

Michelle DeSmyter:Dear All, Welcome to the Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group call on Tuesday, 27 April 2016.

Michelle DeSmyter:: member
page/SOI: <https://community.icann.org/x/l4xlAw>

Michelle DeSmyter:Agenda page: <https://community.icann.org/x/-0WAAw>

Michelle DeSmyter:: If you do wish to speak during the call, please either dial into the audio bridge and give the operator the password RDS, OR click on the telephone icon at the top of the AC room to activate your AC mics. Please remember to mute your phone and mics when not talking.

Jim Galvin (Afilias):We're back to the small chat room. Any chance of changing that before we get started?

Michele Neylon:afternoon

Marika Konings:@Jim - we will be live editing on the screen so for this specific meeting we thought it would be better to have that content displayed as big as possible.

Marika Konings:We'll change it back for the next meeting.

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@Marika - Understand. Thanks.

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@Michele - morning.

Ayden Férdeline:Hello to all

Amr Elsadr:Hi Michele and all.

Richard Padilla:Hi everyone

Vlad Dinculescu:Hi All.

Aarti Bhavana:Hello all

Jennifer Gore:hello

Nathalie Coupet:Hello

Sana Ali:Hi

Chuck Gomes:Great turnout from the Data Team.

Vlad Dinculescu:Yes probably. Come back to me later

Vlad Dinculescu:Sorry :(

Amr Elsadr:Disclaimer: I've been extremely inactive on all subteams. Been busy lately, but am trying to catch up.

Vlad Dinculescu:Yes, thw Whois Task Force 2003 I believe

Vlad Dinculescu:That was superceded by the 2007 report

Lisa Phifer:@Vlad 2012 WHOIS RT report is arguably a successor to the 2007 TF report, but the reports are all relevant as history of discussion on this issue

Alex Deacon:Current focus seems to be more on data that is currently

displayed in WHOIS. I suppose this is a subset of data collected by registrars during registration. Do we need to account for data collected but not made available in the (current) WHOIS?

Vlad Dinculescu:@Lisa Completely agree. That would have been my first point if my mic hadn't failed me :)

Amr Elsadr:@Michele: There was another EWG specific to IRD. I believe Jim chaired that.

Lisa Phifer:@Amr we should probably add IRD report to list of inputs

Ayden Férdeline:@Alex - Hi, what data is being collected but not published? Do you mean registrar-registrant contract information?

Amr Elsadr:If there is still time, I'd be happy to do some work on IRD.

Lisa Phifer:@Amr that would be great - shall I add to input list and assign summary to you?

Alex Deacon:sorry - switching to land line. give me a few mins.

Amr Elsadr:@Lisa: Yes, thank you.

Vlad Dinculescu:@Michele: I think those are the most important. The WTF Final Report is a good foundation for what was required in the past, and mostly what is still required

Amr Elsadr:@Michele: Could you please repeat the question?

Amr Elsadr:Thanks.

Vlad Dinculescu:@Michele: SAC 54 and the RA gives us the "now" of what is required

Jeffrey Eckhaus:It may not be important, but could be relevant to discussions

Amr Elsadr:WTF report!! :)

Lisa Phifer:While back Scott and Andrew identified RFC 7485 is also very helpful to understand what data elements are collected today

Vlad Dinculescu:@Michele: EWG Report gives us insight into what might be required in the future, where data elements might be moving towards

Vlad Dinculescu:I don't believe so

Vlad Dinculescu:Nope, computer says no

Norm Ritchie:+1 for RFC 7485

Elaine Pruis:was the RDAP advisory reviewed?

Alex Deacon:Agree RFC7485 is a good overview of data currently displayed in WHOIS.

Elaine Pruis:the one in development

Vlad Dinculescu:@Michele: the last bit is to do with the proposed

additional contact types that are not currently in the WHOIS such as the Legal Contact.

