

AC Chat:

Andrea Glandon: (1/18/2019 05:28) Welcome to day 3 of the EPDP Team F2F meeting held on Friday, 18 January 2019 at 12:30 UTC.

Andrea Glandon: (05:28) Wiki Meeting Page: https://community.icann.org/x/sAn_BQ

Rafik Dammak: (06:02) good morning

Julf Helsingius: (06:27) Good morning

Terri Agnew: (06:38) we will begin in 5 minutes

Terri Agnew: (06:44) we are starting

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (06:44) Good morning all

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (06:49) Good morning to you Hadia and to others as well

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (06:49) others

Marika Konings: (06:56) The PCRT and discussion tables can be found here: <https://community.icann.org/x/U4cWBg>

Marika Konings: (07:01) From Alan: ICANN Purpose: Monitor the validity/accuracy of Registration Data contact fields. Purpose Rationale: Studies of WHOIS Contact information demonstrated that there was a significant accuracy problem. The WHOIS Review Team recommended that ICANN take steps to reduce inaccuracies and to produce and publish periodic reports on contact information accuracy. The program began in 2015 and continued with semi-annual testing and reporting until it was stopped due to unavailability of data due to the Temporary Spec.

Marika Konings: (07:04) Responses from ICANN Org on the question of use of data by OCTO can be found here: <https://community.icann.org/x/ahppBQ>

Terri Agnew: (07:05) 10 minutes to review (will be silence)

Marika Konings: (07:06) Purpose O: ICANN PURPOSE: research and publish reports on threats to the operational stability, reliability, security, global interoperability, resilience, and openness of the DNS.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (07:21) We did not proceed with Purpose O last time due to time and we said it would be done now. Same with ARS. They are not "new".

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (07:22) If we cannot accept any new purposes why did we ask the question?

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (07:26) I thought we were following the thread - Stephanie was called by name twice, and should be permitted to respond.

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (07:32) agree with James...this feels like a topic for the overall disclosure/access subject

Alan Woods (RYSG): (07:32) +1 James

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (07:35) we have serious issues such as legal-natural persons, geographic differentiation, and redaction to deal with. Those are core issues that MUST be resolved . I cannot believe that we are considering adding new purposes before doing those things

Diane Plaut (IPC): (07:41) +1Stephanie - totally agree - ICANN landing on their role, a true necessity

Alan Woods (RYSG): (07:42) +1 to Stephanie.

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (07:44) So if ICANN is considered the "controller" of whois data it does not need permission or a purpose to do research on it

James Bladel (RrSG): (07:45) So the org that already has the data (Ry/Rr) can do all of these research activities, but when doesn't apply to transferring the data to ICANN or other parties?

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (07:45) Not necessarily, Milton, if it doesn't hold the data

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (07:48) I like Kurt's proposal.

Benedict Addis (SSAC): (07:52) Thomas already requested clarification. I replied: "I have spoken to both current and former members of the OCTO team. They have provided the following additional input:"Octo used registration data as part of LE [Law Enforcement] training.Like other opsec [operational security] practitioners we used reg[istration] data when collaborating with public/private sector investigators.We also used it when we were invited to work with Compliance on a particular

complaint."and"[we] used full whois when we initiated our own investigations but that activity was self-directed not explicitly part of SSR role and remit. I also used whois to report phishing and brand infringements against ICANN.Lastly I used whois as part of research into bulk registrations and other consensus policy or registrar practices that had undesirable or unintended consequences."I should note that prior to 25th May, OCTO used public whois data. Since then, this work is on hold."

Alan Woods (RYSG): (07:54) to clarify benedict's statement the ICANN response is that " ICANN Org would like to clarify that ICANN OCTO does not require personal data in domain name registration data for it's work." There is a conflicting statement here and it needs to be resolved.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (07:57) Just to put my oral remarks into this chat: I am not convinced that OCTO and the NCSG agree on which elements constitute personal information. Date of registration, dynamic IP address, and other elements remain PI if they can lead to the identification of the individual, as they are associated with the file and may not be sufficiently de-identified.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (07:59) This is not to say that ICANN cannot use the data for research.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:00) Just to make sure we examine these legal questions as we examine the other issues such as control

Terri Agnew: (08:04) 10 minutes for break (will be silence)

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (08:08) Good morning! (I was on and off audio for the past 40 minutes. Didn't know we were starting at 7:30 or would have been on then. Apologies!)

Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison): (08:11) @Kristina welcome to "remote participation team" :)

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (08:11) Thanks, Rafik!

