

Michelle DeSmyter:Dear All, Welcome to the GNSO Next-Gen RDS Working Group call on Tuesday, 14 June 2016 at 16:00 UTC.

Michelle DeSmyter:Agenda page:

<https://community.icann.org/x/ix20Aw>

Michelle DeSmyter:Member page/SOI:

<https://community.icann.org/x/I4xlAw>

Chuck Gomes:Welcome all.

Farell FOLLY:hi chuck !

Ayden Férdeline:Hello everyone

Chuck Gomes:Let's wait one more minute before starting the recording.

Marika Konings:No, nothing from me

Lisa Phifer:no

Lisa Phifer:fyi, all responses will be posted here:

Lisa Phifer:SO/AC/SG/C Input Page:

<https://community.icann.org/x/pYxlAw>

Alan Greenberg:ALAC has submitted a statement

Richard Padilla:Hi all

Marika Konings:@Alan - can you confirm where the statement has been submitted?

Marika Konings:I don't recall seeing it.

Alan Greenberg:Will check.

Marika Konings:thanks

Alan Greenberg:Submitted to GNSO Secretariat on 10 June

Lisa Phifer:Cross-Community Session Abstract

<http://sched.co/7NCc>

Alan Greenberg:By Ariel

Marika Konings:ah, Glen is on vacation so she may not have forwarded it yet. I'll check in with Ariel to see if she can forward it to me as well.

steve metalitz:So we have completed our initial requirements list? Everything I have seen has been marked "draft."

Lisa Phifer:initial, yes

Lisa Phifer:the work plan item was just to get a first cut out for outreach message #2

Vicky Sheckler:agree w metalitz re we shouldn't be foreclosing potential requirements

Lisa Phifer:All, the draft slide deck will be posted with the meeting minutes

Lisa Phifer:The possible requirements list is a living document. It states that additions are expected on an on-going basis

Ayden Férdeline:hmmm.... would these cards really be useful? this isn't a referendum... :)

Vicky Sheckler:lisa - thx for the clarification

steve metalitz:What will be the significance of the "vote" you

propose to take at the cross-community meeting?

Marika Konings:it could be used to take the temperature of the room, if deemed appropriate as part of the discussion. It is not intended to be anything more than that.

David Cake:I believe vote is intended only to gauge mood/opinion.

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):@Lisa, the document containing possible requirements is 110 pages long. Will someone attempt to remove duplication before the public sees the document?

David Cake:Not a vote, just a very informal poll.

Lisa Phifer:@Scott, no, but we will discuss this in the next agenda item

Alan Greenberg:My hand is up...

steve metalitz:Not sure how useful it is to gauge mood/opinion of whoever happens to show up in Helsinki for cross-community meeting. But accept it as a possible means to keep people awake/engaged.....

Kathy Kleiman:awake is always good

Vicky Sheckler:agree w/ ayden & metalitz

Sana Ali:vote will surely include remote participants, as well, steve

Greg Shatan:I thought it wasn't a vote.

Ayden Férdeline:I'm with Steve here, I'm afraid. That a number of special interest groups may be able to make it to Helsinki to participate in the conversation doesn't mean we necessarily need an RDS.

Marika Konings:@Sana - yes, adobe allows for agree / disagree (but again, it wouldn't be a vote)

Sana Ali:yes, okay *poll

Lisa Phifer:@Steve et al, it is intended to help the community understand that this WG must try to answer that question in its Phase 1 report

Ayden Férdeline:I am sure some will not like my usage of the term, "special interest group", maybe there is a better word to describe those who find the RDS useful.

Kathy Kleiman:Can we control the slides?

Lisa Phifer:While it is too early to answer the question based on requirements, it helps attendees understand that's the reason we are looking at possible requirements

Greg Shatan:@Ayden, every group represented here is a special interest group.

Greg Shatan:Including yours.

