

Adobe Connect: 27

Alan Greenberg (ALAC)	Julf Helsingius (NCSG)
Alan Woods (RySG)	Kavouss Arasteh (GAC)
Amr Elsadr (NCSG)	Kristina Rosette (RySG)
Ayden Férdeline (NCSG)	Kurt Pritz (Chair)
Ben Butler (SSAC)	Leon Sanchez (ICANN Board Liaison)
Brian King (IPC Alternate)	Marc Anderson (RySG)
Chris Disspain (ICANN Board Liaison)	Margie Milam (BC)
Chris Lewis-Evans (GAC Alternate)	Mark Svancarek (BC)
Diane Plaut (IPC)	Milton Mueller (NCSG)
Emily Taylor (RrSG)	Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison)
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG)	Rod Rasmussen (SSAC Alternate)
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC)	Stephanie Perrin (NCSG)
James Bladel (RrSG)	Theo Geurts (RrSG Alternate)

Audio Only:

Caitlin Tubergen (Staff)

Guest:

Gina Bartlett (CBI)

Apologies:

Matt Serlin (RrSG)
Alex Deacon (IPC)
Thomas Rickert (ISPCP)
Ashley Heineman (GAC)
Benedict Addis (SSAC)

Audio Cast (FOR ALTERNATES AND OBSERVERS)

Peak: 10 joined

View Only Adobe Connect:

28 joined

Staff:

Berry Cobb
Marika Konings
Terri Agnew
Andrea Glandon

AC Chat:

Andrea Glandon: (1/3/2019 06:57) Welcome to the EPDP Team Call #37 held on Thursday, 03 January 2019 at 14:00 UTC.

Andrea Glandon: (06:57) Wiki Agenda Page: <https://community.icann.org/x/-Aj BQ>

Kavouss Arasteh: (07:46) Dear Kurt
Kavouss Arasteh: (07:46) Dear Secretariat
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (07:46) Dear Colleagues or Dear Friend
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (07:46) Once again, Happy New Year to all of you
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (07:46) I wish a very pleasant and joyful year
Terri Agnew: (07:47) Happy New Year!
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (07:47) May 2019 be a year of happiness, health and success for you and your family
Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (07:49) Hello all
James Bladel (RrSG): (07:57) Greetings 2019 ePDP Crew!
Ben Butler (SSAC): (07:57) Greetings all!
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (07:57) Happy New Year all
Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (07:58) Happy next circuit around the Sun
Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison): (07:58) happy new year
Kurt Pritz: (08:00) Hi everyone: if you haven't done so already, please open" <https://community.icann.org/display/EOTSFGRD/Public+Comment+Review+Tool>
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:00) I have no sound, will have to log out and back in
Chris Disspain: (08:01) greetings all and happy new year!!
Margie Milam (BC): (08:02) Happy new year!
Diane Plaut: (08:02) Happy New Year to all!
Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (08:04) I support Milton's proposal on the mailing list to slightly adjust the agenda for today's call.
Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (08:05) I have received a hotel reservation confirmation
Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (08:06) I support the proposal from Milton too
Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (08:07) thanks Kurt
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:07) We can discuss it under 3 b
James Bladel (RrSG): (08:07) I think that was a country song?
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:08) Wasn't that the song from Cannonball Run 2, James? :-)
Ben Butler (SSAC): (08:08) Smokey & the Bandit
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:08) Ah..., right Ben. :-)
James Bladel (RrSG): (08:08) @Ben. :)
Theo Geurts (RrSG - ALT): (08:09) There is indeed very little time
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:10) The comments have been classified, organized and presented to the EPDP. Agree with Kurt that we should not and cannot consider them individually especially on these calls
Kurt Pritz: (08:11) Ben wins
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:11) I disagree that the PCRT is not "user-friendly" I think it is very clear
Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (08:11) I do not think the ITU's method of assembling comments would be useful for us, as the ITU is dealing with alternative text - not comments, like we have.
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:11) @Milton: I do too.
Brian King (IPC - ALT): (08:11) East Bound and Down :-)
Mark Svancarek (BC): (08:12) @Milton +1. Staff did a great job.
Brian King (IPC - ALT): (08:12) Agree and appreciate the good work done by staff in compiling the comments in a user-friendly manner.
Margie Milam (BC): (08:13) Agree we don't need to consider all of the comments individually. However, we should consider indiv comments that we broadly agree would improve our final report. And we must consider any comment that was broadly supported.
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:14) What does "consider" mean?

