ICANN Transcription
GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group
Tuesday 02 February 2016 at 16:00 UTC
Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of
GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group held on Tuesday, 02 February 2016 at 16:00 UTC.
Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to
inaudible passages or
transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not
be treated as an authoritative record.

The audio is also available at: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-nextgen-rds-02feb16-en.mp3

On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#feb

Terri Agnew: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the GNSO
                  Next Generation Registration Directory Services (RDS) Policy Development
                  Process Working Group call on the 2nd of February, 2016.

                  In the interest of time today there will be no roll call as we have quite a few
                  participants. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect Room so if you
                  are only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourselves be known now.

Man: Rod Rasmussen here.

Susan Prosser: Susan Prosser, audio only.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Hearing no more names, I would like to remind you all to please
                  state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please
                  keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any
                  background noise.

With this I'd like to hand it over to Marika. Please begin.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much (Terri) and hello everyone. This is Marika Konings from ICANN Staff. And I'll be your host for today's and Susan is on vacation and has asked that staff run this meeting as it's mainly focused on the tutorial and she will be back next week and to take up where we left off.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Hello?

Marika Konings: And hello? (Ram) I see your hand is raised. You want to speak?

(Ram Mohan): Hello?

Marika Konings: Yes, hello. Who is speaking?

(Ram Mohan): Sorry, sorry, my (unintelligible) on Adobe Connect.

Marika Konings: Yes, hello (Ram). Is there an intervention you would like to make at this stage or you just want to make known that you're on the call?

(Ram Mohan): It was just to make notice that I'm on the call. Thank you so much.

Marika Konings: Okay, great. Thank you. We'll note everyone that is in the Adobe Connect so no worries about that.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: All right, so hello? Yes, hi. Who's speaking? Yes, hello.

Woman: It's (unintelligible) to check. Is this also a (rep sample)? I mean are we able to see each other or is it only an audio?

Marika Konings: There's also an Adobe Connect Room so there you will be able to see all the people that are logged into the Adobe Connect Room and we'll take note of the attendance which will be circulated after the call.

 Does that answer your question?

Woman: Okay, thank you. Yes. I'm sorry. Thank you so much.

Marika Konings: Thanks. So before we dive into the substance of the meeting there's just some housekeeping items I would like to cover. And as already noted at the start of the meeting it's going to be the practice for this working group as we have such a large number of members that we will take the roll call from everyone that's in Adobe Connect and take note of people that are on audio only.

 I would like to remind everyone to complete or update your Statements of Interest. It is a requirement for your participation in this working group. If you do not comply with that requirement despite several reminders that will have been sent to you by the GNSO Secretariat then we will eventually downgrade you to the status of observer which we - that you will receive all the emails but you will not be able to post or participate in the calls.

 However as soon as you complete your Statement of Interest your status as member will be reinstated so again please update your Statements of Interest. And if you need any help in doing so feel free to contact the GNSO Secretariat and they will help you with any login issues you may have.

 Michele you've raised your hand?

Michele Neylon: I believe that somebody has their hand up before me?

Marika Konings: I'm presuming that may be an old hand because (Ram) just spoke. (Ram) if...?

Michele Neylon: Oh.

Marika Konings: ...it's an old hand can you please lower it?

Michele Neylon: While they're working on that, just as the other thing, with respect to the SOIs, might be worth mentioning. I know from looking at some of them that some people are claiming to be members of stakeholder groups and constituencies of which they are not a member.

Now I know the GNSO Secretariat isn't going to police those. But for example with the Registrar Stakeholder Group I do police them. And if you claim that you are a member of the Registrar Stakeholder Group and you are not we will get the GNSO Secretariat to update your SOI to reflect that. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much Michele. And it maybe also worth then to remind everyone when we ask (unintelligible) affiliation and membership (gate keeper) first, so if you are a member of a certain stakeholder group or constituency, not necessarily if you align with their views or you considered it yourself aligned with their perspectives but if you indeed are a member as Michele noted.

And it's something we'll make - hope to make further clear as well when we send out the forms for signup because we've noticed as well that, you know, can be maybe confusion - confusing when we ask about affiliation and maybe we need to be more specific in that regard.

And thank you Michele for as well helping us with making sure that Statements of Interest are correct which brings me as well to the second

point, a reminder to the working group to review the membership list and the affiliations that are included there.

And you see the latest version on the screen here. I think we're currently at 134 members and 90 observers. So if you know that any of the affiliations here are incorrectly listed, please let GNSO Secretariat know.

