

**Adobe Connect:**

Alan Greenberg (ALAC)	Fiona Asonga (ISPCP)
Alan Woods (RySG)	Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC)
Alex Deacon (IPC)	James Bladel (RrSG)
Amr Elsadr (NCSG)	Julf Helsingius (NCSG)
Ashley Heineman (GAC)	Kavouss Arasteh (GAC)
Ayden Férdeline (NCSG)	Kurt Pritz (Chair)
Ben Butler (SSAC)	Leon Sanchez (ICANN Board Liaison)
Benedict Addis (SSAC)	Marc Anderson (RySG)
Beth Bacon (RySG Alternte)	Margie Milam (BC)
Chris Disspain (ICANN Board Liaison)	Mark Svancarek (BC)
Chris Lewis-Evans (GAC Alternate)	Matt Serlin (RrSG)
Diane Plaut (IPC)	Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison)
Emily Taylor (RrSG)	Stephanie Perrin (NCSG)
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG)	Thomas Rickert (ISPCP)

**Audio Only:**

None

**Apologies:**

Georgios Tselentis (GAC)  
Kristina Rosette (RySG)

**Audio Cast (FOR ALTERNATES AND OBSERVERS)**

**Peak:** 5 joined

**View Only Adobe Connect:**

30 joined

**Staff:**

Berry Cobb  
Caitlin Tubergen  
Daniel Halloran (ICANN Org Liaison-Legal)  
Marika Konings  
Trang Nguyen (ICANN Org Liaison-GDD)  
Terri Agnew  
Andrea Glandon

**AC Chat:**

Andrea Glandon: (2/7/2019 07:18) Welcome to the EPDP Team Call #44 held on Thursday, 07 February 2019 at 14:00 UTC.

Andrea Glandon: (07:18) Wiki Agenda Page: <https://community.icann.org/x/R50WBg>

Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison): (07:55) hello all

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (07:59) hi all

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:01) Hi all!

Diane Plaut (IPC): (08:01) Hello!

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:03) Kurt, pls explain what do you mean by categorization ?

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:03) in what sense we categorize

James Bladel (RrSG): (08:08) I want to echo Kavouss' concern that topics are being reopened after closed, and new (material) changes are being introduced at the last moment.

Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (08:08) +1 Kavouss and James

James Bladel (RrSG): (08:08) Feels like an 11th hour scramble

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (08:08) I happen to agree there too; that some issues are constantly being reopened is not helping us move forward

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:08) I also agree with Kavouss. This is why I have suggested to do mini consensus calls for each topic, in order to make sure we can tick things off the list.

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (08:09) and I think some do it in bad faith

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:09) I find it extremely difficult even to report to my constituency with all the moving parts

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (08:10) +1 James and Kavouss

James Bladel (RrSG): (08:11) Pause 5 min for jumping jacks

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (08:12) i can't hear you Emily

Diane Plaut (IPC): (08:12) Yes, Kurt - who know how I believe that exercise is the key to resources and energy!

Mark Svancarek (BC): (08:12) I only do 29 jumping jacks before each meeting - no wonder Kurt is so much more alert than I

Marc Anderson (RySG): (08:12) can't hear Emily

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (08:12) Can't hear Emily at all...

Chris Lewis-Evans (GAC): (08:12) snap on full volume

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (08:12) I will write

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:12) Nine groups with almost nine different interests and different concerns. Is difficult to satisfy all concerns and all interests. Thus each of the group should collaborate and give some concession

Alan Woods (RySG): (08:12) i find if one comes off mute too early your mic level is low ... i find turning mute off and on again works )

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (08:12) Just wanted to say thanks to you and the staff for doing a fantastic job, Kurt.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:12) Kurt pls explore categorization

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (08:13) Also, when re-reading bits of the report, it's actually pretty thoughtful and good. So, we all need to keep our eye on what we have been able to achieve, as well as the challenges ahead.

James Bladel (RrSG): (08:13) Not able to speak for a few min. Can I ask one of my CPH colleagues to rescue me?

James Bladel (RrSG): (08:14) My hero!