Elaine Pruis:RYSG recently commented

Vlad Dinculescu:Yes

Elaine Pruis:(sorry I'm not in front of my desk)

Lisa Phifer:EWG report also provides principles regarding why data elements should or should not be collected/displayed or made mandatory/optional, as well as the concept of purpose-based contact data

Elaine Pruis:just asking as it could influence what has to be collected and published such as reseller info

Lisa Phifer:@Elaine do you have a link to it?

Elaine Pruis:no I'm on mobile but will send as soon as I'm in front of my desktop

Kathy Kleiman:Quick note: that on the EWG, Stephanie (author of Canadian Data Protection Law) has noted that the EWG did not go through the legal analysis under EU/Canadian law re: the collection of data elements

Lisa Phifer:SAC54 certainly triggered several emails on the data list

Alex Deacon:I don't think so - mostly we were in data collection mode.

Kathy Kleiman:That might be a controversial concept, Michele :-)

Lisa Phifer:@Kathy, it is correct that the EWG did not analyze any specific laws but rather stuck to principles - including a principle of compliance with laws

Norm Ritchie:Is "Whowas" data captured in any reports?

Norm Ritchie:yes

Stephanie Perrin:When and how???? I remember being shocked to hear about it?

Kathy Kleiman:@Lisa: there is dissent on this one. I defer to Stephanie

Sara Bockey:Apologies for being late

Berry Cobb:WHOWAS was briefly touched on in the WHOIS Survey WG, which was a survey built more on the technical requirements of a WHOIS system.

Berry Cobb:<http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/inactive/2013/whois-requirements>

Lisa Phifer:@Norm Page 29 of EWG report lists purposes for which WhoWas is important

Norm Ritchie:cool .. thakns Lisa

Berry Cobb:The survey results were submitted to the Council, but no subsequent work was spawn from that effort.

Stephanie Perrin:But it is a value added service produced by a third party, no?\

Norm Ritchie:currnetly whowas is offered by some 3rd parties ... but no one was a complete view of whowas

ELAINE PRUIS:RDAP

link <https://whois.icann.org/sites/default/files/files/gtld-rdap-operational-profile-draft-03dec15-en.pdf>

Stephanie Perrin:Thanks Norm....that was what I did recall.

Lisa Phifer:@Elaine, thanks - will add to wiki and data team list

Jody Kolker:Verisign did offer the whowas service, but it was discontinued.

Jody Kolker:but it did not contain contact information.

Alex Deacon:One could describe "whowas" as an industry innovation to fill a market need.

Norm Ritchie:+1 Alex

Alex Deacon:a great example of permissionless innovation :)

Lisa Phifer:@Berry - I can add requirements survey to wiki for completeness

Stephanie Perrin:Yes but the person who complained had to pay 10 per year to get his cellphone out.....now he uses a proxy, but cannot get the old record out

Alex Deacon:I'm not sure WHOWAS is relevant to the data subgroup. May be more relevant to another subteam.

Alex Deacon:agree

Norm Ritchie:Whowas should be discussed in all WGs

Norm Ritchie:likely should be defined first thoigh

Stephanie Perrin:Indeed.

Fabricio Vayra:FWIW: Article 29 WP 76 Opinion 2/2003 seems to say that the processing of personal data in reverse directories or multi-criteria searching services with unambiguous and informed consent by the individual is fair and lawful

Fabricio Vayra:goes to WHOWAS

Nathalie Coupet:There is no consensus on data collection

Kathy Kleiman:@Fabricio: there are other opinions of the Article 29 WP that indicate otherwise...

Stephanie Perrin:THE catch is the unambiguous consent....it has never

existed.

Nathalie Coupet:Consent is utopic worldwide

Lisa Phifer:re WhoWas, covered in EWG report recs 49, 50, 166, including definition of WhoWas

Nathalie Coupet:Humans always trade privacy for immediate gains

Fabricio Vayra:@ Kathy, Do you mean like this one: Article 29 WP 33 Opinion 5/2000 "Specific and informed consent of the subscriber must be obtained prior to the inclusion of his personal data into all kinds of public directories (traditional telephony, mobile telephony, electronic mail, electronic signatures etc.) used for reverse or multi-criteria searches." Implying that once consent is received it's ok.