Terri Agnew: (08:15) we are starting

Ben Butler (SSAC): (08:21) Just wanted to clarify something from the OCTO research purpose we just debated because break-time conversations indicated there may still be some confusion on something SSAC/Benedict thought had been clear. Simply this: The proposed purpose is ONLY for ICANN to conduct SSR related research. It does not include any other so-called security researcher. I hope that is clear.

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (08:22) @Terri, @Caitlin: is the agenda being displayed in the right window current?

Marika Konings: (08:22) Hi Kristina - yes, it has the topics we are hoping to address, but there may be some shuffling around depending on progress and departure times.

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (08:23) Thank you, @Marika.

Marika Konings: (08:24) We are expected to follow this discussion on redaction with recommendation 12 (reasonable access) at the request of some in the room.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:24) Ben yes, unless delegated to do the research by ICANN, that would be a disclosure

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:24) IMHO

Terri Agnew: (08:25) 10 minutes to review (will be silence)

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (08:26) @Ben though I think that your clarification was understood from the very beginning and based on this was the discussion however I thank you for pointing it now again

Terri Agnew: (08:35) update: 4 additional minutes to review (will be silence)

Terri Agnew: (08:39) update: few more minutes before we begin

Terri Agnew: (08:41) we are starting

Terri Agnew: (08:42) one moment before we begin

Terri Agnew: (08:42) we are starting

Alex Deacon - IPC: (08:59) @james - any chance you could share an example domain name that uses the org field as you describe? Curious to understand that better. (offline is fine)

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:00) +1 James

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG) 2: (09:01) +1 James - in addition, Opinion 4/2007 of the Article 29 Data Protection Working Party advised that where information about a legal person or business is "considered as "relating" to a natural person, it should be viewed as personal data, and the data protection rules should apply."

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:01) I don't really care about personal experiences of people to be the ground for arguments here. that is not reasoning. Because Alan does it doesn't mean it's right or should be done that way

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:02) +1 Thomas

James Bladel (RrSG): (09:04) @Alex - checking on this. May not be able to share specific customer domain names, but might be able to get you some rough stats.

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG) 2: (09:04) +1 Thomas - we need to understand the risk of getting it wrong - the consequences for harm in some countries, for journalists, vulnerable persons, religious organizations, etc - is certainly high

Alex Deacon - IPC: (09:08) +1 Mark re: legacy data.

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:11) those registrants that wish to be public they can opt in

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:13) if it's about talking about personal experiences to argue for non-redaction of data we can tell you stories about human rights violations because of data not being redacted. so that you see the extent of the problem!

Alex Deacon - IPC: (09:13) I think MarkSV's suggestion that unredacting org moving forward falls somewhere inbetween the binary options Milton described by Milton.

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:15) it's one thing to be at risk of losing your domain name, it's another if your house is ambushed and you are put into jail for expressing political opinions

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (09:16) it is not just a rectification process, it is all the third parties that have already harvested the registration data...

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:23) +1000 Stephanie

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:26) how does Hadia know this? she can't just keep repeating some domain name registrants want their domain to be public. repetition doesn't make the argument stronger.

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG) 2: (09:26) Cloudflare requests that natural persons include their full name in the org field if you register/transfer a domain name. So there is definitely a lot of legacy registrations, at least with Cloudflare if not with others, that need to be cleaned up. I

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG) 2: (09:27) To the best of my knowledge @Farzi the ALAC does _not_ engage in any research, or surveys, of registrants or natural persons more broadly, to understand their concerns or how they use domain names or registration data.

Terri Agnew: (09:48) 10 minute break (will be silence)

Terri Agnew: (10:08) we have started

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:14) @Farzi the organization field has always been optional [and published] so the mere fact that registrants have filled it in means they want their organization field to be published

James Bladel (RrSG): (10:18) Hadia - that is not standard. Registrants put junk data in there, or aspirational data (for organizations that don't exist) or re-copy their firstname/lastname. It's all over the map. Mostly, Registrants don't undrestadn this field

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (10:19) No Hadia. it's not as easy. it has to be genuine awareness. and registrars should not be in charge of educating people what an org is and what a natural person is.

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (10:19) Hadia, that is completely untrue, I have already provided the example of how Cloudflare REQUIRES natural persons to add their name to the org field.