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:14) Wish lists of wording changes that reflect my own views EXACTLY are an unrealistic approach to the end game of this process

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:15) What does "broadly agree" mean. Happy New Year all.

Margie Milam (BC): (08:15) meaning-- dont need to discuss each comment individually on the call, we can assume we all read the report

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:15) I WILL COPNTACT THE SECRETARIAT TO FIND OUT WHERE CAN i FIND THE READLINE DOC,

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:15) Sorry for cap

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:15) I too would like to see the redline document.

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:15) Possibly this: "broadly agree" means "my tribe wants it" "Consider" means spend 2 hours on wordsmithing debates

Marika Konings: (08:16) @Kavouss, Stephanie, can you please clarify what you mean with a redline document?

Leon Sanchez: (08:16) Hello everyone, my apologies for lateness

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:16) Showing changes proposed in form of revision mark from different commenter

Marika Konings: (08:17) there is no such redline document as there are many proposed revisions, many of which that may be in direct conflict with each other.

Marika Konings: (08:18) the PCRT does include any edits that have been proposed by commenters

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:18) I guess I am used to including those in a comment stream, and justifying them in additional comments. Provides a public record of deliberations.

Margie Milam (BC): (08:20) Great job Staff!

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:21) yeah all these things being suggested have been actually done and done clearly by staff.

Marika Konings: (08:21) staff did create a short form document which focuses on the proposed edits, but the idea is that the EPDP Team would go there after reviewing the PCRT and a general sense of support or lack thereof for input received would be established.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:21) To Marika,

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:22) PLS PROVIDE THAT REDLINE VERSION TO ME AFTER THE MEETING

Marika Konings: (08:22) Kavouss, there is no redline version.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:22) Thanks Marika for that clarification. It is a difficult task to sort all this and you did a great job, over the holidays, so please do not take this as criticism. Just trying to document and print it all (I know, plenty of people don't print things, I still do)

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:23) Then I WOULD LIKE TO NO WHERE i can see the comments made against the initial text

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:23) berry breaking up

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:23) It sounds like we are going to have to cut and paste it ourselves Kavouss.

Marika Konings: (08:23) @Kavouss - any comments made against the initial text are included in the PCRT.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:24) I expect answer to my comments from secretariat only and not from others

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:24) IS THE pcrt available in word format?

Marika Konings: (08:25) they are in word format - they are all posted here: <https://community.icann.org/x/U4cWBg>

Theo Geurts (RrSG - ALT): (08:26) @Marika, those word documents do not work well with open source variants like libre office etc.

Marika Konings: (08:27) @Theo - if helpful, we can also post them in PDF format?

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:27) my goodness are we doing MS Word one on one here? please distinguished delegates work with what you have. convert the doc, re-format them pdf them ...

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:27) Mrika, I have downloaded those docs all but I DO NOT SEE THE CHANGES AGAINST THE INITIAL TEXT

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:28) You are in a university with resources Farz. Lots of us are not, and are having trouble with the formatting and conversion. Sad fact, but true.

Theo Geurts (RrSG - ALT): (08:28) @Marika that should work.

Marika Konings: (08:29) Kavouss, if you review the comments under the heading "Support Purpose intent with wording change" and "Significant change required: changing intent and wording" you can find specific changes that may have been proposed by the commenters.

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:29) I can't believe we are arguing over this during a meeting where we should discuss substantively .please take it offline with staff.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:29) Once again , I ASKED QUESTIONS FROM SECRETARIAT ANSD DO NOT EXPECT PEOPLE TEACHING OTHERS

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:30) @staff: Could the PCRTs be posted on the wiki in pdf format? There are folks who don't use MS Word, and are having trouble viewing the documents.

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:30) please don't ask questions using my time Kavouss.

Marika Konings: (08:31) @Amr - yes, we can do that.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:31) i do not agree with yr time and my time do not read the chat

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:31) Thanks, Marika.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:34) Frzaneh, the v best thing for you is not to reply to the chat as you do not want others raising questions.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:34) Yes thanks Marika.

Berry Cobb: (08:35) Thanks Alan. Will take care of it.

Marika Konings: (08:35) hah, that may have been an auto replace of the word 'agreement' to 'support' in the last column. Thanks for pointing that out.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:35) We do not fighting with each other we working with each other. There is no need to represent everybody

Marika Konings: (08:36) if any one spots any other errors, please do let us know!