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (08:14) The EPDP Team recommends that the effective date of the gTLD Registration Data Policy shall be [DATE]. All gTLD Registry Operators and ICANN-accredited registrars will be required to comply with the gTLD Registration Data Policy as of that date. The EPDP Team recommends that until [DATE], registries and registrars are required EITHER to comply with this gTLD Registration Data Policy OR continue to implement measures consistent with the Temporary Specification (as adopted by the ICANN Board on 17 May 2018, and expired on 25 May 2019). Registries and registrars who continue to implement measures compliant with the expired Temporary Specification will not be subject to Compliance inquiry specifically related to those measures.

Terri Agnew: (08:15) 2 minutes to review (silence during this time)

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (08:16) The Effective Date is blank since it's TBD at this point but we have toyed with January 1, 2020 as a placeholder

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:18) Aren't effective dates usually determined by GDD and IRTs, not by PDPs/EPDPs?

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:18) Quality is poor some sort of echo

Marika Konings: (08:19) Correct, Amr, that is the usual practice.

James Bladel (RrSG): (08:19) @Amr - I think that's often the case, but we're trying to expedite that.

Emily Taylor: (08:21) Sorry, had to drop out of the adobe room to correct sound issues, hopefully resolved now

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:21) I need some rationale for

Marika Konings: (08:21) To clarify, is [DATE] expected to be the same date (the implementation effective date of the gTLD Registration Data Policy)?

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:22) the last paragraph

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:22) Registries and registrars who continue to implement measures compliant with the expired Temporary Specification will not be subject to Compliance inquiry specifically related to those measures.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:22) pls describe the rationale for this

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:23) @Marika: That's how I'm reading it. To be the Consensus Policy Effective Date.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:23) these measure? what measures?

Beth Bacon (RySG): (08:23) Ashley, I think the date in the second sentence brackets that end of the interim compliance time period.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:23) ..., for the gTLD Registration Date Consensus Policy, which won't actually exist until GDD and an IRT work it out. ;-)

Marika Konings: (08:23) so would it be helpful if [DATE] is clarified to say [DATE - Implementation Effective date of the gTLD Registration Data Policy]

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (08:24) Gotcha Beth, but I think it should still be in the last sentence or work they sentiment of the last sentence into the second.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:24) @Marika: gTLD Registration Data "Consensus" Policy?

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:24) sorry I have to drop off for 30 mins will be back

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (08:25) @Beth agree the second sentence brackets determine the end of the use of the temp spec.

James Bladel (RrSG): (08:28) Agree that it's not ideal, but it's the least worst option.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:28) gTLD ROs also deal with multiple registrars in multiple jurisdictions. Registrars deal with multiple ROs as well as resellers too.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:31) will not be subject to Compliance action specifically related to those measures. what are the actions we referring to?

Mark Svancarek (BC): (08:31) Having a defined term makes it explicit that both "[DATE]" references are the same

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:32) I HAVE DIFFICULTIES TO AGREE WITH THE LAST SENTENCE AND ,UNLESS IT IS DESCRIBED OR DRAFTER CLEARLY, IT SHOULD BE DELETED

Benedict Addis - SSAC: (08:32) eIRT?

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:32) tbh..., this recommendation seems unlikely to be practically implemented. Or at least, it'd be very difficult for us to predict a Policy Effective Date.

Marika Konings: (08:32) Normally, an implementation effective date is put forward together with the implementation as it is put out for public comment (which is a step that happens before finalization)

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:32) Sorry for unintended cap

Alan Woods (RYSG): (08:33) gesundheit Benedict!

Benedict Addis - SSAC: (08:33) Thanks ;)

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:33) @Marika: That is my understanding as well. Easier to calculate it at that point.

Marika Konings: (08:33) also note, that an IRT is currently required under the PDP Guidelines, "unless in exceptional circumstances the GNSO Council determines that an IRT is not required (e.g. if another IRT is already in place that could appropriately deal with the PDP recommendations."

Diane Plaut (IPC): (08:38) +1MarkSV

James Bladel (RrSG): (08:39) We could consider adding text to the WHOIS output in the terms of service. "REGISTRAR IS CURRENTLY OPERATING UNDER ICANN TEMPORARY SPECIFICATION ADOPTED MAY 2018"

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:39) @Kavouss: CP Effective Date is a technical term, which is defined. But good point on the need to be specific on whether this Effective Date refers to implementation of phase 1 recommendations, phase 2 recommendations, or both. Probably just phase 1.