Also please have a look through this list and see whether from your perspective if there are any groups that are either underrepresented or not represented. We anticipate that one of the items for next meeting will be to review the overall membership and participation to make a determination of whether additional outreach should be conducted to make sure that the required expertise and perspectives are represented in this working group.

Also wanted to remind you that we still have an open call for volunteers with regards to those interested in participating in the Leadership Team as we discussed during the last meeting that is an item that is expected to be addressed during next week's meeting and several of you have already come forward and would like to thank you all for doing so.

As we suggested staff is working on two polls one of which we hope to launch later today that will ask for working group members' input on the characteristics of the Leadership Team and later in the week we begin to launch a poll that will ask you to endorse those candidates that you think meet the requirements to fill a position on that Leadership Team.

So you're strongly encouraged if you still are on the fence and considering volunteering to do so at that latest by Thursday because we anticipate that we'll launch the poll at the latest by Friday so hopefully those two pieces of information will give the working group sufficient information to make a decision with regards to the Leadership Team.

And I have noticed as well that just prior to this meeting some additional suggestions have been made. And of course we want to encourage you all to continue that conversation on the naming list.

One last thing I wanted to mention is that just prior to this meeting a newcomer webinar has been held which provided a briefing on the GNSO Policy Development Process in general. So for any of you - of those that weren't able to attend and I know that several of you did and I hope you thought it was helpful, will share the information in relation to the recording as well as the presentation that was used with the list as it may be of interest for those of you that are new to the Policy Development Process and may be interested to learn about this.

So that's all the reminders I wanted to note as part of welcome and introduction.

I'm not seeing any hands, although (Ram) I still see your hand is up. Is this a new hand or need some assistance in lowering your old hand?

Oh (go ahead).

(Ram Mohan):   (Unintelligible) waiting to lower it. Thank you. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much. So then we're moving onto item 2 of our meeting today. As we discussed during the last meeting it might be helpful or staff, helpful for staff to put together a kind of beginner's tutorial and providing an overview of some of the basic information that is expected to be covered and known in regards to this Policy Development Process.

And can I maybe remind you to all mute your microphones as there's a bit of an echo on the line.

So staff has done so and we put together this slide deck which it's really intended to be an introduction and help everyone on their way and to finding your way around the different materials that are available in relation to this Policy Development Process.

So basically what we've done is we've broken the presentation down into six different segments. First of all, we'll look at how we got here. Secondly, we'll look at, you know, what is Whois?

Then we'll briefly cover some of the past efforts that have tried to address concerns about Whois which will then be followed by an overview of the Next Generation Registration Directory Services or Next Gen RDS. And after that we'll take another look at the questions that this Policy Development Process is expected to address.

And we'll end with some guidance on where you can find further information if you want to find out more details concerning the topics that we'll cover during today's briefing.

And as I said, you know, the tutorial is really intended to be a starting point. And so as it becomes clear in the course of the working group's deliberations that more in-depth briefings are needed on certain subject's staff is of course more than willing to work with you to prepare these and make sure all the information is available as necessary.

And in order not to bore you too much with my voice or someone else's voice, we've actually divided the presentation up between and myself and (Lisa Pfeiffer) and Steve Sheng who is one of our colleagues that is supporting the (SSAC). And I thank them very much for joining us today.

And I would like to propose that we pause briefly after each section purely for clarifying questions and that we leave the broader questions for the end of the presentation as we've set aside specific time to look at questions and

answers that may go, you know, beyond some of the specific topics covered here.

Of course you should also feel free to type any questions you may have in the chat. And I'm sure one of us or one of a fellow working group member is willing to provide - will try to provide you with an answer.

So having said that let's move onto the first section which will look at why are we here today.

So the title of the slides already indicate, this PDP was basically launched to overcome the deadlock that the community felt it was in after many years of hard work, trying to come up with consensus recommendations to address the many issues that had been identified with Whois.

It's really important to remember that Whois was originally created back in the 80s as a mechanism to identify and contact those responsible for the operation of Internet network researches when there were only a handful of people that were involved.

In comparison we now have over 160 million domain registrations in the gTLD space. And however the growth was not accompanied by any substantial changes to the Whois protocol despite really 15 years of task forces and working groups and studies.

So as a result, you know, the ICANN Board decided to request an issue report on the Next Generation RDS and in parallel task the Expert Working Group to look at this issue so that it's finding could inform the policy Development Process that we're currently in, apologies.