Alan Woods (RYSG): (08:36) absolutely agreed ... mammoth amounts of work at a difficult time! thank you!

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:37) +1 Emily.

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (08:37) good point @Emily about representation; this was hardly a referendum...

Margie Milam (BC): (08:37) +1 Emily

Berry Cobb: (08:37) @Alan. Change made on PCRT Purpose 1. I'm not sure how that ONE word got omitted.

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:37) So who speaks for those "other voices" Emily?

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:37) Emily "1

Diane Plaut (IPC): (08:37) Very much agree, Emily.

Alan Woods (RYSG): (08:38) thanks Berry:) the joy of technology lol

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:38) It is most unfortunate, but these issues are complex, the consultation mechanism was forbidding in its complexity, and many stakeholders who are not immersed in our work did not comment because they did not feel competent re the questions and formatting.

Brian King (IPC - ALT): (08:38) Let's get to it

Mark Svancarek (BC): (08:38) Well said, Enily

Mark Svancarek (BC): (08:39) Emily

Marika Konings: (08:40) everyone can zoom in and out as needed by clicking the plus / minus sign

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:43) yes I said that Kavouss. it's enough. we need to talk about substance.
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:45) nobody stopped you to do that but we need to udwerstand what we are doing

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:45) what was the quedtion?

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:46) None of us should act as replacing chair.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:47) i have not asked farzaneh any question and I WILL NEVER WEVER ASK HER AT ALL

Brian King (IPC - ALT): (08:47) "activate" appears 18 times in the Registry Agreement, almost always as "activate in the DNS", meaning "to register" in my opinion

Mark Svancarek (BC): (08:47) Isn't "activate" used in multiple places in RAA?

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:47) None of us is tzhe spokeman of GOD

Mark Svancarek (BC): (08:47) +1 Brian

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:51) will we now?

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:52) support to discuss it?

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:52) Which change are we considering?

Kurt Pritz: (08:53) (II) To ensure that a registered name holder may exercise its rights in the use, disposition, transfer and recovery of the registered name;

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (08:53) If the general understanding of "activate" is to just register the domain name and not necessarily bring it online then I am fine with that

Brian King (IPC - ALT): (08:54) @Hadia, that is my understanding of "activate"

James Bladel (RrSG): (08:55) Woof!

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:55) LOL

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:55) It is important that dogs be represented - they are stakeholders too, and just because they couldn't submit written comments doesn't mean they shoujld be ignored.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:55) +1 Amr. Defining the purposes of processing and detemining the necessary data for that purpose does not require going through all the purposes of the business involved. This is a logical fallacy.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:56) And it is one that explains how we lose so much time.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (08:56) Recovery is getting a domain name back after it is nominally expired

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:57) I think George made a reference to domain names that are mistakenly transferred or have been hijacked. Maybe that's what he means by recovery?

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:57) Getting those names back.

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:57) no he thinks that recovery and transfer is a domain name registrant right ... so he does not want it to be dropped

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:58) agree with James and Amr that George Kirikos proposed change does not need to be incorporated

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (08:58) No, @Amr, he's referring to things like transfer of a domain name between registrants, or between registrars, and 'recovery' (as James is saying) is likely to refer to domains that have expired and are subsequently saved from deletion during the relevant grace periods

Alan Woods (RYSG): (08:58) Agree with James and I would also point at "consesus policy" qualification in purpose 1 which covers both does it not

Brian King (IPC - ALT): (08:58) Agree, Amr. To me, that's part of what establishing your rights in a domain name is all about. It helps you recover the domain.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (08:58) Purpose 1 has a preamble that says the rest of it is in accordance with policies incl Consensus Policy.

Brian King (IPC - ALT): (08:58) I think the existing language covers the intended edit.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:58) @Emily: Thanks.

