Article 61E of the directive is a fundamental principle in EU data protection law imposing that personal data must only be kept as long as necessary to achieve the purpose for which the data had been collected or for which they are better processed; Page 17.

Now, note that this possible requirement would likely only apply when the applicable jurisdiction, however we define that, let's not go there now is the EU or another jurisdiction that have similar directives. So that would be an example of a requirement that we wouldn't site right now. We'll get to that later, okay?

So - and then I'll go ahead and finish this Section 3 and then we'll open it up for discussion. Item ii there. So, after we would identify these possible requirements that go across all of the categories, and decide, you know, deliberate on them then we would review and refine the triage and grouped possible requirements that (Lisa) and (Susan) are preparing and refine that.

That then will help facilitate us going on to Step 3 there which is to start deliberating on all of the rest of the requirements that don't fit in that first category. Now, let me first of all ask the leadership team, did I leave anything out in that explanation or say anything incorrectly and then I want to open it up and you can start raising your hands now to anybody who has a question or a disagreement or whatever on this particular approach? Okay, it sounds like the leadership team doesn't have anything to add.

Any questions or comments or a disagreement? I'm going to ask you a very important question in a minute and that is, is there any opposition to this approach? Now, we may get into it and define it doesn't work and if so we'll adjust but is there any opposition to this approach from anybody on the call now? And if you need more time to think about it, we'll allow until Friday for people on the call or those not on the call to respond. Otherwise, we'll start moving in this direction but we need to find out, is there any strong opposition to this particularly approach at this time?

Okay, I'm not hearing any questions. Now, again, it's throwing a lot at you that you haven't seen before. So, I fully appreciate that. So, if you think of things after this meeting please communicate them on the list. It would really be helpful if we have a reasonably good idea that we can move in this direction by the end of this week so that when we move into our cross-community session on Monday in Helsinki can communicate that and where we're going next because there will probably be questions along that line.

I see some people typing so we'll watch what's said there and I'll just be quite for a little bit. Please excuse the quietness for a moment but I want to give people a chance to think and then possibly respond. Totally agree (Stephanie). And we will hit walls. As long as we all continue to be constructive and think out of the box and try to find ways to bridge gaps, I think we can have success.

Okay, I'm not hearing anyone or seeing anyone outrightly objecting to this approach. We're going to assume, at least for this call, that there are no strong objections to moving in this direction and action item them, after this call, if staff could help me out on this, let's get a message out to the full working group and give them until Friday to express any concerns or suggest any edits or ask any questions so that hopefully we have a pretty good idea by Friday, by the end of the day on Friday where we stand with regard to this and in particular work plan Step 11.

Okay? Well, I told you we'd spend a lot of time on that and hopefully that was helpful for you and most importantly, hopefully, this will help us start moving and making some progress while we still triage the list and so forth. I saw we, (Susan) and (Lisa) and then all of us reviewing that and commenting on it. So that buys us some time while it's still allowing us to start doing some deliberation.

So, let's go then to planning for the Helsinki meeting, Agenda Item 4 and I believe, I've looked at so many things today I can't remember, I believe that the present - where the present… Let me ask the questions instead of just saying I believe. (Lisa) were the two presentation documents sent around to the whole working group or just to the leadership list, I don't remember?

(Lisa Pfeiffer):   Chuck, we posted them on the meeting materials page but, no, we didn't redistribute the…

Chuck Gomes: Okay, so they're posted on the meetings material page and I encourage you all to go to that page and how do they get to them quickly on that page?

(Lisa Pfeiffer):   I'm just looking for the link right now, we have the meeting materials link in the chat here somewhere.

Chuck Gomes: So the agendas for both meetings really haven't varied much from what we talked about last week, okay? But one of the things that we need to do for the cross-community agenda is to make sure we know who's going to give examples. Now, we didn't get examples like we had asked for so it's okay if we just go with the examples that (Lisa) proposed. I'm fine with that. If there - if we still get examples that are brief and can be shared in a one-minute sharing by a workgroup member, we can add those to (Lisa)'s examples but it would be really helpful if we know who's going to do that before we go into the meeting and keeping in mind that we would like working group members to do it but we want to make the overall cross-community session very

oriented towards the visitors that are there, allow them to suggest requirements even if they're duplicates and allow them to comment and ask questions.

A few examples will hopefully make it easier for them to see what we're looking for. Any questions or comments on the cross-community session? And as the - both sessions I believe have remote participation so if you can't attend in person, I know the hours won't be very good in some cases, but hope you'll be able to attend. And keeping - I want to repeat what I said last week is that the working group session on Tuesday, which is all morning in Helsinki, will be an actual working group meeting just like this call is right now.

Okay, no - any questions or comments on the two sessions in Helsinki, anyone on the leadership team, did I leave anything out? There's the cross-community session agenda, correct and we're not going to go through these slides but they're available on the wiki, the working group wiki, and you can check those that they really haven't changed much except being more complete from last week and I think I suggested that, well, I won't even say that.

All right, then we're - we may still end a little bit early. So, the next meeting is in Helsinki and just to let you know, unless we change this next week, I think the plan is to skip meetings the week after Helsinki. That's been a practice in the GNSO for quite a while and because people have different travel schedules, some of them combine other activities after the meetings and we've had an intense week. So the plan is to skip the working group meeting the week after Helsinki. So, just to let you know on that.

Any questions or comments, is there anything else we need to cover on the agenda? Please raise your hand or speak up if there is. Good point (Rod) for at least - at lease for those of us in the U.S.

Okay, well, in the first of July in Canada. I'm still going to be in Helsinki then. Some of you probably will be too, sorry for the Canadians on that. Sorry, (Stephanie). Okay, all right, well thank you very much and please remember if you have any comments or thoughts or suggestions with regard to this approach, we really want to get a sense of that by Friday. Otherwise we're going to assume we can kind of move ahead in that direction and I appreciate the fact that you will find a way to celebrate, you should. And I joined (Maxine) in wishing everyone safe travels for those of you that are traveling and hope to see a lot of you, maybe meet you for the first time in some cases. I always loved doing that after working with people online so looking forward to that in Helsinki.

Thank you very much and I will adjourn the meeting and the recording can end.

Woman: Thank you very much.

Coordinator: Thank you very much, this concludes today's meeting, have a great day everyone.

END