Nick Shorey - UK Gov:on this point: What data? What users? What privacy? - would be my suggestion for order of approach

Nick Shorey - UK Gov:To Chuck's comment

Luc Seufer:What about the rectification and erasure rights?

Luc Seufer:It's tied to the consent IMHO.

Sana Ali:@Nick I disagree, what privacy doesn't make sense. What purpose should be first because it leads the discussion about the rest of the questions

Lisa Phifer:@Nick - the charter recommends agreeing upon purposes and users before data so that data needs can be put into context

Sana Ali:+1 Lisa

Vlad Dinculescu:@Stephanie: +1

Sana Ali:+1 To stephanie's point

Jim Galvin (Afilias):+1 to stephanie's point

Chris Pelling:+1 to Stephanie

Kathy Kleiman:@Lisa: we agreed that the order is noit key

Stephanie Perrin:Purpose of the RDS collection use and disclosure comes first

Kathy Kleiman:Not a single drafter of the Charter in Marrakech thought that we (WG) would not rethink and reevaluate the order

Lisa Phifer:This is really a venn diagram - a large set of possible data, a subset of data for each user/purpose, and a subset of that as permitted by laws in each applicable jurisdiction. (not a perfect description, but the point is that all are inter-related)

Sana Ali:subject to purpose

Nathalie Coupet:Striking a balance between privacy and security.

Sana Ali:yes

Kathy Kleiman:(at least the ones I talked with)

Jim Galvin (Afilias):I'm not supporting privacy first, per se, but I do think it is integral to all steps. What I think is first is the "purpose of the data".

Jennifer Gore:i agree

Nathalie Coupet:Privacy AND security

Alex Deacon:I think the reality of this discussion is that these three topics are intertwined and interrelated.

Sana Ali:+1 Agree Purpose absolutely have to be first. Let's not equate purpose with privacy

Fabricio Vayra:According to Article 29 WP 76 Opinion 2/2003 "essential to determine in very clear terms what is the purpose of the Whois and which purpose(s) can be considered as legitimate and compatible to the original purpose" -- original [purpose was defined in the green and white papers that established WHOIS / ICANN.

Daniel K. Nanghaka:I think the data must seek purpose before it is served

Jennifer Gore:yes

Vlad Dinculescu:yes

Jennifer Gore:that seems reasonable

Daniel K. Nanghaka:@Sana, Purpose cannot be equated with Privacy

ELAINE PRUIS:yes

Amr Elsadr:Hmmm....., not sure I'll be able to finish everything on IRD by Friday, but will try.

Sana Ali:@Daniel, that's what I'm saying, but it seems to keep happening in the discussion.

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@amr - there were two IRD working groups. I co-chaired the first. the second was an expert working group and I chaired that group. What do you need with respect to the two groups?

Farell FOLLY:hello all..

Lisa Phifer:Silence?

Chris Pelling:cross line ?

Luc Seuffer:let them give their pin code!

Farell FOLLY:i was in since the beginning, but I decided not to intervene before the time slot for my sub group came

Amr Elsadr:@Jim: I'm thinking to summarize the final reports of those two groups as part of the "data" sub-team, along with the translation/transliteration PDP. Any insight you can offer would be great. I'll

get in touch with you offline, if that's OK.

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@amr - that would be great.

Amr Elsadr:Just thinking that IRD is something that should be considered as part of "data elements".

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@amr - IRD does affect the quality of the data that is collected. I think that is pretty straightforward.

Lisa Phifer:@Amr, is that GNSO PDP on Translation/Transliteration of Contact Information and Final Report (2015)

Amr Elsadr:@Lisa: Yes. That one is rather straight forward. The other two may need some more work on my part. :)

Amr Elsadr:@Jim: Certainly agree.

Jim Galvin (Afilias):Two other principles I think that matter are what is required in the presence of translation and transliteration and what is required to support an appropriate user experience.