Trang Nguyen (ICANN Org Liaison): (10:28) Regarding the point I just brought up about some registrants using the org field to identify themselves, an example of that would be ICANN

["https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.godaddy.com_whois_results.aspx-](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.godaddy.com_whois_results.aspx-)

[3Fdomain-](#)

[3Dicann.org&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=k7uKdjSb7_ZjItyVqrCYHo_rKms9SFxImbYEJqG-y9I&m=pBDeDGAwb--zFW3QIQ-YCaL0n_e6sIHw8r77fD4681E&s=FZ8o2TEc-6XHlpsIERLwxUbbmzuKulCZF1ygnGeVBLc&e="](#)

James Bladel (RrSG): (10:29) @Trang - yes that is common, so it's vital that these organizations confirm.
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (10:30) Believing is not enough argument. believing is not a reason. you have to say what your reason is for city not to be personal info.

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (10:32) WHOIS is not to be used to bring general law suits against someone. If you have legitimate grounds (security, UDRP etc) you will have access to those fields eventually

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:33) @Farzi and Ayden it is not a matter of opinions it is a matter of facts second you are conflating the organization field with the natural and legal issue

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (10:35) Hadia - I have re-read the thread and I think my comment above stands. I suggest you re-read it. Thanks

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (10:35) I suggest the same approach as Ayden did Hadia.

Terri Agnew: (10:56) we are back

Alan Woods (RYSG) 2: (10:57) RYSG have no issue with the change proposed.

Alan Woods (RYSG) 2: (10:59) (i.e. Miltons proposal)

Terri Agnew: (11:09) 5 minutes to review (will be silence)

Trang Nguyen (ICANN Org Liaison): (11:12) Regarding Milton's question earlier about why the City field is redacted in the Temp Spec, the Cookbook provides the following rationale: "The registrant's state/province and country will be published, but the address fields that could be used to more specifically identify the registrant would not be included in the public WHOIS (e.g. street, city, postal code). This would enable non-accredited users to determine the registrant's general location and likely jurisdiction but would generally not enable identification of the registrant."

Trang Nguyen (ICANN Org Liaison): (11:12) Here's the link to the Cookbook: [https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_en_system_files_files_gdpr-2Dcompliance-2Dinterim-2Dmodel-2D08mar18-2Den.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=k7uKdjSb7_ZjItyVqrCYHo_rKms9SFxImbYEJqG-y9I&m=pBDeDGAwb--zFW3QIQ-YCaL0n_e6sIHw8r77fD4681E&s=NJdzqdD1OPawoCpuX1I8J_vlL0ztwCab74txrfu0I0E&e="](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_en_system_files_files_gdpr-2Dcompliance-2Dinterim-2Dmodel-2D08mar18-2Den.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=k7uKdjSb7_ZjItyVqrCYHo_rKms9SFxImbYEJqG-y9I&m=pBDeDGAwb--zFW3QIQ-YCaL0n_e6sIHw8r77fD4681E&s=NJdzqdD1OPawoCpuX1I8J_vlL0ztwCab74txrfu0I0E&e=). The above quote is on page 26.

Terri Agnew: (11:16) update: 2 minutes longer

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (11:18) Thanks Trang. So it's clear that ICANN legal considered not publishing the city as a reasonable way to protect privacy

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (11:21) That is, in terms of balancing, state/province was considered ok to publish but city not

Terri Agnew: (11:23) we are back in the room - working on audio issue, one moment

Terri Agnew: (11:25) audio is back for all

Farzaneh Badii: (11:28) this is really absurd ... after all the access discussions IPC is now arguing email should not be redacted

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (11:30) ok Alex , it seems like you are concerned about access which is a different issue. to alleviate that concern we should discuss disclosure in phase two - we should not publish the email addresses!

Alex Deacon - IPC: (11:33) no as I said I'm no longer arguing that email address should be un-redacted.

Trang Nguyen (ICANN Org Liaison): (11:34) Section 7.2.1 of the Temp Spec says: "7.2.1. As soon as commercially reasonable, Registrar MUST provide the opportunity for the Registered Name Holder to

provide its Consent to publish the additional contact information outlined in Section 2.3 of Appendix A for the Registered Name Holder."

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG) 2: (11:40) Thanks Trang, but I think Section 2.3 does not cover email, just address etc? I think email is captured in 2.5?

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (11:43) I'll be back in 20 minutes.