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:58) I actually support the change but don't think it is necessary

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (09:00) mARC +1
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:00) what? Marc? it's not the interwebs?
Marc Anderson (RySG): (09:02) lol
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:03) cannot hear Milton
Terri Agnew: (09:04) @Stephanie, I am able to hear Milton, are you still unable to hear him?
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (09:05) @marc sure if activate just means putting it in the DNS then there is no problem there
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:05) yes he is back now, just noting the delay in case he was on mute, thanks Terri!
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:05) and +1 Milton.
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (09:05) no sound
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:05) @Milton: +1
Brian King (IPC - ALT): (09:05) @Marc thanks for the good clarification on allocation vs. activation
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:05) Every purpose will become a kitchen sink if we do not resist the urge to see our preferred language in each one.
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:06) @Stephanie: +1
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (09:06) +1 James se could change obligations to responsibilities
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (09:07) Kurt, may be you could ask who is in favour of the proposed change '
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:09) if you add a word that cchanges the nature of the purpose you have to create another purpose and justify it by going through the data matrix. we can't just create purposes out of thin air. "obligations" "responsibilities" can be a new purpose.
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:09) I agree with Amr. we are trying to disambiguate the processes involved in registering a domain name, with a data protection lens. SUREly we can identify a primary purpose, from the registrants perspective, without including all the attendant rights rules and ancillary policies with it.
Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:11) Purpose 1 is not limited just to registrars.
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:11) in support of ?
Theo Geurts (RrSG - ALT): (09:11) When is the final report due?
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:11) are we voting for inclusion of obligations/responsibilities?
Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:12) Can we limit comments in support to 1 per SG/C/AC?
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:12) @Stephanie: Discussing, not voting. :-)
Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:12) In the interest of time
Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison): (09:12) @Theo 1st Feb
Margie Milam (BC): (09:12) @Kristina- wouldnt be fair if others have had the luxury of more than one speaker already
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:12) I meant voting in the loose, adobe hand waving sense Amr...
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:12) :-)
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:13) oh public comments turned into the laundry list of various stakeholder groups wishes...
Theo Geurts (RrSG - ALT): (09:13) @Rafik Thanks.
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:16) The purpose already says that the rights are conditional upon contractual terms of Rr
Alan Woods (RySG): (09:16) let's remind ourselves as to the responsibilities we are talking about ... https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_resources_pages_benefits-2D2013-2D09-2D16-2Den&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=k7uKdjSb7_ZjltYVqrCYHo_rKms9SFxImbYEJqG-y9I&m=T5FsVvoeOuP2Xk7c7bFW8hWXxTYoX2-soM8NWvK0ZGk&s=pohHMAR6a611RjzgiSZLakclUwp2W68NOfcGiQktHbl&e=

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:16) I'm not sure I understand how updating gTLD RD is a purpose of gTLD RD?
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (09:16) +1 Margie
Margie Milam (BC): (09:16) registrants have obligations to maintain accurate rds data
Margie Milam (BC): (09:17) they risk losing their domain name if it is in inaccurate
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:17) @Margie: Agreed, but this is not a purpose of RDS Data.
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:17) That does not mean it belongs in purpose 1
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:17) @Margie: The risk of losing their domain name is mitigated by the already existing purpose 1.
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:17) every procedure in ICANN cannot be dragged up to the level of a purpose. We will never end. We have what, 4 weeks left?
Margie Milam (BC): (09:17) this purpose deals with the registration process -- RDS is part of that
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:18) We shouldn't be trying to squeeze in every ICANN policy into these purposes.
James Bladel (RrSG): (09:18) Agree, Kristina. Why do we keep making this mistake? Or is it intentional?
Emily Taylor (RrSG): (09:18) Thanks @Kristina
Margie Milam (BC): (09:18) we aren't-- this is a clear processing issue -- where else is it covered?
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:18) which data elements need to be processed to carry out responsibilities of registrants?
Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:18) @Kristina, doesn't the preamble cover that??
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:18) @Milton: +1
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:18) We are trying to unpack the purposes of processing into clean themes. Not muddy the waters.
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (09:18) Marika, what you put on the screen is not identical with those in the word doc.
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:19) if it is not about third parties, we don't need it
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:19) @Kurt: My understanding as well.
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (09:19) On the screen, the changes are shown in bold. In the document that is not the case
Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:19) Everyone has spoken, what next?
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:19) it is already covered by "Registrant and Registrar terms, conditions and policies"
Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:20) To be clear, I'm not saying that I support adding obligations. If, however, the broader view is that we need to include something along those lines, then responsibilities is far preferable. It seems clear to me that the intention of referencing "obligations" was to include obligations to 3P.
Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:20) And I agree that obligations to 3P is a whole different ballgame.
Marika Konings: (09:20) @Kavouss - this is an abstract that was created for this agenda item to facilitate review of proposed edits.
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:20) This is where independent legal counsel might be very helpful, to help clarify this particular task, and the need to be clear and limited in purposes.
Alan Woods (RySG): (09:20) agreed ... it is likely unnecessary Milton. But if it were to be included, we would need to be very clear as to not cover 3rd party responsibilities. (or what Kristina just said :D)
Theo Geurts (RrSG - ALT): (09:21) I think next is we collecting data so the RNH can invoke the right for deletion
Margie Milam (BC): (09:21) we should clarify this is obligations related to maintaining the registration
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:21) But Alan, we just shouldn't include it.
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (09:21) My question was merely addressed to Marika, then I do not expect any comment from others