So the Expert Working Group or EWG as it's also being referred to, was asked to take a clean slate approach and basically start with redefining the purpose of gTLD registration data which would then help inform the

development of the proposed new model for gTLD Registration Directory Services which would, you know, amongst others address questions related to the accuracy, privacy and access.

So after the EWG submitted its final report to the ICANN Board which it took 50 months of intense discussions to deliver, the Board reaffirmed its request for this Policy Development Process.

As it realized that this would be a complex undertaking, the Board and the GNSO got together to develop a process framework which is intended to provide a post-structure for the PDP taking into account the complexity as well as the interlinkage between the different elements that are expected to be considered.

And following the completion of the process framework and the Board's reconfirmation of the request for an issue report, staff produced a new preliminary issue report for public comment. This issue report is intended to include all the information that is relevant to this PDP and it also detailed the questions that are expected to be addressed as part of this Policy Development Process.

The issue report also included PDP working charter which basically is built on the process framework and the content of the final issue report.

Following the submission of the final issue report the GNSO Council then adopted the charter and a call for volunteers was launched in early January of this year.

And here we are today.

So for the next segment I'll hand over to my colleague Steve Cheng who will talk to you about what is Whois.

Steve Cheng: Thank you Marika and greetings to all. My name is Steve Cheng. I'm a policy staff supporting the Security and Stability Advisory Committee. In my capacity as a staff I also participated in the IETF effort to define a replacement protocol.

So the topic here is what is Whois. Well Whois is a overloaded term. It could mean several things. Sometimes people refer Whois as the registration data that registrants submit when they register the domain name to registrars and then published in the registrar or Registry Whois Server, Directory Service.

Others use Whois - they refer Whois as the access protocol which is the latest version of that protocol is RFC 3912. That was specified. That specified the query, the client and server query interaction on how to get these registration data displayed.

And finally some people refer to Whois as the Directory Service which implements the access protocol along with policies for the Directory Service to serve the registration data.

So I think when we start talking about Whois it's important to understand exactly what we are talking about. Are we talking about a data? Are we talking about a protocol or are we talking about the Directory Service?

Now just a bit more on the protocol and policy itself, Whois was defined in 18 - in 1982 by IETF so it was a simple Directory Service for allowing the ARPANET which is the predecessor of the Internet users to be able to find the contact information for the person operating an ARPANET host. The - you know at that time there was a relatively closed community. You know anyone from the ARPANET can request any information.

As Marika mentioned as Internet grow, the Whois began to serve the needs of different stakeholders such as registrants, law enforcement, intellectual property (mark) owners, business and individual owners so each of these find

usefulness in obtaining the registration data of a domain name for a variety of purposes.

The protocol itself has remained - largely remained unchanged. The IETF has embarked in the past several efforts to replace Whois. Those have largely - those efforts have seen little adoption.

Lately in last year in 2016 the IETF did another try with - for the RDAP which is called the Registration Data Access Protocol which it's much more promising as a replacement for the protocol itself.

Now I just want to clarify. It was a replacement just for the protocol itself, the underlying technology but the policies regarding data and the Directory Service, those as Marika mentioned still needs to be addressed and by this PDP Working Group.

In terms of ICANN's commitment for - ICANN is committed to enforce its existing policy relating to Whois subject to applicable laws. These policies require that ICANN implement measures to maintain timely unrestricted and public access to accurate and complete Whois information. That it was specified in the affirmation of commitments which is a set of founding documents guiding ICANN.

Now technically how Whois works is fairly simple. This graph depicts a regular decline server protocol as defined in RFC 3912. Essentially the client, you know, queries the Whois interface on the server. The servers could be operated by a registrar or registry.

And they open up the portfolio 3 and then make a query. The server, you know, responds by, you know, looking into its data store, the registration data. And then display back to their client at which point the connection is closed.

The registrars or registries also implement something called a Web-based Whois where mostly implemented is a user could go onto the registry or registrar, Whois web site and type in the domain name and also maybe other information and then the information is returned via a web interface.

Now who runs Whois?

This is a, you know like a simple diagram depicting the various players here. Whois servers are run by registrars and registries for the domain names that they are sponsoring. You know registrant, when they register via either by them self to the registrars or via resellers to the registrars submit the registration information, registrars keep that part of that information. In some sense - instances you would provide a copy of that to the registry operator. And then both registrars and registries show some Whois information depending whether, you know, it's a thick Whois or thin Whois.

This is an example to show what registration data is in the Whois servers. These include - for gTLDs it includes a registrant contact information, the administrative contact and the technical contact. It also includes information about who the registrar is, the registrar name and, you know, it's IANA ID and the abuse contact information for the registrar.

