

**ICANN Transcription
Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group
Tuesday 24 May 2016 at 1600 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group call on the Tuesday 24 May 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-24may16-en.mp3>

Operator: Your recording has started; you may now proceed.

Michelle DeSmyter: Great, thank you, Zack, okay, good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the Next Gen RDS PDP Working Group call on the 24th of May, 2016 at 1600 UTC. In the interest of time today, there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants, attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect Room, so if you're only on the audio bridge please let yourself be known now.

All right, thank you, I'd also like to remind you all please to state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise, with this I will hand the call over to Michele Neylon.

Michele Neylon: Thank you, good morning, afternoon, evening everybody, I'm Michele Neylon speaking for the record, I'm going to be trying to share this call today as (Chuck) is indisposed, and please bear with me because I'm a bit stuck – I'm

in a hotel in Orlando so the doors might be thrown open by crazy people trying to get in here because they might want me out of the room.

Okay, so if anybody has an update to their SOI or anything, please let us know, if you're on the Adobe Connect you can see the instructions there on how to update your statement of interest and if anybody has any questions about that, please let one of the co-chairs or ICANN staff know and we'll be more than happy to help you.

So today's call agenda, you can see it up there on the Adobe Connect, we're looking at the Helsinki meeting plans and then we're going to move on from that to the possible requirements list. So on the Helsinki meeting plans – okay so (Lisa) is uploading something, waiting for that to go up – okay so for this section here I think, Marika Konings is going to take the lead, off to you Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika, if I can make up my mind on which consult I'm going to use – heavy breathing on my side of the line – so as you may recall on the last meeting we briefly discussed the plans for the Helsinki meeting to a separate session that are currently scheduled in relation to this topic, the first one being a cross community session that has been identified as one of the topics that has a broader interest than just the GESTONE and as such it was the last to feature in one of the cross community sessions which are scheduled to take place in the afternoons of the meeting and this particular one is currently scheduled for Monday from 5:00 to 6:30.

I think that you are also aware that the meeting – it's a new concept and it's the first time that it's been implemented so learning and adjusting as we go along and it's true for both the staff – we're also the community side so we're trying to figure out, you know, what works fast and how to make best use of the time that we have available to focus on these topics.

And so the real objective of this cross-community session is to encourage and facilitate the cross-community participation and discussion. So the leadership team, having reviewed, you know, where we're currently at and where we anticipate to be hopefully by Helsinki, saw that the topic would probably be easiest to manage both from a community perspective but also hopefully will evolve into useful input for the working group and would be the focus on the possible requirements that a community believes it should be supported by next generation RDS.

And so to that end of course we can make, you know, materials available and we found really that we can provide some – an overview of what the group has gathered for that date and, you know, hopefully working with the members also be able to put – participate but at the same time making sure that there's enough movement and opportunity for the community members to join in that conversation.

And some of the details have been outlined in the document that was shared yesterday and I think we are trying – we are suggesting that we may need to make the time and suggestions that people make are also where something is done as that will hopefully allow some more people to speak and we would also plan to have kind of taking notes during those interventions, and be able to provide – put those requirements that are being suggested on the big screen, which will also avoid people repeating what has already been said – some of those that have been suggested.

And so I think that, you know, at the end of the session we hope that we will have a big list and a good sense of the requirements and also, you know, hopefully additions to the – what the working group has already produced and then we can maybe conclude with a kind of temperature in the room on the foundational question of whether people believe that based on the possible requirements and whether a next generation RDS would be needed or are those requirements also able to be returned (unintelligible).

I think that's a good – the structure and format that the leadership is putting forward as a suggestion to the working group so they were requesting assistance from all of you, whether you think that is something that will work well and would be a good use of the time that has been annotated for this section which is 90 minutes, or do you have any other suggestions or ideas that you think should be explored to make sure that the most (unintelligible) out of this.

I want you to think about that and I'll move on to the next meeting that's also scheduled, we'll also have a big talk behind – on Tuesday morning currently from 8:00 to 12:00 with some breaks in between, which is basically our regular face to face meeting of the working group.