Mark Svancarek (BC): (08:39) Thank, James

James Bladel (RrSG): (08:40) @Margie - that's a good approach. They did something similar for the transition from the 2009 RAA to the 2013 RAA

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (08:40) ICANN did something similar with the 2013 RAA I believe

Mark Svancarek (BC): (08:40) +1 Margie

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (08:40) James and I sharing a brain today :)

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (08:41) @Margie +1

Marika Konings: (08:41) Would it make sense to instead of having a fixed date, say 'should be no later than....' so there is also some flexibility to move faster, if possible?

Diane Plaut (IPC): (08:41) Agree Margie

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (08:41) That's fine I think Marika

Marika Konings: (08:41) that would also give a concrete timeline to any IRT to complete its work

Marika Konings: (08:41) and for staff to plan the work accordingly

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (08:41) @marika your suggestion makes more sense

Diane Plaut (IPC): (08:42) +1 Marika

Margie Milam (BC): (08:42) James is right-- ICANN can update this page: [https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_www.internic.net\\_alpha.html&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=k7uKdjSb7\\_ZjItyVqrCYHo\\_rKms9SFxImbYEJqG-y9l&m=hkFfLKVvWMITbVDM2ibutYa7kYWMI6VYbova7UTqa8g&s=8clZXraR2K4fLTAmnb5Du9SpazKrz9p\\_a-Myo7GMIqeo&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.internic.net_alpha.html&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=k7uKdjSb7_ZjItyVqrCYHo_rKms9SFxImbYEJqG-y9l&m=hkFfLKVvWMITbVDM2ibutYa7kYWMI6VYbova7UTqa8g&s=8clZXraR2K4fLTAmnb5Du9SpazKrz9p_a-Myo7GMIqeo&e=)

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:44) Kurt, I move the motion of closure of debate agreeing with 01.01.2020 as the effective date of coming into force the outcome from PROCESS

Stephanie Perrin: (08:45) apologies for being late

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:50) I do not agree with TARGET DATE

Beth Bacon (RySG): (08:50) Why don't we make some edits and recirculate to the list?

James Bladel (RrSG): (08:52) 2020 is a leap year, let's use that. 29 Feb 2020. Misses the holidays!

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (08:52) James - I was wondering if it was!

Beth Bacon (RySG): (08:52) Haha

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (08:52) For clarity, my "Jan 1" comment was it should not be during or just before a holiday period. I would think that anything after Jan 10 would be ok.

Marika Konings: (08:54) To clarify, when the implementation effective date is announced, it will be obviously be a fixed date, and not a target. Maybe that helps clarifying Kavouss's concern?

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:54) WE NEED TO INDICATE ONE SINGLE DATE AS THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF COMING INTO FORCE THE RESULTS OF THIS PROCESS.

Marika Konings: (08:54) but as far as I understand, this team cannot announce the implementation effective date as that is a responsibility of the GDD team (following consultation with Contracted Parties) when the final implementation is announced.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:55) SHOULD GNSO or ICANN Board wishes to establish another date dealing with the implementation flexibility they are free to do so

Marika Konings: (08:55) @Kavouss - I think we are saying the same thing - the implementation effective date would be a fixed date, but this date is announced together with the final implementation plan.

Terri Agnew: (08:56) 2 minutes to review (silence during this time)

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (08:57) Thanks all for the transition recommendation

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:59) The EPDP Team recommends the 01.01.2020 be established as the effective date of coming into force of this process. ICANN Board or GNSO may opt for another date before 01.01.2020 to count for some degree of implementation flexibility

Kurt Pritz: (09:01) thanks Kavouss

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (09:05) Hadia, are you reading out the email you sent to the list and which I responded to already?

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (09:06) While I agree we have discussed this issue "thoroughly" I do not believe you have listened or addressed the concerns that have been sent to the list re: expanding the role of contractual compliance

Margie Milam (BC): (09:08) +1 Ashley

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:08) Ashley, haha - you are right. it looks like listing burdens for the requestor, but actually it lists the factors that need to be present so that disclosure requests can be honored.