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:21) i'm OK with that

Brian King (IPC - ALT): (09:22) I should have been clearer. This is not about third parties.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:22) This purpose is clear, narrow in its objective and specific. Just what it's supposed to be. No need to change it.

James Bladel (RrSG): (09:22) then we should revert to the original language.

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:22) We don't make a change, that's where we take it

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:23) +1 james and Milton

Brian King (IPC - ALT): (09:23) We should add "and responsibilities"

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:23) @James @Milton: +1

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (09:23) I do not see any serious support for proposed changes

Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:23) Is there a vote? Why is Milton's preference the decision?

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:24) I don't think responsibilities should be added. it's not justified by those who put it forward

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:24) it's about accuracy again

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:24) my preference? the change is only supported by 2/3 of a single SG, everyone else opposes it

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:24) @Brian: I argued against it in the chat, so you might not have heard it, but you can read it. :-)

Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:24) So take a vote

Brian King (IPC - ALT): (09:25) Thanks Amr, will review :-)

James Bladel (RrSG): (09:25) @Alan, were the negatives you just listed from Milton and others not sufficient?

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:25) I may have misheard Brian K, but it sounded as if he just said that he believes Margie's suggestion is a different purpose.

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:25) Did I mishear you, Brian?

Brian King (IPC - ALT): (09:28) I should be more careful with the word "purpose" I suppose. It's the same Purpose.

Margie Milam (BC): (09:28) It accomplishes a specific need that isn't addressed yet

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:28) what is that need?

Margie Milam (BC): (09:28) need to update registration data

Margie Milam (BC): (09:29) at the registrants request

Margie Milam (BC): (09:29) that's just one obligation or responsibility

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:29) @Margie: What you're describing now is a RNH right established by the existing Purpose 1.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:29) Not a responsibility.

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:29) that right is already required by all countries DP law as well

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:29) That's not a purpose Margie ... that's a data subject right.

Margie Milam (BC): (09:29) not sure it's a right

Margie Milam (BC): (09:30) not sure it's a right

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:30) It's certainly a responsibility in other contexts, but those are already covered.

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:30) article 18

Margie Milam (BC): (09:30) so let's define rights

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:30) Agree with Marc SV that we need to decide whether and how to move on

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:30) @Margie: But you said at the registrant's request?

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:30) I have been asking this Margie since the beginning, what data elements are needed in WHOIS to ensure RNH fulfill its responsibilities? you have to be within the

responsibilities enumerated here: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_resources_pages_benefits-2D2013-2D09-2D16-2Den&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=k7uKdjSb7_ZjItyVqrCYHo_rKms9SFxImbYEJqG-y9I&m=T5FsVvoeOuP2Xk7c7bFW8hWXxTYoX2-soM8NWvK0ZGk&s=pohHMAR6a611RjzgiSZLakclUwp2W68NOfcGiQKtHbl&e=

Margie Milam (BC): (09:30) yes-- at the registrants request as part of the registration of the domain name

Diane Plaut (IPC): (09:30) +1 Marc

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:31) that is covered by Registry and Registrar terms, conditions and policies, Hadia

Brian King (IPC - ALT): (09:31) It's the same Purpose for processing the data - to establish that the entity that has registered the domain name is the one subject to the benefits and responsibilities that come with it.

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:31) wehre is the responsibilty in that Brian

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:31) SG not constituency

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:31) no sorry Kurt. I object to this

Amr Elsadri (NCSG): (09:31) @Margie: Now you're confusing me. Are we taking about "as part of the registration of the domain name", or about updating already existing RD?