Finally it also includes a set of statuses for the domain names. These statuses are really important. Although mostly kind of used by registrars and registrars to signify that the status of the domain names they are actually very useful to know what the status of the domain name is.

So that's kind of roughly a very high level overview of, you know, what is Whois, the history behind the protocol, you know, how the protocol works and what data information is in the Whois.

Now in terms of the policies, the Whois policy recommendations are created and refined by the ICANN community through the supporting organization

and influenced by Advisory Committees mostly, you know, in a multi-stakeholder, a bottom-up process.

Here is a list of the Whois policies that we currently have. So for example we have a Whois Data Reminder policy that requires the registrars to annually present to the registrant the Whois information. And remind them, you know, that, you know, if a registrant was to provide false Whois information that can be grounds for cancellation of their domain names.

So it's kind of an annual reminder policy. If you're a registrant of domain names I'm sure you have received some of these reminders from your registrars.

We also have the Restored Name Accuracy policy. This refers to when a registrar restores a name that has been deleted, you know, on the basis of submission of false contact data or, you know, nonresponse to registrar inquiries, the policy specified, the name must be placed on registrar hold status until the registrant has provided its update and accurate Whois information.

You know going down the list of the policies, marketing restriction, you know, the concerns of policy that results changes to the Registrar Agreement, essentially, you know, putting - place clauses that Registrars Access Agreement require a third party to agree not to use data to allow, enable or otherwise for marketing activities.

These policies - these consensus policies are applied to generic Top Level Domains, the gTLDs. Within the ccTLD space there's - there are policy making process is different. And it's up to each registry, you know, what kinds of policy do they implement, you know, regarding data reminder, you know, whether, you know, the Whois can be - Whois data can be used for marketing purposes. It is they have a much varied practice there.

I think having said that I think although the ccTLD shows a variety of practices some of those are, you know, extremely good practices that can - that are valuable to a generic Top Level Domain.

So I wouldn't bore you with all these, you know, policies. But as you have seen a lot of efforts have put in the past for Whois policies and implementations.

So with that that concludes my short introduction; any questions or Marika should we take some questions or should we wait till the end?

Marika Konings: Thank you. If there are any clarifying questions, anything that, you know, you didn't understand or you have questions about specifically what Steve presented, so please ask those now and maybe some of the broader questions we'll keep till the end.

Steve Cheng: Thank you.

Marika Konings: I'm not seeing any hands though. There you go. Michele go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Yes. Just because I'll just reference people to have a look at the (chats) because I mentioned it and you provided links to it. I mean the issue around local laws. You provided a link to the IAG Whois conflicts. And the entire thing around the local laws is something which I think we can all agree to disagree on quite actively at the moment. Thanks.

Steve Cheng: Thank you Michele, noted.

Marika Konings: I'm not seeing any further hands. Well then I move onto the next segment of this presentation which focuses on some of the past efforts that have tried to address concerns in relation to Whois.

As many of you are undoubtedly aware that there are many different issues that have been identified in the course of the years, you know, starting with, you know, what is the purpose of collecting and displaying gTLD registration information and questions in relation to the accuracy of this data and concerns about the data privacy and security, the availability of the data and cost involved with potential changes to the system, concerns about IP and identity theft, just to name a few.

And as a result of these concerns numerous initiatives have been launched over the years to try and address these issues and come up with consensus recommendations. But Whois has proven to be one of the most divisive issues with many different perspectives and opinions.

In 2003 Whois Task Forces which were the predecessors of the PDP Working Group identified two questions that needed to be addressed, you know, how to improve data accuracy and avoid data abuse. And this resulted in two GNSO consensus policies which Steve also referred to in his presentation and namely the Whois Data Reminder policy and the Whois Marketing Restriction policy.

In 2007 another Whois Task Force was formed. And this one was tasked with defining the purpose of Whois and was asked to make recommendations about access, accuracy and resolve the differences in the applicable laws and regulations. A topic that's already being discussed as well in the chat. And, however, in the end, the council was unable to reach a consensus on the recommendation that the task force had (control) in relation to an operational point of contact, OPOC.

And instead, decided that additional studies should first be on the (paper) to help inform the debate and confirm or negate a number of assumptions that had been made in relation to it.

So these studies, which we now commonly referred to as the WHOIS studies, are focused on a set of six separate studies that address questions in relation to issues such as a misuse of WHOIS data and registrant identification, issues related to privacy and proxy and relay and reveal and accuracy.