Terri Agnew: (11:43) 20 minute break (silence until we return)

Andrea Glandon: (12:09) Still on break

Andrea Glandon: (12:30) The room is back

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (12:32) can't hear whomever is speaking

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (12:32) that's better

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (12:32) Gina is speaking now

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (12:36) can barely hear David

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (12:36) better. thanks

Daniel Halloran (ICANN Org Liaison -Legal): (12:39) FYI RAA section 3.4.2.2 requires registrars to retain "3.4.2.2 In electronic, paper, or microfilm form, all written communications constituting registration applications, confirmations, modifications, or terminations and related correspondence with Registered Name Holders, including registration contracts;" https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_resources_pages_approved-2Dwith-2Dspects-2D2013-2D09-2D17-2Den-233.4.2.2&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=k7uKdjSb7_ZjItyVqrCYH_o_rKms9SFxImbYEJqG-y9I&m=pBDeDGAWb--zFW3QIQ-YCaL0n_e6sIHw8r77fD4681E&s=O_YepLjqvxn3613oTiN6UwzRhU7QFrN8Rq5NHRmydU&e=

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (12:48) Thanks Daniel for the above clarification

Marika Konings: (12:49) The PCRT for this topic can be found here: https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/102139731/gnso-EPDP-pcrt-Initial-Report-QUESTION3_20190103.pdf?version=2&modificationDate=1546579245000&api=v2

Terri Agnew: (12:50) 5 minutes to review (will be silence)

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (12:51) where is question three?

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (12:51) in agenda?

Benedict Addis - SSAC: (12:52) Farzi - I think it's "prioritized issues"

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (12:52) thanks Benedict

Terri Agnew: (12:57) we are back

Diane Plaut (IPC): (13:05) +1 Emily

Diane Plaut (IPC): (13:08) +1 Kurt the sooner the better and research is very important and examples of what others are doing, the IPC/BC included information along these lines in its PC

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (13:08) I am happy with the proposals to create a study, move forward immediately

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (13:10) Let's not forget the not-so-minor point that this study will need a budget allocation . . .

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (13:11) even if it comes from an existing budget authorization.

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (13:14) +1 Milton

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (13:14) (on having a specific recommendation that geographic differentiation is not required)

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (13:19) Worth noting (again) that the existence and role of 3P providers (resellers and backend providers) can make GDPR applicable where it would not otherwise appear to be, based on location of RO, Rr, and RNH

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (13:19) personal experiences do not add to the argument vigor! it is not an argument!

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (13:21) the location of registrant is not necessarily their place of business. you can't just determine the jurisdiction based on that

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (13:22) . . . which further complicates applying geographic differentiation in a commercially reasonable and implementable way

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (13:23) oh my god! you have to evacuate?

Terri Agnew: (13:23) one moment, waiting for announcement to end

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (13:23) Yikes.

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (13:23) and this concludes our regularly scheduled programing..

Terri Agnew: (13:24) we are continuing inbetween announcement

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (13:25) so all ALAC members agree that there should be geographical differentiation. I don't know how that happens

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (13:26) I think this is a sign, everyone.

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (13:26) it is ! it is saying evacuate you are not getting anywhere

Diane Plaut (IPC): (13:26) Agree, Kristina!

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (13:27) You could all evacuate to Tim Horton's . . .

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (13:29) lol

Steve DelBianco (BC): (13:39) James -- are you thinking that Council would approve an Interim Policy, as suggested in the EPDP charter?

Steve DelBianco (BC): (13:42) James -- what would make it "interim" is that COuncil's policy Recc would have a sunset date?

Steve DelBianco (BC): (13:44) Implementation details, really. Such as a standard form for Disclosure Requests that Rr/Ry evaluate under 61f. And a reasonable expectation for a specific response, even if that response just explains why Rr will NOT disclose.

James Bladel (RrSG): (13:49) @Steve DelB - we're trying to understand what is viable, some CPs do not believe that a Temp Spec is eligible for extension at all. An "Interim Transition Specification" or something with the same obligations but a different name may be one option.

James Bladel (RrSG): (13:49) It's not as simple as I thought, initially.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (13:50) Kurt, Marika, Would we have a list of those items that are being postponed either to be done at phase 2 or before that and the modlity to perform such activities with the indication of that those items once discussed would come back to the EPDP Team or not?

Sarah Wyld (RrSG Alt): (14:08) +100 to James

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (14:15) Apart from raising the flag and identifying the issues to be addressed no other decisions are expected from or to be made by this group as a)there is no sufficient information available and b) making such decision may not be within the mayndate of this group

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (14:16) mandate(correctedc)

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (14:19) I can't stand the echo so asking here. Just to confirm - there is no current intention/anticipation that publication of the Final Report will be after February 1.

Marika Konings: (14:20) From a staff side we are still working towards the deadline, but there obviously still some items that the group needs to discuss / agree upon.

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (14:21) Thanks, @Marika. I

Marika Konings: (14:21) I guess the meeting schedule for the next two weeks will be one topic the group that needs to discuss.