Luc Seufer:Iron Mountain for their RDE did

Jim Galvin (Afilias):That's where things get interesting because there are a few different opinions about requirements versus options.

Amr Elsadr:@Jim: User experience is one of the things I'm thinking about, if by user you mean registrant. Have heard from registrars in my region that they are eager to provide end-to-end services in Arabic to their clients.

Amr Elsadr:@Jim: and on what's required re: translation/transliteration, the standing policy is that it isn't mandatory, but I don't need to tell you that. ;-)

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@amr - I carefully worded my comment to say, "when T&T is present, what is required?" Issues include tagging (language and script), noting which is authoritative, keeping related elements in sync, and other logging considerations. :-)

Amr Elsadr:)

Marika Konings:David, you may be on mute

Nick Shorey - UK Gov:Interesting point Susan

Nathalie Coupet:No sound

Greg Shatan:Street address is not per se required -- just a mailing address.

Alex Deacon:So - is facebook's HG mailing address personal or sensitive data?

Alex Deacon:HQ

Susan Kawaguchi:@Alex neither in my opinion it is publicly available

Daniel K. Nanghaka:Street Address are attached to users location which I

could term as Sensitive Data

Susan Kawaguchi:As Kathy describes it we may have 3 categories personal, sensitive and commercial data.

Susan Kawaguchi:I just want to be sure that we do not convey to commercial entities protection that they do not have a legal right to

Kathy Kleiman:+1 Daniel

Lisa Phifer:@Susan, do we have documents included in our inventory that detail data protection laws that apply to commercial entities?

Alex Deacon:@susan - agreed there will be multiple categories.

Luc Seuffer:The EU Data Protection Regulation is actually the most important IMHO.

Daniel K. Nanghaka:I agree with Kathy the categorisation of the Data

Kathy Kleiman:@Susan, every 501(c)(3) non-profit entity in the US is a corporation - required by law

Susan Kawaguchi:@ Lisa not sure have not done that review

Kathy Kleiman:and some deal with the most sensitive data of all

Susan Kawaguchi:but every corporation in the US is not a 501(c) 3 so that could be an easy distinction to start with

Daniel K. Nanghaka:Data such as Phone Contacts, addresses whether email or not is sensitive data

Greg Shatan:Not every 501(c)(3) has "sensitive information". Indeed, the vast majority do not, and should be considered no different than any other corporation. Which, in most cases, they are under relevant law.

Kiran:Hi Kathy, many 501(c)(3)s do deal with highly sensitive topics, but they have to have contactable information displayed and registered by law. Why would that same data be inappropriate to display in an RDS system?

Kiran:Also agree with Susan that the distinction is easily made

Lisa Phifer:@Susan, @Kathy - could be useful to include WHOIS Reg ID study findings which differentiated between type of entity (eg corp, individual) and presence of potentially commercial activities associated with domain

Susan Kawaguchi:I agree Lisa please add to the list

Kathy Kleiman:@Lisa: and found that banks used privacy/proxy extensively

Kathy Kleiman:I see no reason to include this study

Kiran Malancharuvil:I think it's very important to include the study. If you want to make the point, it must be examined

Daniel K. Nanghaka:Banks use privacy proxy because of the sensitive data that they are using like transactions details and this data cannot be made open

Fabricio Vayra:According to Article 29 WP 76 Opinion 2/2003 "registration of domain names by individuals raises different legal considerations than that of companies or other legal persons registering domain names" ... "the publication of certain information about the company or organisation (such as their identification and their physical address) is often a requirement by law in the framework of the commercial or professional activities they perform"

Farell FOLLY:I agree that the study should be included in our review
steve metalitz:@Kathy, a 501 c 3 organization need not be a corporation but it cannot be an individual. [https://www.irs.gov/Charities-&-Non-Profits/Charitable-Organizations/Organizational-Test-Internal-Revenue-Code-Section-501\(c\)\(3\)](https://www.irs.gov/Charities-&-Non-Profits/Charitable-Organizations/Organizational-Test-Internal-Revenue-Code-Section-501(c)(3))

Susan Kawaguchi:None of my banks use PP I wont do business with them but i also require they registry lock their domain names

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Steve

Kiran Malancharuvil:Also, frankly, just because banks may use p/p because it's permissible for them to do so doesn't mean that is a good idea. We should examine the issue as a whole, it would impact all equally.