The studies were then followed by a policy review that was conducted by the WHOIS policy review team which stemmed from the information of commitments. In this review team was tasked to review the extent to which ICANN's WHOIS policy implementation is effective and meets the legitimate needs of law enforcement and promote the consumer trust.

So this review resulted in a final report in May 2012 and contained 16 recommendations on a range of topics which were adopted by the ICANN board and have or are in the process of being implemented by ICANN and the community.

And on this page you see a summary version of the topics to which these recommendations relate. Security and stability advisory committee, or ASAC, as to the WHOIS review team recommendations in 2012 and they conducted their own review of these recommendations.

And their report enables a (SAC 55) and they concluded that further work should be undertaken before the WHOIS review team recommendations are implemented and notably, in relation to defining the purpose of the (mailing) registration.

They even recommended that all activities directed at finding a solution should be halted until a new registration data policy would be developed and accepted.

So based on these two pieces of input, the ASAC report and the review team final report. And the ICANN board decided to pursue a two-pronged approach by focusing on the one hand a ways to enhance existing WHOIS policy, while

on the other hand, focus on the consideration of a next generation (party) by requesting the issue report and forming the expert working group.

In addition to all the activities that have been mentioned so far, it's probably also worth calling out some of the ongoing activities that the working group is expected to factor into its deliberations such as the 2013 registration accreditation agreements, the WHOIS requirements contained in there which are called out in a specific specification, the new WHOIS accuracy reporting system, all the WHOIS (program) improvements that have been introduced such as a dedicated Web site at WHOIS.ICANN.org, as well as a consolidated WHOIS lookup tool.

Furthermore, there have been a number of other policy development processes that have tackled aspects of WHOIS, such as a (thick) WHOIS PDP which is currently in implementation phase, as is the translation and transliteration of contact information PDP.

The PDP working group on privacy and proxy services accreditation issues most recently finished this work which is now expected to be considered by the ICANN board now that the GNSO Council has adopted this recommendation.

And then there's also work that is ongoing as I already pointed out in the chat and by the implementation advisory group which is reviewing the implementation of the ICANN procedure for handling conflicts with local law.

As appropriate, the working group is expected to review the outcomes of these other activities to ensure that there's no conflict between what has been recommended as a result of these other initiatives in the recommendations of this working group, or if there are, then these are recognized so that a solution can be found.

So in addition, as also noted during the last meeting, there are many other important contributions to the WHOIS policy debate that the working group is expected to review and consider as part of its deliberations, such as the input that has been provided by the Governmental Advisory Committee or the GAC, in their communiques as well as the 2007 GAC principles regarding gTLD WHOIS services, input that has been provided by the Article 29 data protection working party in the form of letters that have been submitted to ICANN, other WHOIS studies that have been carried out, the (RDAP) standards which already - conversations around which have already started on the mailing list, as well as the extensible provisioning protocol or the EPP standards.

So to facilitate the working group's review of this information, staff has created a wiki page where we've tried to bring together all this information. And as we called upon you as well during the last meeting, if there's anything missing please let us know and will make sure to update the page accordingly.

So with that, I'll hand it over to (Lisa) to talk to about the next generation gTLD registration directory service, unless there are any questions. Sorry, going too fast. (Mikala), go ahead.

(Mikala): I'm just going to state the obvious but I assume the slides are going to be available somewhere afterwards, yes?

Marika Konings: Yes, that's correct. The slides have already been circulated prior to the meeting and they are also posted on the wiki space, and I believe they were just earlier post it as well in the chat here again.

(Mikala): Okay, thanks.

Marika Konings: No further hands? (Lisa), the floor is yours.

(Lisa Fifer):   Great. Thanks, Marika, and thanks for covering the community's history on this issue. For those of you who don't know me, my name is (Lisa Fifer). I went outside consultant on contract on contract to ICANN and I've been helping to support a number of the WHOIS activities in the past that Marika spoke about.

Among other things, I help the staff of the expert working group on the next generation gTLD registration directory services, and for the next, oh, maybe ten minutes or so I'm going to present a brief primer on the next generation RDS.

And by that, I mean, a brand-new policy framework and implementation to replace WHOIS. Now the EWG was formed at the end of 2012 when the ICANN board considered the WHOIS review team's recommendation, as well as the (SX) findings and the Elephant and Blind Men Report.

At that time, the board issued a resolution that, as you all know, initiated this PDP. They did so recognizing the community's decade-long inability to reach consensus on WHOIS policy reform.

And as part of that, the court directed ICANN's CEO to launch a new and hopefully somewhat different effort to redefine the purpose of collecting, maintaining and providing access to gTLD registration data including, of course, safeguards to protect that data.