Brian King (IPC - ALT): (09:31) https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_resources_pages_benefits-2D2013-2D09-2D16-2Den&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=k7uKdjSb7_ZjItyVqrCYHo_rKms9SFxImbYEJqG-y9I&m=T5FsVvoeOuP2Xk7c7bFW8hWXxTYoX2-soM8NWvK0ZGk&s=pohHMAR6a611RjzgiSZLakclUwp2W68NOfcGiQKtHbl&e=

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (09:32) I support the RYSG proposal for the purpose

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:33) and what is the wording exactly? to enforce domain name registrants' responsibilities as stated here: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_resources_pages_benefits-2D2013-2D09-2D16-2Den&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=k7uKdjSb7_ZjItyVqrCYHo_rKms9SFxImbYEJqG-y9I&m=T5FsVvoeOuP2Xk7c7bFW8hWXxTYoX2-soM8NWvK0ZGk&s=pohHMAR6a611RjzgiSZLakclUwp2W68NOfcGiQKtHbl&e=

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_resources_pages_benefits-2D2013-2D09-2D16-2Den&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=k7uKdjSb7_ZjItyVqrCYHo_rKms9SFxImbYEJqG-y9I&m=T5FsVvoeOuP2Xk7c7bFW8hWXxTYoX2-soM8NWvK0ZGk&s=pohHMAR6a611RjzgiSZLakclUwp2W68NOfcGiQKtHbl&e=

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:33) And SSAC

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:33) against

Margie Milam (BC): (09:33) its fulfilment of the contract

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (09:34) Sorry to be late, Kurt - voted against

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:35) what is not definitive about the fact that there is no consensus and a preponderance of opposition?

Rod Rasmussen (SSAC - ALT): (09:35) @Kristina - that doesn't necessarily apply to the entire SSAC.

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:36) Got it.

Berry Cobb: (09:36) It's a proposed change to add a 4th bullet to the purpose statement. For John Poole's comment.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:37) Let us ask the legal counsel to explain how one goes about elucidating purposes of processing. It is a bit late, but we are a long way from bringing this thing home, in my opinion. Better late than never.

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:39) Some of these comments are just based on a lack of understanding of what a "purpose" is under DP law

Berry Cobb: (09:39) From Siva: It is important to ensure the availability of unregistered names to natural and artificial persons without the availability status being masked in the middle paving way for speculative transactions by intermediaries which may not always be fair. This purpose is added to

ensure fairness in the availability of Domain Names to natural and artificial persons; It is acknowledged that some names that are beyond the purview of TradeMarks are desirable names by many, hence have a premium value. To ensure fairness and transparency of opportunities for registering premium names by existing and new processes between ICANN and Registries.

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:39) No

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:40) the comment is based on a policy objective not a data collection/purpose

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:41) Hopefully we discard it

Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:41) Acknowledge that it was reviewed but don't change the text.

James Bladel (RrSG): (09:41) kurt

Berry Cobb: (09:42) @James, this was all that was provided.

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:43) there is a rationale included Berry. ... to ensure the availability of unregistered names to natural and artificial persons

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:43) This is the rationale provided for this proposed change: It is important to ensure the availability of unregistered names to natural and artificial persons without the availability status being masked in the middle paving way for speculative transactions by intermediaries which may not always be fair. This purpose is added to ensure fairness in the availability of Domain Names to natural and artificial persons; It is acknowledged that some names that are beyond the purview of TradeMarks are desirable names by many, hence have a premium value. To ensure fairness and transparency of opportunities for registering premium names by existing and new processes between ICANN and Registries.

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:43) thanks Amr ... i'm working on 2 systems!! :)

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:44) ;-)

Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:44) @AW: you need a bigger monitor!

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:44) hahaha at work yes .. but i'm still on Annual Leave and at home with Ipad and computer! :)

James Bladel: (09:45) Thanks, all. Adobe crashed in the midst of Kurt's explanation, but I get the gist.

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:46) agree with Alan. I do not see this as an inclusion that is necessary at this stage.

Ben Butler (SSAC): (09:46) @Kristina - to clarify earlier "vote" on proposed change 2. That was my personal vote rather than SSAC consensus. Will try to be more clear in the future.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:47) I don't think it belongs in any of the purposes, existing or new. Unless I've misunderstood the rationale.

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (09:49) Agree with @James

James Bladel (RrSG): (09:49) Alan, that is occurring now.

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:50) Any action would be out of scope.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:50) @James, yes, "your "flag it" meets my needs

James Bladel (RrSG): (09:50) k.