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (09:10) @Ayden this is not about ICANN compliance if this is the issue honestly it is off point

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (09:10) Alan - I wasn't being flip. I honestly think this doesn't make sense and I'm not trying to be difficult.

Diane Plaut (IPC): (09:10) +1 Thomas

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (09:11) I also find it dishonest, Hadia, for you to claim in your recent emails that you have addressed "our" concerns, when you have made no effort at all to do that. You continue here to brush off my concerns as being "off point" when they remain in the language in the Adobe window in front of us

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (09:12) I guess to clarify and avoid any possible misinterpretations of being flip, there is more to this section than the reasonableness of the request itself. I agree that is part of it, but it isn't the only part. That is all.

Margie Milam (BC): (09:12) Let's suggest "reasonable" on both sides - the disclosure & the reasonable side

Margie Milam (BC): (09:12) response I mean

Alan Woods (RYSG) 2: (09:13) absolutely!

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (09:13) @Ayden I said it was discussed thoroughly

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (09:13) discussing does not mean that we need to agree

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (09:14) ok

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (09:14) @Hadia - Of course discussing does not mean we reach an agreement, but your dishonest summary in your email stated that you had addressed my concerns when you clearly had not.

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (09:15) Acknowledging concerns requires that one be honest and state they will not address something and why; not to pretend that one has.

Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison): (09:16) guys let's keep this discussion constructive, no need for such exchange

Alan Woods (RYSG) 2: (09:16) as per article 6 ..... Point (f) of the first subparagraph shall not apply to processing carried out by public authorities in the performance of their tasks.

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (09:17) @Ayden this is becoming impossible - I never pretended anything everything is public - honestly you need to stop maneuvering and that's it for me on this topic

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (09:18) @Hadia I'm not sure what you mean by "stop maneuvering"; I have been trying to work with you on the list to get somewhere where we are both happy with the language

Alan Woods (RYSG) 2: (09:19) so +1 to thomas . 6(1)c , d, and e are much more applicable and therefore Thomas' wording is absolutely supported.

Diane Plaut (IPC): (09:19) Agreed

Chris Lewis-Evans (GAC): (09:20) Yes and this language would stop those request

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (09:21) Chris - can you highlight the specific language again that you object to - sorry, it's a bit hard to follow the flow here

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:22) We cannot ignore this now. We can always change it in Phase 2.

Chris Lewis-Evans (GAC): (09:23) @Emily These criteria are applicable to disclosure requests relating to civil claims.....

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (09:23) Thanks Chris

Alan Woods (RYSG) 2: (09:24) completely disagree Chris, law enforcement in the pursuit of their 'public interest' authority, should not be relying on 6 (1)f at all. If the GDPR has left a gap - I'm pretty sure that it is not solely in the Domain Name industry, and this necessitates legislation, treaties, and arrangements that are waaaaaaaay above our paygrade and responsibility.

Diane Plaut (IPC): (09:24) This sentence can be brought under to the criteria portion which asks for the identification of the entity - because the reason for the identification of the entity was input for this purpose to identify needed entities for which other legal requirements would apply

Alan Woods (RYSG) 2: (09:24) +1 Amr - OK with that

Alex Deacon - IPC: (09:25) @amr - this is simply acknowledgement of receipt of a request - not if its lawful/etc.

Alan Woods (RYSG) 2: (09:25) its a wording thing Alex though .. i get where he is coming from.

Chris Lewis-Evans (GAC): (09:25) Sorry Alan not clear why the legal basis for rec 12 has to be 61f

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:26) @Alex: Understood, and that's fine. The text should probably be clear on that.

Alan Woods (RYSG) 2: (09:26) It's not for me to pre suppose the actions of Law enforcement here, but I fail to see why any law enforcement would jump through the hoop of Recommendation 12, as law enforcement. Surely that have a much more pressing, direct and potentially more 'urgent' methods of communicating their needs.

Diane Plaut (IPC): (09:27) I thought the language was clear on acknowledgement but it can certainly be clarified Amr

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:27) Thanks, Diane.

Alex Deacon - IPC: (09:27) if there is confusion around that we can address it with an update.