So I think what you see on here in the document where it's basically looking at the work plan and where the work plan indicates where we'll be at and of course that works well with, you know, this may need to be adjusted depending on the progress that is made over the next couple of meetings that we have between now and the Helsinki meeting.

And I think I'd also like to see if we can take advantage of having people in the room, although noting that we'll also have a remote participation available to have some brief introductions from those members that didn't have an opportunity to do so at the last face to face meeting.

As far all those present, maybe to have pieces of paper in front of everyone which you can write your notes so there's a way to connect the names to faces. And of course the difference with the face to face meetings is going to be that it's going to be open to observers, the public meeting but the working committee of course will be given to the working group members to continue their deliberation to cut out specific at times, so to allow for Q&A from those attending to ask about the work status and plan roughly to provide the input on the working sessions there and the working group.

So I think that's what we have for you at the moment, so would encourage you to share any feedback or input you may have, we have been requested to provide the description by tomorrow and those need to go into that meeting but I have that noted especially for the working group face to face meeting, we may need to make adjustments to the agenda based on where we're at but we hope at least this will be a good indication to those that are (unintelligible) and what they can expect to be as well as provide some guidance on what – as well as what is accepted to prepare for.

In that regard, we'll also be working with some materials and possibly Webinars or some recorded sessions to see what works best to really make sure that we spend as little as – as little time as possible with the meetings actually focusing on (unintelligible) to focus on the discussion so anything we can do to facilitate that will be helpful.

So I think I'll pause there and see if there are any hands or comments or questions. So if anything comes to your mind please share that by the end of today so we can factor that in a little bit and go ahead and submit the description as is to the meeting requested in the schedule. Any hands? So I'll give it back to you Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Marika, Michele for the transcript, just, you know, for those of you who haven't looked at the Helsinki schedule, please do take a moment to have a look at it, you'll see that unlike the more traditional ICANN meeting formats, there are far fewer sessions being held in parallel, so the number of conflicts or potential conflicts up against any session has been reduced quite dramatically. I think the idea behind all this is to facilitate more cross community, wider community, whatever term you're comfortable with – engagement around policy and policy items.

Okay, so any questions or comments or anything on this thing for the – on the meeting in Helsinki? Klaus is asking on the chat where he can find the schedule for Helsinki? It – it should be – there was a link posted to it – it

should be – oh there it is – I think there's a link posted to it on the chat thing box on the right, and Marika just put it in the chat box again for you there as well.

Also, just for those of you that aren't aware, the meeting teams are finalizing some final tweaks I believe with the overall schedule for Helsinki, because several groups have tried to organize meetings and sessions and things, just a lot of moving of stuff around at the moment.

Okay, next item on the agenda, so the continued work of draft – possible grounds for the Q&A steps, is this the one with (Greg) – where (Greg) was going to talk about this Marika? Or am I misunderstanding something?

Marika Konings: This is Marika, yes, sorry, trying to get off of mute here – I think it was first maybe with the, you know, update of where we're at and then a deep dive into some of the comments that we have posted and we were hoping that maybe he could talk to those and – but maybe he can briefly give a status update of where we're at and highlight and hopefully everyone had a chance to review the document that we posted together on the agenda as well as the recording from last session which has the detail on the structure of the document and.

Michele Neylon: Okay so I believe David Cake was actually going to look after this item, so David Cake, I'll hand it over to you.

David Cake: Right, yes, can you hear me?

Michele Neylon: Yes.

David Cake: Yes, so the leadership team has been thinking about the requirement process, we – you should have a possible requirements draft to think about where we realize that this is a draft that has – it's a, you know, it's got a lot of items in it – but we want to be very sure that we are not – that any possible

requirements and we want to emphasize of course that this is a possible requirement, there's no – we have not yet at all begun to deliberate as to whether we have consensus on these things, actual requirements, but the list of possible requirements so first remind everyone that you can add to that list, please do, we don't want to sort of go back and – go back to the sub-teams but if you were part of one of those sub-teams, you certainly should look at the, you know, the documents you looked at and see if they are well represented in the requirements document.