The board's hope was that this new effort would be able to come together and build a strong foundation upon which the policy effort that you are currently embarked upon, as well as contracts, could be based.

Furthermore, the board directed staff to prepare an issue report for this board initiated GNSO PDP and, of course, the end result is what you now see on this working group's wiki as a final issue report for this PDP.

So when we refer to the next generation RDS now, we do not mean a specific implementation. We do not mean a set of policies. Of course, those policies are what are still to be determined by this particular PDP.

Instead, what we're referring to is really this entire effort to establish a new policy framework upon which to build the next generation RDS potentially to replace WHOIS.

Now, in early 2013, at the CEO's request, this group came together, not as the expert working group, but they were really a diverse group of volunteers they came together as individuals to kind of brainstorm on this problem.

They studied the board's request to re-examine and define the purpose of registration data for, I think, Marika mentioned 15 months. Boy, it felt longer. This group poured through background documents. They solicited new community inputs.

They published a couple of draft reports. They collected and responded individually to public comments. And they even conducted some new research. All this was to try to better understand the problem and then to suggest an approach that would somehow better address everyone's needs.

Through weekly calls, over, actually dozens of face-to-face meetings, the group tried to look at WHOIS from, really, every angle, trying to appreciate the many different viewpoints that made it so difficult for the community to reach some kind of agreement on overall WHOIS policy reform.

Ultimately, in June of 2014, the group recommended abandoning today's WHOIS model where everyone has the same public access to registration data that is really too often incomplete, inaccurate or just not useful for the purpose.

In its place, the EWG recommended a brand-new system built from the ground up to meet existing and future needs of the global Internet community. And that's final report, the AWG recommended a paradigm shift - paradigm shift to a next generation RDS that collects, validates and discloses registration data but does so for permissible purposes only.

In this new paradigm, which is very - at a very high level, illustrated on this slide, basic data would remain publicly available. It would be publicly available to satisfy many purposes that registration data is used for today and perhaps in the future.

However, the rest of the data would be gated. Sometimes people refer to this as differentiated access. In the EWG's report it was referred to as gated. And that means that it would be accessible only to accredited requesters who identify themselves, state their purpose and then agreed to be held accountable for using that data appropriately.

As shown here, only the data that an authenticated user was actually authorized to access for the stated purpose would be obtained. It would be obtained from - by pulling data from the responsible gTLD registries and also some new ecosystem entities including one shown here called, "The Validators," would assist in making the data a higher quality.

In reaching this conclusion, the EWG actually tried to strike a compromise and acknowledging in its final report that the compromise was in perfect. And what they try to do is balance everyone's interests and concerns.

Moreover, the EWG really wasn't limited to just recommending changes to the existing WHOIS system. They did have the opportunity to try to take a fresh look at the problem, of course, appreciating the history and the current system, and then envision a new system that might be able to address the needs that they saw.

Now, to suggest the system, the EWG considered each of the stakeholders involved in gTLD directory services today and possibly in the future, examining some needs for accuracy, access and privacy and considering possible approaches that might meet the needs more effectively.

Ultimately, the group's final report included 108 principles that encompass all of the areas that you see listed here. Ultimately, that group delivered its final report and those areas that you see listed here, you'll see a close resemblance to the questions to addressing this PDP because they are intended as a foundation to help inform those PDPs.

Now, for example, here on the slide, you see illustrated in a summary graphic now the EWG try to answer the board's request to define the purpose of gTLD registration data.

And in its final report, you'll find a definition for each of these purposes along with list of users that have those purposes, detailed list of tasks that might fall under this purpose and associated data.

You'll also find that suppose regarding why and how access to the elements for each purpose might be gated, and yes, it's not a new concept. With the group that is try to apply the concept to registration data.

In the report, you'll also see how data and personal privacy may be protected given consideration that this is a system to meet the needs of the entire global Internet and it is subject to national laws of each jurisdiction in which data may be accessed.

You'll find principles for contact data validation and privacy and many other steps in the EWG's report. Then finally, to examine how such a new system my work, the EWG did take a look at possible implementation models as well as associated cost, and it surveyed the ICANN community for input on

potential risks and benefits of moving to a new system such as the one outlined in its report.

In cases where community viewpoints were especially diverse and very difficult to reconcile, the EWG also requested additional research to inform its recommendations.

Now, I can't hope to cover the EWG's findings in this morning's brief tutorial. We can take a request to provide more information in the future tutorial if you'd like but I'd encourage you to actually read the final report along with a series of frequently asked questions and answers.