Diane Plaut (IPC): (09:28) Alan - it is why perhaps the language should stay at the top of the document as a qualifier as Thomas originally proposed

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (09:28) I think the concern Amr had was acknowledgement that the request was, in fact, lawful

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (09:28) FYI - I just sent an email to the group with my proposed edits.

Alex Deacon - IPC: (09:29) The last sentence of first paragraph explains the reasons for this.

Alan Woods (RYSG) 2: (09:29) I totally agree with Thomas' language and addition

Alan Woods (RYSG) 2: (09:29) \*language

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (09:29) yes emily  
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:30) @Alex: Thanks. Appreciate it.  
Diane Plaut (IPC): (09:30) Yes, Kurt, as the first paragraph states that further policy will further "complement, revise or supersede"  
Diane Plaut (IPC): (09:30) +1 Emily  
Ashley Heineman (GAC): (09:30) +1 Emily  
Kurt Pritz: (09:30) @ Kavouss - I think Diane's comment above answers your concern  
Kurt Pritz: (09:31) \*answers  
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:31) @Emily: +1. But the predictable procedure needs to be practically and reasonably implementable too, I suppose.  
Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:31) @Amr. On 1st point, doesn't a title of "Response time for acknowledging receipt...." suffice?  
Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:31) suffice  
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:31) +1 Emily  
Diane Plaut (IPC): (09:33) To Emily's point, I think we should leave Thomas' language at top, as it stands, and add to it to state that law enforcement requirements are to be separately reviewed and applied.  
Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:33) Sounds good.  
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:33) +1 Diane. Furthermore, EU law enforcement will be asking under the Directive, no?  
Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:34) I recall now, Kurt!  
Emily Taylor (RrSG): (09:35) Stephanie, yes I think they would, and national laws would be implementing the Directive.  
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:35) @Alan G: "Response time for acknowledging receipt of disclosure requests" seems fine to me. This would cover both disclosure requests that are reasonable/lawful, and those that aren't. I suspect it would be too soon to determine which bucket the disclosure requests falls into within 2 days after it's submitted.  
Chris Lewis-Evans (GAC): (09:36) Thanks Emily i dont want us to have anything that is overly restrictive and causes problems that we then have to fix later if LEA want / have to jump through these hoops to get disclosure requests serviced then surely this is up to them and as Tomas says we are not sure on how Non-EU LEA could do this currently.  
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:36) Thanks, Diane.  
Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:36) Agree that determining the bucket is a later bullet. Bullet one is just the confirmation that \*something\* was received.  
Chris Lewis-Evans (GAC): (09:36) hoops  
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:36) @Mark: Great!!  
Matt Serlin (RrSG): (09:37) Amr's language above seems good  
Alan Woods (RYSG) 2: (09:37) what ... me? No issue, i was just clarifying! :)  
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (09:37) I suggest an addition in the first line of the second paragraph as follow: 'tHE epdp Team recommends the the new policy , on an interim basis,efers to .....

Diane Plaut (IPC): (09:38) +! Amr that works  
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:39) I think slow line is a great analogy Mark  
Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:39) Thanks!  
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (09:40) @Alan thanks for that  
Margie Milam (BC): (09:40) Ashley's changes work-- thanks Ashley!  
Diane Plaut (IPC): (09:41) +1 Ashley  
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (09:42) +1 Ashley  
Terri Agnew: (09:43) break time, will be silence

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:46) Can we abbreviate these breaks in favor of fewer days of the week blocked off in meetings? Bit late now but ...

Margie Milam (BC): (09:48) can we set the document above to "scroll"

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:48) And allow us to download??

Marika Konings: (09:49) done

Marika Konings: (09:49) note this was also sent to the mailing list by Caitlin yesterday

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:49) :-)

Margie Milam (BC): (09:50) so many emails to read :)

Kurt Pritz: (09:52) You read emails?

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:53) no, just getting in line.

Margie Milam (BC): (09:56) Can the report mention that logic to address SSAC's concerns?

Caitlin Tubergen: (09:57) @Margie - are you referring to the current RAA requirement? If so, we can include some text under the recommendation noting how the RAA requirement has not changed as a result of this recommendation.

Margie Milam (BC): (09:58) yes-- the note that the RAA requirement would apply to the situation where there is a bounced email from the web form contact

Alex Deacon - IPC: (09:58) Agree adding this note would be helpful.