Luc Seufer:Sorry to be late to the party but have you looked at the GDPR? 2017 is just around the corner.

Daniel K. Nanghaka:I think there must be neutral data handler such that incase there is a request of data about the individual, the individual must give consent to the data handler to grant access to the requester

Michele Neylon:Irish banks all use .ie domain names so the entire question is moot :)

Greg Shatan:Under the Data Protection Act, Sensitive Personal Data does not include phone contacts and addresses. It does include:(a) the racial or ethnic origin of the data subject,(b) his political opinions,(c) his religious beliefs or other beliefs of a similar nature,(d) whether he is a member of a trade union (within the meaning of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992),(e) his physical or mental health or condition,(f) his sexual life,(g) the commission or alleged commission by him of any offence, or(h) any proceedings for any offence committed or alleged to have been committed by him, the disposal of such proceedings or the

sentence of any court in such proceedings."

Susan Kawaguchi:@ Daniel That doesn't work well in acquisitions, MA and other transactions

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Greg

steve metalitz:@Luc, impact of GDPR on opinions under 1995 directive has been raised on list. When we get to question (iv) this may be addressed.

Nick Shorey - UK Gov:let's be careful on this 'banks use pp' statement

Luc Seuffer:thanks Steve

Daniel K. Nanghaka:@Susan, Yes, it also has restrictions

Grace Mutung'u:I did the African Union Convention on Cybersecurity...it is still a work in progress as it is not yet in effect but it is worth considering as it is an authority

Kiran Malancharuvil:It's an ongoing debate whether it would be within ICANNs remit. The issue needs to be examined.

Kathy Kleiman:@Susan: Mergers & Acquisitions are the essence of corporate data that is kept private - so that there is expressly not disclosure prior to full market knowledge per SEC mandate

Amr Elsadr:@Grace: Is the AUC on cybersecurity an authority?

Grace Mutung'u:@Amr, it is, or will be once it is in effect

Fabricio Vayra:Article 29 WP 217 Opinion 4/2014 says that "personal data shall only be processed (a) based on the data subject's unambiguous consent; or if -briefly put -" ... "(c) compliance with a legal obligation imposed on the controller" and government regulation would fall under this.

Daniel K. Nanghaka:The AUC on Cybersecurity is still a work in progress

Stephanie Perrin:Could the record please delete my apologies for not making it to this meeting, since I made it after all?

Marika Konings:@Stephanie - done

Stephanie Perrin:thanks!

Amr Elsadr:@Grace: My understanding is (and I may be wrong) is that local legislation is required as a follow-up to the convention, because it isn't actually authoritative as far as member states are concerned.

Grace Mutung'u:depends on the country...For example, in Kenya you can depend on conventions in court even before ratification

Farell FOLLY:Grace; I was unable to download this convention document from the link provided, can you share it with me again ?

Fabricio Vayra:@Kathy, is that an opinion or fact?

Fabricio Vayra:I'd hate to base our work on speculation

Lisa Phifer:@Kathy we haven't received a request from Peter Kim pian to join subteam, we will follow up

Amr Elsadr:@Farell: Is this what you're looking for? <http://au.int/en/cyberlegislation>

Grace Mutung'u:@ Farell, here you go http://pages.au.int/sites/default/files/en_AU%20Convention%20on%20CyberSecurity%20Pers%20Data%20Protec%20AUCyC%20adopted%20Mala bo.pdf

Lisa Phifer:Stephanie's statement is indeed in the privacy team's list, summarized by Nathalie Coupet

Farell FOLLY:yes thank you both Amr and Grace

Greg Shatan:That's not what McIntyre says. It dealt only with an election law, and did not cover speech generally, except in dictum (the musings of the court). As such, it has no legal effect outside the issue of election pamphlets.