But we are starting to have some concerns and these are concerns that Greg Aaron offered which is that the requirements document is not doing a very good job or may – there's an issue about whether the requirements in there are definitely, like, business or policy requirements in the sense of requirements for what an RDS in abstract should do, what we need it to do, and the informs out work in phase one and requirements sort of are more about the functional design of a system and the – should really be more informing our working phase two. So that is an issue that we have been thinking about, so I'd like to ask Greg if he was able to share his feedback with?

Greg Aaron: Hello David Cake, can you hear me?

David Cake: Yes.

Greg Aaron: Okay, this is Greg Aaron, as David Cake described, this draft document has pulled in pieces of information from I think at least one document, mainly the expert working group final report, and what I started to see was what David Cake described, which is some of these requirements are actually very detailed and have to do with system design.

And a lot of these items have assumptions built into them, an example was there should be a reverse query capability, but that actually assumes some

more fundamental things have already been decided, for example, that there will be differentiated access.

And that goes – that differentiated access question is really more of a phase one question that we have to talk about, who are going to be the users, what are the acceptable purposes of accessing the data, who should have access to what, so basically what I've suggested is after we have a list of all of these possible ideas, we need to do triage, we need to decide which ones are really phase questions and then which might be phase two or even phase three and defer those, we can come back to those later, decide whether they're still applicable depending upon what the working group has decided through consensus, etcetera.

So we can put this material into a grid, we can try to identify what phase is really related to and then concentrate on perhaps on the phase one items. One piece of feedback I have is that we're supposed to go through all of the documents, find all possible requirements between now and May 31st, and – but I haven't seen a lot of that happening on the list yet, so my question back to the organizers and the leaders is, is that – are you getting the material from other sources to put into this draft or are we behind on that work?

David Cake: We're still sort of open to other sources – we are actively – the leadership is actually – we are very open to the workings of adding.

Greg Aaron: I cannot hear David Cake.

David Cake: Sorry, I had moved my microphone, I don't think we are actively taking expositional requirements from specific sources, but we are certainly still open to the members of the working group contributing and adding additional sources.

Greg Aaron: Okay, this is Greg, so my feedback is that there are probably lots and lots of other pieces of material that need to go into this draft from – since all those

papers we identified in the sub-teams. But what I don't see happening now is members of the working group going through and actually contributing that material into this summary document. I don't see any way that that's going to be done and finished this week.

David Cake: That's – that's certainly a concern. But your right about the – what do you suggest we do about the issue of separating out relevant?

Greg Aaron: This is Greg, I don't know if I have a suggestion, but the – I think the working group did a good job of identifying a lot of relevant documents, and if we don't find the phase – all of the phase one questions at this time – we're going to have to go back and do it later, which would be a – probably inefficient. So my question is back to the leaders in the group which is we've got all those documents, it sounds like we need to go through the summaries and put them into this – some of that material into this new document, I just haven't seen it really happening thus far other than the staff summary of the EWG material. So if people have time to do that, they need to step forward or we need to do it some other way, but right now it doesn't – it doesn't seem like we've made a lot of headway against this deadline of the end of the month. But I know that there's a lot of material that's probably very useful and highly relevant.

David Cake: (Lisa), you've got your hand raised.

Lisa Phifer: Yes, thank you David Cake, this is Lisa Phifer for the record, Greg, your suggestion of converting the possible requirements list that is in the first draft into a grid format so that we can then start categorizing the possible requirements by phases, seems to be a very useful one, we took a quick crack at that yesterday but I don't know if you've had a chance to see that in your email, do you believe that it would be helpful for us to recirculate the possible requirements list in that format as a way of encouraging some structure as we progress and secondly, do you see that something like calling

for volunteers to cover specific documents, key input documents, might be a way of encouraging filling out the – expanding the grid that we already have?

Greg Aaron: This is Greg, thanks (Lisa), I don't know if the format is as important right now as finding the actual core material. It's – it might be good use of somebody's time at a later point to put it into the grid, which I think is a good format, I think it seems to be working, but we – that's kind of detail that we need to do after we've got the raw material, all right?