Caitlin Tubergen: (09:58) Thanks - will add this note as an action item for the support team.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (10:00) I am afraid I do not understand what Caitlin just explained. Why are log files out of scope, just because they are in the RAA? Do contracted parties not have to justify the retention of log files under the GDPR?

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (10:00) Are you saying this is a picket fence item?

Marika Konings: (10:00) @Alan - note that is part of a separate recommendation re. consent

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (10:01) Perhaps that last coffee I got has overloaded my feeble brain...

Marika Konings: (10:01) maybe we can refer to that, for any avoidance of doubt?

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (10:02) I think it might be necessary Marika. Consider me the average 6th grade reader that has to understand this....

Marika Konings: (10:03) maybe we could add something to 1) like 'unless as per recommendation X, the registrant has provided consent for the publication of the email address'?

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:04) @Marika that would address it.

Margie Milam (BC): (10:04) +I Marika

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:04) But we also need a requirement that registrars off that option.

Marika Konings: (10:05) @Alan, that is already a separate recommendation in the report

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:05) If it covers this case, fine.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:06) Not sure I recall that though.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:06) I thought that was only for redaction.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (10:07) Pls consider my suggestion to separate the issue of e-mail and occasional bouncing and then the issue of webform and its associated problems including the note requiring the need to address the issue of acknowledgement

Marika Konings: (10:08) @Alan - it refers to providing consent for publishing additional contact information, which is intended to include email as discussed in Toronto.

Kurt Pritz: (10:08) Kavouss- Margie is reaffirming your point - we are considering that now

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (10:09) Why are contracted parties retaining log files? Is it to: 1. Prove to compliance that they responded to a request to communicate with the RNH 2. Prove that they have a valid email address (under accuracy requirements, those requirements being relevant to the contract but not necessarily the GDPR). 3. Maintaining info that might be useful in an investigation (seems highly unlikely to me, and if the data were useful it would be illegal)

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:09) ok. Then all we need to do is make sure this statement does not conflict.

Margie Milam (BC): (10:12) going offline to drive but will remain on the phone

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (10:12) Put my hand down as James spoke to the points I was going to make...I don't object to the spirit of what this is trying to get at, but we have to think about the unintended consequences of this.

Alex Deacon - IPC: (10:12) @james - if you remember in PPSAI we addressed your concern by using the term "persistent delivery failure".

Alan Woods (RYSG) 2: (10:13) 100% agree with James on this!

James Bladel (RrSG): (10:13) Alex - yep, "persistent" is a good add.

James Bladel (RrSG): (10:17) @STephanie - another use/purpose would be for internal diagnostic of a system problem that may have gone previously unnoticed

James Bladel (RrSG): (10:17) (for retaining system log files)

Alex Deacon - IPC: (10:18) lol

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (10:18) That one I find justifiable James, but how long do you need it for that purpose?

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:18) back again on adobe - I was only on the phone bridge since the break

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (10:19) and you don't need a rec from us to do good systems health....

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (10:19) I think the intent was to have the GNSO look at the anonymized e-mail/web form as the standard (as was first put forth with the temp spec) for contacting registrants

Alex Deacon - IPC: (10:19) ISCMTP - ICANN Super Complicated Mail Transfer Protocol

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (10:19) believe it came out of conversations we had in Toronto of a longer term way to achieve contactability...

Marc Anderson (RySG): (10:19) lol +1 Alex

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:19) @Marc. GNSO should respectfully request that the IETF develop and reliable mechanism for anonymous communication??

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (10:19) Please replace recommends in the last but one line of second Note by ,GNSO may need to address this mater

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (10:19) call's over i guess!

Kurt Pritz: (10:19) Please go ahead Marika

Kurt Pritz: (10:19) I'll be back

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:19) I would be delighted to see the response from the IETF!

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:21) such a mech would be of great use to spammers and phishers!

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (10:23) IETF?

Marika Konings: (10:23) Do note that the 'note' is not a policy recommendation

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:24) @Marc: +1

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (10:24) Marika, but it looks like we ask for a policy recommendation

Marika Konings: (10:24) For everyone's information, we have tried to separate out the policy recommendations from 'clarifying' or 'additional' notes. For the Final Report the idea is to put the policy recommendation in a separate box so that it is very clear what the actual policy recommendations are.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:25) IETF = Internet Engineering Task Force., the folks that develop Internet protocols.