Fabricio Vayra:@Stephanie, or wait for the report comes out and not speculate on the outcome

Amr Elsadr:@Grace: Thanks. The link I found isn't working. :)

Luc Seufer:They are rebranding to European Data Protection Board

Kathy Kleiman:@Lisa: it belongs with the EWG Report. Per ICANN's transparency, Final Reports are always issued with their dissents; final decisions of the ICANN are similarly always listed with the dissent. Tx Lisa for including in the bullet lists!

Greg Shatan:Of course, one can use McIntyre to advocate for broader things. But that's advocacy, not a statement of the case's holding.

Stephanie Perrin:no sounds???

Kathy Kleiman:@Lisa: shall I have Peter Kim pian write to you directly to join this subgroup? He keeps trying...

Lisa Phifer:@Kathy, I have asked GNSO sec to reach out to Peter

Luc Seufer:They will starting 2017

Stephanie Perrin:They are a group of data protection authorities. Each one has its own powers of enforcement.

Fabricio Vayra:Great point, Steve.

Sana Ali:+1 Kathy on including the Article 29 opinions

Amr Elsadr:@Kathy: +1

Luc Seufer:Agreed

Chris Pelling:+1 to Kathy

steve metalitz:The material (opinions, working documents, letters etc.) issued by the Article 29 Working Party (Art. 29 WP), available on this website reflect the views only of the Art. 29 WP which has an advisory status and acts independently. (Art. 29 WP website)

Kathy Kleiman:@Lisa: Could you kindly put EWG Dissent in brackets next to EWG Recommendations. That will keep the point and allow us to continue the discussions!

Kathy Kleiman:Tx All for the discussion!

Greg Shatan:Maybe there's been no enforcement actions in this area because there's been no violations. That seems at least as valid a conclusion.

Fabricio Vayra:To be clear, is one of these documents the March 12, 2007 letter to Vint that says "The Article 29 WP therefore recommends to modify the proposal in such a way that at least for private domain holders that use domains solely in a non-commercial context the name of the domain holder should only be published in the WHOIS service with the explicit, freely given consent of the data subject"?

Lisa Phifer:RegID report was tasked to answer GAC questions identified as important to understanding WHOIS data actually supplied by registrants of various types, engaged in various kinds of activities

Fabricio Vayra:Thanks, David!

Marika Konings:In red, input that was received on the mailing list following the circulation of the template.

Sana Ali:sorry!

Stephanie Perrin:yes

Fabricio Vayra:I think yes

Susan Prosser:yes.

Chuck Gomes:Kathy has her hand up

Fabricio Vayra:I think the Green and White papers should be added.

Kiran Malancharuvil:Agree Fab

Greg Shatan:+1 Fab

Susan Prosser:Also agree with Fab on the other docs

Lisa Phifer:please recap that list

Kathy Kleiman:I think we need to do a summary first

Fabricio Vayra:Summaries were already submitted for Green and White papers

Stephanie Perrin:How about the art 29 opinion on purpose limitation 3/2013.....could be a typo, the Opinion on whois is 2/2003

Greg Shatan:The docs named by Kathy are really privacy and data protection documents and should be (and are) dealt with under that list.

Kiran Malancharuvil:I also think some of the international laws that have been identified with relation to consumer protection and transparency of contact information is relevant to purpose.

Stephanie Perrin:They are purpose docs

Greg Shatan:Disagree.

Fabricio Vayra:@Kathy, I already submitted the summaries and both have extensive terms to purpose

Stephanie Perrin:please note the typos in the doc being displayed.

Kiran Malancharuvil:Summary was completed by Fab already

Lisa Phifer:STephanie which document please

Greg Shatan:They already exist, Susan....

Stephanie Perrin:Art 29 2/2003 on WHOis, art 29 3/2013 on purpose

Kathy Kleiman:@Fabricio - sorry to miss that!@

Stephanie Perrin:Coming soon....