There's also a detailed tutorial that was presented in June 2014 when the final report was completed. There are a couple of top ten question Webinars and there are also about half a dozen research reports which the group used to inform its final decision.

To agree upon principles, as suggested in its final report, EWG members made many compromises. In the end, the group managed to reach consensus on all but one really very important and difficult principle.

There was dissent on that principle and you'll find that dissent along with the views expressed by several other individual EWG members also posted on your wiki.

Those are informative reads to complement what you'll find in the final report. After considering the EWG's output, as Marika mentioned, the board reaffirmed its request for this PDP and requested that the EWG's output be used as a foundation from which the GNSO might develop new global policy.

But you shouldn't be this as limiting the PDP working group's task at hand. As Marika explained, there are many, many other inputs available on this issue

and this working group's charter does call for community outreach to ensure that all perspectives are heard and used to inform your work.

So let me pause here before I cover the questions to be addressed by this PDP. Are there any clarifying questions at this time? I note there's a request to categorize the principles.

Actually, you'll find on the working group's wiki that there is a list of principles that we can easily use that table as a mechanism to further categorize them, but they are grouped into each of the individual question areas already.

All righty, seeing no hands raised I'll continue. Given all these available inputs including, but not limited to, the EWG's output, let's take a look at some of the specific questions at this PDP working group must address.

As described in the final issue report and the charter that was approved by the GNSO council, the task before this particular PDP working group is to attempt to reach consensus, first, on some overarching questions that are given here.

Now, as evident from this issue's very long history, this will not be an easy task. The GNSO counselors and the ICANN board came together informally and discussed how to structure this PDP.

They came up with a process framework which you've seen diagrams of. Here at the upper right-hand corner of the slide, I show where that framework came from.

With the group of counselors and board members did was look at typical software development life cycles and tried to break down the work into three phases that could actually be used in the structure of this process and hopefully come to consensus.

Importantly, the framework asks that you begin with the fundamental requirements for gTLD registration data. As the (SSAC) found in its report, it's very hard to agree upon policy if you don't first agree upon requirements.

At a minimum, this PDP working group has been asked to reach consensus on users and purposes for registration data, associated access, accuracy, data elements and privacy requirements.

This PDP may, of course, agree upon additional requirements but these are the primary questions that were felt to be essential to answer before further progress can be made.

Next, using those requirements, the PDP working group has been asked to try to reach consensus on whether a next-generation system is needed in order to actually satisfy those needs, those requirements.

If so, the PDP working group must then consider, at minimum, requirements for coexistence, compliance, system modeling, cost, benefit and risk analysis. Again, these are felt to be crosscutting requirements that really apply to any new system and establishing requirements of these areas is essential to reach consensus.

Finally, as a working group finds that the current WHOIS policy framework can, in fact meet these agreed requirements for registration data, the PDP working group must explain how it can do so. It's not enough to establish requirements without deciding how to go forward in this issue.

On the slide, we've listed the minimum set of eleven questions to be considered as part of this working group's deliberation. It's easy to see that the questions I really very closely related.

Your answers on purpose will be influenced by, for example, requirements associated with protecting data and personal privacy. As has been noted in

the chat, there are certainly questions of applicable national law and how the - those requirements will be addressed.

Of course, those requirements must be put in the context of gTLD registration data and the specific data elements that must be collected, maintain and accessed through any system where there (unintelligible) or the RDS.

For data to be useful, it must be accurate at least to the extent required for a given purpose and so on. In a one-hour tutorial, of course, we can't hope to drill it's all these questions in detail.

For today's tutorial, we'll just start with the first, and arguably, the most difficult question which is who should have access to gTLD registration data and for what purpose?

This slide, which is drawn from the board's approval process framework, intended to guide this PDP demonstrates how the question of users and purposes I'd be approached in three separate phases.

During your first phase, the most fundamental question to be answered is whether to gTLD registration data should continue to be accessible for any purpose as it is in today's WHOIS.

If the working group should reach consensus, the registration data should only be accessible for specific purposes, then it must recommend the users and purposes of the system that the system should be designed to support, and why it must support those users and purposes.

Having forged a consensus on this very difficult first question, the working group will have created its own foundation to help answer the big emerging question of whether a brand-new policy framework is actually needed to meet those requirements.

If the PDP working group finds the new policy framework is, in fact, needed in the GNSO council agrees, the PDP would then continue on to face two drafting specific policies to support the requirements in phase one.