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (09:52) Thank you Berry - so this is still open till we decide to close it whenever

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:52) agreed!

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:52) +1 Kristina

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:52) @Kristina: +1

Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:52) +1 Kristina.

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (09:52) I support @Kristina's suggestion that we record that we have considered the comment and consider it out of scope, and not return to it

Margie Milam (BC): (09:53) +1 Kristina

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:54) +1 Kristina

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:54) can we have a small group working on the recommended changes to the purposes and flag those that need extensive discussion to be brought back to the group? this is taking us way too much time t

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:54) @Farzi: +1. Surely some of these can be handled on-list?

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:55) +1 Farzi

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:55) It should suffice for the record to say that we discussed this one point for 1.5 hours, and the majority of the group felt the addition was not necessary

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:55) When you read this one, please substitute "agreement" for "support"

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:56) Apologies..., which proposed change are we on?

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:56) 12. RySG

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:56) Split into two purposes

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:56) the call dropped me at the greatest time

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:56) lol

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (09:56) I can't hear anyone

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:56) @Alan G: Thanks.

Terri Agnew: (09:57) @Hadia, Marc A is speaking, are you still unable to hear him?

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:57) @Alan. It always does! Technology has a nesty streak.

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:57) i have audio now again! :)

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:57) nasty

Kurt Pritz: (09:57) RySG rationale: The RySG believes that Purpose 1 encompasses the fundamental and primary reasons for whichgTLD registration data is processed in the domain name registration ecosystem. However, as written, the Purpose 1 text captures two separate and distinct purposes: one is the technical provisioning of a domain name registration and the second is the establishment of the Registered Name Holder's rights in that domain. The latter of these two purposes may be conditioned by (or subject to) registry or registrar terms, conditions or policies at the option of the registry or registrar, but the former is not. Furthermore, these two purposes may require different processing and/or different data elements to achieve them, with the data elements necessary to achieve the establishment of the rights to the domain dependent on the specific terms, conditions and policies implemented by the registry or registrar.

Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:57) LISP technology has a nesty streak

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (09:58) I am back again

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (09:59) I have to drop off now. Thanks all.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:59) My comment about seeking legal advice, was to try to explain to us what this process is. We do not have a sound methodology, people are all over the map, in my view because they do not really understand what we are trying to do.

Alan Woods (RYSG): (10:00) the purposes ... with the error noted ... are as drafted

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (10:00) (that was in response to Kavouss' comment)

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:01) I assume the workbook would be the same

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (10:02) Stephanie, who do not understand?

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:02) @Alan W so the you would have two workbooks

Alan Woods (RYSG): (10:03) yes ... we shall dutifully do so! :)

Marc Anderson (RySG): (10:03) @staff can you provide the latest word versions of the workbook templates so we can flush that out?

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (10:03) We have no right to say other do not understand pls be careful

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:03) : @Alan W so you would have two workbooks that initially have all the elements of the single workbook

Alan Woods (RYSG): (10:04) this is also a good note that the data elements and the purposes must make sense together in all workbooks as it was only when we looked at this closely, and in isolation we saw this problem. We have some very difficult discussions ahead as it stands ...

Brian King (IPC - ALT): (10:07) good point, Alan W.

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (10:07) yes Alan. been trying to say that we can't treat suggestions that are very substantive stand alone without going through the workbooks ...

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (10:08) I think assuming that people do not understand the procedure of data mapping and purpose identification is a kind interpretation of what happens in this MS community, Kavouss. I certainly meant no harm, just trying to get independent counsel to explain the process that we ought to be going through at this point.

Alan Woods (RYSG): (10:08) got to drop ... thank you all

Alan Woods (RYSG): (10:09) *drop

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:09) I sometimes say that I don't understand. I hope that's ok. :-)

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (10:09) Stephanie has the right to express her opinion however she wants.

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:09) @Alan W so I guess no one can actually make any decision about this until we see the associated workbooks and data elements - the concept is fine but the rest of the work is what would really determine if we can do that or not

Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison): (10:10) thanks all

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:10) Thanks all. Bye.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (10:10) Farzaneh, stating that other do not understand is offensive statement

Leon Sanchez (ICANN Board Liaison): (10:10) Thanks everyone

Leon Sanchez (ICANN Board Liaison): (10:10) bye

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:10) bye all