Now I don't think we have all the raw material or close to it. I think one question is the sub-teams went through all those documents and are most familiar with them, so are you going to ask – one approach would be to have the sub-teams extract requirements out of the material they already created, the summaries that they already created. Or have somebody take that work on themselves, say look at all the summaries of all the documents, pull out the relevant material.

David Cake: Yes, I know one of the issues there is that not all relevant material was covered by the sub-teams, but only addressed some specific areas. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika, and also in addition to what David Cake said, I think that although they weren't quite complete I think they did operate very much on an individual basis by individual documents and those were then added to the summaries for those and I think we did cover quite a bit actually to get a more collective discussion and conversation and observations.

I'm not really sure if taking it back to the sub-teams will lead you to the desired results, it may actually (unintelligible), I think people that did put forward documents did feel quite strongly about those and already felt that those were key inputs that needed to be observed by the working groups so maybe we could, you know, try to have – raise up some of those documents in a kind of table format and hopefully get people to follow through and to take on some of those documents.

(Unintelligible) that we already identified a number of key inputs and maybe that is a way to at least start designating documents and volunteers to do the work, definitely will require some people coming forward and being willing to go through this and add to the list.

David Cake: Right, do we have any other more comments on this item? Greg, do you have further comments? Or Michele?

Michele Neylon: Michele for the record, yes, I think we need to start moving forward with some of this, you know, the – if there are sources of documents, sources of material that people feel need to be identified, addressed, looked at, studied, whatever – that’s great – but we shouldn’t spend too much time saying that we’re missing something, I mean if there’s something missing and we know what it is, let’s, you know, put it forward.

It just seems rather than talking about potentially missing something, I mean ultimately any output from this group is going to end up going through multiple iterations of public comments, we’re already doing outreach to different groups, etcetera, etcetera, so if there are big gaps, gaping holes, whatever – then I would expect them to be filled at that time, I mean, what I’m just a bit conscious of is if we spend too much time worrying about potential gaps, we’ll still be stuck in this phase in a year’s time, thanks.

David Cake: Thank you Michele, Greg, would you like to – do you have more comments in response?

Greg Aaron: Thank you, this is Greg here, well our summary document so far has pieces from the EWG report, okay, but I can’t recall if it has anything from any other document. There are some very obviously holes, we don’t have anything from the ASAC papers, I don’t think we have anything from the who is review team report, those will be obvious places to look.

So what was great is staff when through the EWG report and pulled the material out, somebody needs to do the same for other key documents, those are fairly easy to identify, we've already identified a lot of them. That's what the sub-teams did, so I think we know where to go, it's just a matter of somebody doing it.

David Cake: Okay, thank you Greg. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Sorry, it took me a while to get off of mute, so what we asked a week ago, was exactly what Greg just suggested, the requirements list there is from the EWG report, that was made very clear with the understanding that it shouldn't be restricted to that, and so that's what we asked, so if there are requirements from the SSAC reports that should be added that aren't covered from the EWG report, what we've asked people to do starting a week ago, was to identify those.

Don't have to elaborate on them, just identify those and yet to date after a week, no additional requirements have been added. Now as much as I hate to agree with Michele – sorry Michele – the, you know, we can spin our wheels for a long time waiting for people to do that, I thought it would be relatively easy for those who reviewed and summarized some of the documents to see if there's anything missing and just communicate those.

Now Greg, you talked about starting with the raw materials, I must admit I'm kind of getting mixed messages from your email messages and what you said today, the whole idea of this requirements list is just to be a raw materials list as you suggested, and we want to make it as complete as possible to start with.

And then we can whittle it down and we can move things to other phases and so forth, and that's kind of what I'm hearing you say today is okay, let's get this raw materials list of all possible requirements that we can think of now, we can add more later, and then we will start whittling it down later and that

works for me, I think that works for all of us, but we do need people to see if there's some missing, for those of you that have been specializing in the privacy area, it's a great opportunity for you to look at the requirements that came out of the EWG report on privacy and see which ones you would add and if you can connect that to one of our sources that's great.