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (14:28) BTW, the Legal Committee meeting next week overlaps with the RySG meeting . . .

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (14:28) I vote for more meetings over longer meetings.

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (14:29) (I know the meetings for next week have been scheduled for 3 hours)

Berry Cobb: (14:30) I'd note that the invite sent out now are placeholders and to get events on peeps calendars. We can for example, use a 3 hour session and split it in tow 1.5 hours sessions with smaller groups. Or, as I stated, we do not need to use three hours.

Berry Cobb: (14:30) *two

Steve DelBianco (BC): (14:36) I can stay in Adobe if I can be helpful on Marika's work

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (14:36) so no RP after this? you are depriving us from staring at our computer for another two hours?

Marika Konings: (14:36) Yes, we continue in this AC and RP

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (14:37) oh ... I have to find another excuse to run away :)

Terri Agnew: (14:40) we are on break, will chat when we return (will be silence)

rafik dammak (GNSO Council Liaison): (14:43) @farzi there is escape

rafik dammak (GNSO Council Liaison): (14:43) sorry no escape :)

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (14:48) haha I was gonna ask how...

Terri Agnew: (14:53) we are starting

Terri Agnew: (14:55) 5 minutes to review (will be silence)

Terri Agnew: (15:07) @Steve, we can dial out on the telephone

Steve DelBianco (BC): (15:08) please do. +1.703.615.6206

Andrea Glandon: (15:08) Will do, thank you!

Terri Agnew: (15:12) we are working on the echo

Marika Konings: (15:13) Steve, we are having a hard time hearing you. If you can post your input here, I am happy to read it out.

Steve DelBianco (BC): (15:14) public comments that raise concerns are misunderstanding this recommendation. Sara's comment suggests these disclosures are required. They are not.

Steve DelBianco (BC): (15:15) This is not Unified Access. This is a disclosure Request that would STILL need to be available after UAM, because not everyone will be Accredited and eligible for UAM. Those requestors would still use this method

Steve DelBianco (BC): (15:16) so to Milton -- this is not a "placeholder"

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (15:17) we have agreed

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (15:17) it was the small group recommendation

Alex Deacon - IPC: (15:17) What is currently called Standardized Access in the temp spec is actually Standardized Disclosure.

Alex Deacon - IPC: (15:19) It is the regime that we have between now and a future when we have completed the Access discussion.

Steve DelBianco (BC): (15:23) @Alex - we will ALWAYS need ad-hoc disclosure requests. Not everyone will be accredited!

Steve DelBianco (BC): (15:24) @Thomas -- you don't need criteria for these Disclosure Requests. It's up to the Rr/Ry to determine whether to disclose

Alex Deacon - IPC: (15:27) +1 Steve - agree we will always need ad-hoc requests.

Steve DelBianco (BC): (15:29) No, it is NOT INTERIM. We will always need ad-hoc disclosure requests, even after UAM

Steve DelBianco (BC): (15:30) UAM will only work for an entity whose Code of Conduct is approved by DPB and ICANN Org

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (15:32) Am back. Waiting for operator.

Benedict Addis - SSAC: (15:32) I suspect that ad-hoc requests will continue to happen directly with registries and registrars, under local law. That is not ICANN's business, and will not be under its purview.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (15:32) Alan +1

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (15:34) New Language for Rec 11

Steve DelBianco (BC): (15:34) @Alan -- right, and under 61f it is you who determine whether to disclose upon a request

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (15:35) Can't seem to get an operator. Will keep trying.

Terri Agnew: (15:36) alerting op, one moment

Steve DelBianco (BC): (15:36) n this recc, the words "Standardized Access to non-public registration data" is what we sometimes call Unified Access Model (UAM)

Terri Agnew: (15:37) @Kristina, the op wil dial out to you. One moment

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (15:38) I'm back. Thanks!

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (15:38) The EPDP Team recommands that until the time that the standardiozed access is studied and agreed upon ,as approprioate, the current practioce using parameters for responding to lawful disclosurebeused on an interim basis

Terri Agnew: (15:41) 5 minutes to review (will be silence)

Caitlin Tubergen: (15:41) Please note the GAC comment on Recommendation 12 was inadvertently omitted from the public comment review tool. Please note the GAC comment is now included in the Agenda Pod of this Adobe Room, and we will update the public comment review tool shortly.

Terri Agnew: (15:47) update: additional time is needed, will chat when we return

Terri Agnew: (15:50) we are back

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (16:12) Ok. Thanks, everyone. Safe travels. Talk to you on Tuesday!

Rafik Dammak: (16:12) thanks all