James Bladel (RrSG): (10:25) Hah, good point Alan

Marika Konings: (10:25) it is not clear here on the screen, but hopefully in the Final Report it is (it currently has two lines separating the policy recommendation from other sections)

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (10:26) what is the relevance of IETF here pls ?

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:27) @Kavouss, The note implies that the GNSO should develop a protocol and I pointed out that it was really the IETF which would do something like that.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:27) It was a note to a note to a note. Feel free to ignore!

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (10:27) tks Alan

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (10:28) Can we not just dump this

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (10:28) +1 Stephanie

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (10:28) if it is not necessary, this report is complicated enough. Have mercy.

Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (10:28) Indeed

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (10:28) @Alan, G, you really think I don't know what IETF is?

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (10:29) Stephanie ,what do you DUMP this ?

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:29) @Stephanie, are you saying we dump requirement to have anonymous e-mail or a web form?

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (10:29) remove the note re: develop a protocol

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:30) Leave or omit. It makes no difference. Let's move on.

James Bladel (RrSG): (10:30) Need to drop> Thx all

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (10:30) Thanks Ayden. Yes

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (10:32) Surely that is an implementation issue....we already have a tech cttee working on this, surely we do not need to tell them how to cut their own grass

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:32) +James.

Ben Butler (SSAC): (10:33) Agree with James

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (10:33) agreed James

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:33) Surely there must be more important issues to talk about in our last 1/2 hour.

James Bladel (RrSG): (10:33) And appreciate everyones' work on all of this.

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:33) agree james "minimum viable policy "

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:34) +1 James

Caitlin Tubergen: (10:35) The original language appears below, Kurt.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (10:38) Kurt, I had and still have difficulty to the term " as soon as practiceable " as it is too open too flexible. We need to be more precise ,I suggested " as a matter of urgency" instead ...

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:40) :)

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:43) It seemed to me that those other processes in the data retention specification that Trang shared are covered by recommendation 11.3 - concerning contracted party requirements.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:44) Sorry, other \*purposes

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:45) @Marc +1

Diane Plaut (IPC): (10:45) Agree with James comments

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:47) TDRP clearly requires >1 year because a complaint can be lodged at the 1 yr point. My question is just whether we are aware of others.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (10:55) Kurt please wrap up at 17,00 UTC sharp

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (10:56) I thought we were supposed to keep things flexible. I don't agree with "as a matter of urgency"

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (10:56) it's not justified

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (10:57) I do not agree not to include that as it is combined with " as soon as practiceable and as a matter of urgency" which complement each other

Alan Woods (RYSG) 2: (10:57) well ... Farzi, some sort of language agreeable to the parties. And whether or not it is justified is up to ICANN compliance isn't it?

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (10:58) Alan Wood + 1

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (11:00) Agree with ALAN. The Art 29 cttee has been crystal clear on this, and it is not new

Alan Woods (RYSG) 2: (11:02) some one needs to do it!! lol  
Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (11:02) Need to leave now. Thanks all.  
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (11:03) bye alan  
Emily Taylor (RrSG): (11:03) Sorry - have to drop now  
Diane Plaut (IPC): (11:03) Yes, must sign off. Good day and evening to all  
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (11:06) Sorry old hnad  
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (11:06) Marika, when we would have our next meeting?  
Matt Serlin (RrSG): (11:07) thanks all  
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (11:08) I don't think I made my points clear on this recommendation. Yes it looks clear, but the devil lies in the details.  
Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (11:08) @Kavouss Monday  
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (11:08) bye  
Terri Agnew: (11:08) email invite will go out shortly for Mondays's call  
Mark Svancarek (BC): (11:08) bye  
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (11:08) Thanks all. Bye.  
Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (11:08) See you Monday...  
Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (11:09) Thanks Kurt and all!  
Leon Sanchez (ICANN Board Liaison): (11:09) bye all  
Fiona Asonga (ISPCP) 2: (11:09) thanks bye  
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (11:09) Particularly with respect to ICANN's control of the data it is expecting the contracted parties to retain for policy purposes.