It doesn't have to be, but that's nice if it can be. For those of you that focused on purpose, same approach, like Michele said, we can drag this part out for weeks and months if we wanted to, I personally don't see a lot of value in that, let's start with the list, we can add them as we go, my personal preference is that we would give – unless somebody can really convince us that it will be productive that we stick with our deadline of next week, try and finalize this first cut of requirements list a week from now, with whatever people add, and then as we discover more requirements when we start deliberation, we can add those. Just stretching it out for several more weeks with the amount of response we've had in a week, isn't encouraging to me.

Now again, I'm open to be convinced that it will be more productive in the next week or if we extend it further than that that it will be productive, but so far I'm not convinced it will be so I'm looking for being convinced.

David Cake: Thank you Chuck, Michele you want to respond?

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Michele for the record, no I'm not going to respond to Chuck because that would be too much for one day. No just on the – being more serious – on the, you know, these gaps and things like that, okay so, I'm going to pick on Greg, so Greg I know you've been involved with SSAC and probably I think you still are involved with SSAC, maybe you're not but I know you were in the past, if you feel that something needs to be addressed with regards to the SSAC documents, then maybe you could take a first stab at that, that might be helpful. I mean Greg, if you want to respond, thanks.

Greg Aaron: Thank you for using that very old working group trick on me Michele, actually I'm working on that right now. I think we're all on the same page which is we've got all these document summaries; somebody needs to distill them. So people need to step forward and do that or staff needs to be assigned to do it just as staff did with the EWG report. All I'm saying is there's work that needs to be done and right now it's not proceeding.

David Cake: Thank you, actually staff have said in chat that it's actually Chuck that did the hard work, but thank you for that and I think Alan – Alan Greenberg is next in the speaking order.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much, this discussion has been going on for a while, what I'm hearing is there are people who believe there is work that really has to be done and that we're at a disadvantage if we don't do it, and despite the hundred or two hundred people on this working group and the fifty or sixty people on – at this meeting, no one is willing to step up to do it. If that indeed is where we are, I think we have a problem going forward. Just noting it, there's a lot of work that's going to have to be done in this whole process, if we're having trouble finding volunteers at this point, I'm worried, thank you.

David Cake: Thank you Alan, Greg is that an old hand or do you have something else? That was an old hand but Michele, you want to say something?

Michele Neylon: Oh, I have plenty of things to say, thanks – Michele for the record, okay, so just seeing on the chat there are a couple of people are volunteering to do various things, but the concern that they're voicing is around the deadline. So Chuck and others, personally I have absolutely no issue with pushing the deadline out by a few days if that helps to move things forward and bring about world peace, does anybody have any objections to extending that deadline? To give our people the time to do some of this work?

David Cake: Yes, and I'm hearing concerns about people want to do this but it's a lot of work as well, so that's probably – does anyone want to ask – anyone want to

comment on that question about if we extend the deadline slightly, is that going to be a huge problem if people were finding just a little bit too difficult, obviously we don't want this to go on for a very long time.

Michele Neylon: I mean just proposing – this is Michele again – I mean just say this hypothetically, let's say we extend the deadline out to Friday of next week, just, you know, hypothetically, would that be helpful for those people who are willing to do some of this work or do you need more time? I mean, if you can just give us something to work with here in terms of how much time do you feel you need. So I'm seeing on the chat that (Natalie) is happy with extending it to the Friday, it would help her. Does anybody else have any thoughts on this, it would be helpful, thanks.

David Cake: I see (Lisa)'s hand up, yes, no, yes, (Lisa), if you have some comments on this. No?

Lisa Phifer: Sorry, I was on mute, I suggested in chat – this is Lisa Phifer for the record – I suggested in chat that possibly one tool that would help organize the work and prevent duplication of effort is if we provide a signup sheet that volunteers people and pick off the documents that they are either very familiar with or have some expertise in the area, that will make covering those documents much easier than if you take a document that you're not already extremely well versed in of course, but if we put up a sign up with – for that purpose – that would help volunteers avoid trying to pull possible requirements from the same document over and over again. So my question to the group is, would a sign up list help?