For example, you might identify policies for data element collection, collecting data that's required for some of the (permissible) purposes and the conditions under which they did it would be made accessible through the RDS.

This is just one example of a policy that might emerge from phase two. Finally in phase three of the policy working gro- or PDP working group, we (set this) policy recommendations I actually looking at possible implementations and considering whether there's any implementation or co-existence guidance that might be applied as part of this PDP process.

Looking at that may actually require the working group to take another look at those phase two policies and kind of refine the policies until all the answers seem to be workable.

Now, in the future tutorial if you wish, we can cover, in greater detail, each of the questions to be answered by this PDP. Today, we hope to just give you a good starting point to do some of your own reading and homework and in particular, to help you sort through the very large number of inputs and identify those that are most relevant to each question.

You'll find on your wiki, a list of questions and hyperlink tables to key inputs. Shown here is the table for the users and purposes question, but there are similar tables for other questions.

These tables are drawn from the final issue report and you can, of course, expand these as the working group begins to examine each question and finds that there are additional key inputs.

However, we do hope that you'll find this useful as a guide and start exploring each question. For example, on the question of uses and purposes, we point you to Section 3 of the EWG's final report.

That - Section 3 is also backed up by an annex on use cases that illustrates some of the purposes identified in the report. You can learn more about EWG principles and (those) tutorials and facts and individual statements of course made by members.

However, the question here, purposes and users, is certainly not a new one and it has been the subject of many, many efforts that Marika outlined earlier including WHOIS task forces, policy review team reports, Article 29 working party letters, GAC communiques, and of course, the (SSAC)'s report.

You are encouraged to review all of these inputs to better understand the history as well as the diverse community views that exist on how to answer this question.

With that, I'll turn things over to Marika to wrap up and give you links for further information.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much, (Lisa). Are there - first of all, are there any questions in relation to the information that (Lisa) presented on the EWG and the RDS? I guess you already noted as well, you know, there may, at some point, you need to go into more depth in some of the findings and information in that report.

But we just wanted to really give you a snapshot of what is contained in there. And not seeing any hands, just briefly moving on to, you know, where can you find more information.

As we've noted, there's a wealth of information available on this topic and we try to do our best to gather that information in a most logical way possible, so

all the information we referred to during this meeting can be found on the working group wiki space as a working group charter.

There are questions mapped to key inputs, (back on) document, initial key inputs, as well as, a section that - a list of comments that have been received on the issue report.

As I've noted before, if there's any information you believe is missing, if there's any way in which we can make this information more accessible, if there are any specific topics you think we should hold further tutorials on, please let us know.

We really want to make sure that everyone has an opportunity to review and understand this information. We know that it's a lot to digest but as we feel, it is as well - it's really key for your participation in the working group and you have reviewed this information as it will come back in various questions and discussions that the working group will have.

So I think with that, we get to our questions and answers section. We've already tried to answer some of the questions that you posted in the chat, as well, some of these questions were obviously come back in the working group deliberations as you start tackling the charter questions as well as start thinking about your work plan.

And - but at this stage, I want to give you the opportunity if there any questions you have, you know, about anything we raised in the presentation, to raise those now.

Not seeing any hands - and of course, have any questions, but after the presentation, feel free to either post those on the list or send those to us privately and we'll do our best to answer those.

So I think with that, we actually may be able to wrap up this call a bit sooner than originally anticipated. For the next meeting, we would like to suggest to keep on the current schedule of the 1600 UTC, so the next meeting will be on the 9th of February at 1600 UTC.

Again, noting that once the leadership team is in place, they're expected to review the membership spread across the different time zones and recommend a possible rotation in the form of one meeting out of four taking place in a different time zone that it's more convenient for those participants in Asia-Pacific locations to the working group.

But at this stage, we suggest to keep - stick with the current schedule until the leadership team can take a decision on that aspect. Also as a reminder, again, on the action items, please make sure to update your statements of interest.

You can look forward to receiving a poll from staff later today, as well, later in the week in relation to the leadership conversation and please keep the conversation going on the list on that aspect than any other topics think are really worth considering.

One of the next items that the working group is expected to tackle is to look at requesting early input from the GNSO stakeholder groups and consistencies as well as other ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committees as well as looking at the work plan to tackle this - the topics.

So not seeing any further hands, and to give you 29 minutes of your time back, I would like to thank you all for your participation. I'd especially like to thank (Lisa) for all the hard work she's put in, and the slides and presentation, as well as (Steve) for joining us today and assisting in this effort. So with that, thank you very much and look forward to seeing you all next week.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. With again, the meeting is adjourned. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END