Fabricio Vayra:@Kathy. No worries. To make it easier to find in the emails, summaries sent Mon 4/11/2016 12:08 PM

Kathy Kleiman:@Fabricio - I'll read closely!

Klaus Stoll:I have a lot of cut outs in audio, is it just me?

Nathalie Coupet:Could I have more time to find other sources? I'm sure there are many more.

Nathalie Coupet:Yes

Nathalie Coupet:Sure.

Chuck Gomes:Keep in mind that we can always add info sources as we proceed with our work.

Greg Aaron:+1 on what Stephanie just said

Kiran Malancharuvil:I can't hear the speaker

Kathy Kleiman:@Susan: the ones being listed are directly related to Purpose (Article 29 WP)

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Susan P

Daniel K. Nanghaka:please dial me

Daniel K. Nanghaka:Could you please dial me - I got a call dropped

Kathy Kleiman:Needs to be considered....

Maryan Rizinski:Susan, all, I will miss the rest of the meeting because of a

family engagement for which I apologize. I will listen to the recording later this evening. Thank you and have a great day!

Kathy Kleiman:Comments are good!

Kathy Kleiman:@Lisa: are we still missing some summaries??

Stephanie Perrin:Lisa good point. Sadly I have not had time to look at everything yet.

Daniel K. Nanghaka:Please dial me - I have network issues

Kathy Kleiman:How can we get those?

Nathalie Coupet:Is the psychology of the end-user taken into account at this stage in order to appreciate whether the purposes considered will actually meet their goals?

Daniel K. Nanghaka:+256772898298

Kiran Malancharuvil:Mine are missing, sorry. Getting to the group today.

Kathy Kleiman:Tx Lisa!

Marika Konings:For the latest versions of the check lists and summaries, please see <https://community.icann.org/x/p4xlAw>.

Kathy Kleiman:Tx Kiran!

Sana Ali:Thanks for that link Marika

Kiran Malancharuvil:Thanks for your patience!

Amr Elsadri:@Marika: Thnx.

Sana Ali:@Nathalie, by psychology do we mean end user expectations or something else?

Nathalie Coupet:I can do it

Nathalie Coupet:@Sana: yes

Nathalie Coupet:Yes for expectations, fears reactions, etc.

Lisa Phifer:Nathalie, you may wish to refer to the Individual Internet User purpose as outlined in the EWG report, and to Carlton Samuels' blog

Sana Ali:Thanks for the clarification, Nathalie, are there examples of documents we could turn to for this kind of information? If you have suggestions I'd be happy to look into it as I certainly think it is an important element to be considered.

Sana Ali:*be

Kathy Kleiman:I like that phrase -- Embarrassment of riches!

Nathalie Coupet:@Lisa: Where can I find Carlton Samuels' blog?

Lisa Phifer:Refer to the Purpose team's consolidated summaries, page 41, and linked blog

Nathalie Coupet:@Lisa: Tx!

Kiran Malancharuvil:Slightly burned out and I even joined late! :)
Kiran Malancharuvil:Agree with Stephanie
Kiran Malancharuvil:Can we continue on the list?
Chris Pelling:we could rotate each section on each call
Kathy Kleiman:Chuck - sorry, where is your question? Is it in writing?
Chris Pelling:giving a fair chance for each section
Stephanie Perrin:no stamina, compared to the CCWG
Fabricio Vayra:Thanks, Chuck!
Fabricio Vayra:Thanks, Susan
Ayden Férdeline:Thanks to all
Kathy Kleiman:Tx Susan, Chuck, All!
Luc Seufer:Merci à tous !
Susan Prosser:thanks all
Amr Elsadr:Thanks all. Bye.
Vlad Dinculescu:Thanks All.
Greg Shatan:By all!
Susan Kawaguchi:Thanks all!
Jim Galvin (Afilias):thanks all bye
Chris Pelling:thanks all
Sana Ali:Bye everyone!