David Cake: Okay, so I'm noting that (Stephanie) in the chat who's unable to get on audio is saying that it's a lot of work due to the requirement to – because thorough legal examination has not been done in past reports and we have positives from (Natalie) and (Kelly) and (Vlad) that the signup sheet will be positive and from Chuck I think, that's – they don't have any objections to the idea of a signup sheet and some extension to the work getting, you know, that we

extend the deadline slightly but get commitments that people will add specific – look at specific documents for additional requirements, I'm sure we'll discuss this in some detail in the leadership but does anybody have any objections to that?

Yes, and also positive from Marika and (Rudy), okay, so that sounds like we have some consensus in the group that a – extending the timeframe slightly to getting a signup sheet, doing explicit commitments for people to look at specific documents and so on and ensure that those requirements are added to the possible requirements list. Thank you – and Chuck suggests 48-hours which sounds reasonable.

Okay, well we seem to have a direction forward on this issue, do we have any further general questions on this topic? (Lisa).

Lisa Phifer: Thank you David Cake, I just wanted to raise one more point and it's circling back to Greg's observation, Greg Aaron's observation, that, you know, many of the principles that were pulled out of the EWG report won't ultimately end up being phase one topics for discussion, but will be something hammered out further down the road when we enter into detailed policies based on the requirements or even further down the road when the working group offers implementation guidance, so as all of you are signing up for documents, you may want to focus primarily on what you see as those fundamental requirements, particularly for the first five questions in phase one, even if we can only focus on those and get those all out on the table in our first pass, I think that would help advance the work. If we need to take a second pass to add in the other questions or of course once we get to phases two and three, add in further recommendations, different groups made with respect to specific policies or implementation, that will come down the road if we focus on phase one first it will make the job much easier I believe.

David Cake: Yes, yes, agreement that we focus on phase one and try not to fall into requirements that really don't need to be – requirements until we have made

more fundamental decisions in phase one. Okay, and we have some discussion in the chat about authority of sources, but I don't think – I think – do we have any further questions on this topic or should we sort of end this and move on? There being no other questions, I might hand us back to Michele to continue on with the topics, thanks.

Michele Neylon: Thanks David Cake, I'll be brief because I'm going to have to hand it back to you again in a few minutes as I get kicked out of this hotel room. Okay, so good discussion there, I think that's very helpful, so the next item on the agenda – we do that correctly – so we are onto – I think I might be misreading this – is our next item on the agenda the next – talking about the next meeting? Or am I missing something here?

Okay, it looks like the next item on the agenda is to discuss the next meeting, so the next meeting at present is scheduled for the 31st of May, in other words in – how many days is that – in a week, next Tuesday after. Chuck has his hand up, please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, thanks Michele and thanks for leading this and for David Cake and Marika for taking part in leading the meeting, I should be closer back to normal next week, and not having to have my foot raised up side my head right now, so I will – I would just ask that let's try and make some good progress before that meeting next week so that if people are having problems we can talk about those problems and try and help and so forth so we can indeed meet a deadline of the following Friday.

So if everybody can really make a good effort to sign up for at least one document – I don't think we need more than one person per document, if that happens we can live with it but let's get the work spread out and some documents may be outdated and if you think so try and pick the most updated ones, but let's get the signups in the next couple of days, get at least a start with some requirements done before our meeting next week and then we can finish it off the following week, keeping in mind that we – it doesn't have to be

perfect and this isn't the time for deliberation, just identify a possible requirement and then we'll decide as a group what that is.

So as much progress as we can make in the coming week before our meeting next week, which will be at the same time, same day and time as this one, that will really help us assist those who may need some assistance and see where – if there are any gaps that we need to fill before that deadline comes, thanks and I'll turn it back to you Michele, maybe you can adjourn before you have to leave.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Chuck, so without further ado, thank you for all of you who were able to join the call and I am more than happy to give you back a little part of your day, speak to you all next week and if anybody has any issues please let us know, thank you, bye-bye.

((Crosstalk))

David Cake: Thank you everyone.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you, today's meeting has been adjourned, Operator please stop the recordings and disconnect all remaining lines. Enjoy the rest of your day everyone.

END