Lisa Phifer:@Kathy, I think Chuck wants to address what's on these two slides first

Holly Raiche:Maybe have a slide either with the EWG list of data involved or SAC054 - the list of information required at

each stage

Ayden Férdeline:@Greg: That is one perspective. I see a special interest group as any entity which is seeking to use inordinate socioeconomic power to twist the RDS so to serve their own interests.

Carlton Samuels:Howdy all. Apologies. Unscheduled task for work

Ayden Férdeline:@Greg: But, it is fair to say this definition can be applied to many different stakeholder groups.

Lisa Phifer:@Holly we could display an existing WHOIS record

Kathy Kleiman:@Lisa: it's always a good idea to display an existing Whois record! It always surprises people...

Lisa Phifer:In Marrakech we ran this on the screen before the meeting start to help set context for those unfamiliar with WHOIS

Holly Raiche:@ Lisa - the issue is all the information - not just the traditional notion of Whois as what is required to be publicly available under the RAA

Carlton Samuels:@Lisa....Holly just answered

Carlton Samuels:I think it is important to show and distinguish the existing WHOIS dataset from the corpus of data collected in the registration transaction

Lisa Phifer:@Holly, could use that approach and add a slide with a few examples from 054 to show what other data is collected by some

Holly Raiche:Agree with Kathy's suggestion

Holly Raiche:@ Lisa - even just the tables in SAC054 - to show the range of information required at each phase of registration

Carlton Samuels:Then a followup slide might show the data elements that are of heightened importance - the PIIs

Holly Raiche:Glad to see documents beyond the RAA

Holly Raiche:Agree with Carlton's suggestion as well

Lisa Phifer:@Holly, Carlton, Kathy - staff can take a crack at expanding the rolling display used in Marrakech to add 054 examples and highlight some of the PII if you like

Holly Raiche:Thanks Lisa - that would be great

Carlton Samuels:@Lisa Perfect! I know you will get that done in ways that communicate the message

Carlton Samuels:@Jim would be perfect spokesperson

Lisa Phifer:@Jim, hopefully WG volunteers will suggest possible requirements not listed on this slide - could you do that?

Greg Shatan:@Ayden, thank you for clarifying that you are using "special interest group" as a pejorative and stereotyped phrase. That's helpful in understanding your viewpoint.

Lisa Phifer:hmm, don't know where stereotyped came from - autocorrect....

Lisa Phifer:@Greg, never mind - I thought that was in my last chat

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@NOTES - Jim is volunteering to speak with respecting to any examples we choose from SSAC documents, not just SAC054.

Marika Konings:@Jim - updated. Thanks :-)

Lisa Phifer:@Lisa - to clarify, I was suggesting that we display a series of slides BEFORE the session starts, illustrating what's in a WHOIS record, plus a little bit of SAC054 to show additions that some entities collect, to set context - but that would not be presented

Benny Samuelson / Nordreg AB:About the Validation part, news was coming today about a new naming system Mongolia are going to put in place

Benny Samuelson / Nordreg AB:<http://qz.com/705273/mongolia-is-changing-all-its-addresses-to-three-word-phrases/>

Carlton Samuels:@Chuck: I strongly suggest that we first address the policy question at the broad level BEFORE we go to asking what should be collected, validated and disclosed.

Benny Samuelson / Nordreg AB:According to the rumours I have heard this will be rolled out in Africa too

Benny Samuelson / Nordreg AB:Will this affect our work here? Or can we safely ignore this for now?

Holly Raiche:@ Carlton - maybe we work though my one slide?

Holly Raiche:I like Lisa's suggestion

Holly Raiche:@Lisa - have the information up even before the session would be really helpful

Greg Shatan:This is all part of the Meeting B "Policy Forum" experiment....

Lisa Phifer:@Holly, we can take a pass at this and circulate to WG for finalization at next week's WG meeting

Greg Shatan:We have a WG meeting as well in Helsinki.

Greg Shatan:This is more of a "crowdsourcing" meeting....

Lisa Phifer:RDS PDP F2F Session: <http://sched.co/7GqJ>

steve metalitz:Possibly another jargon-free way to draw out views from the audience is to ask them what they would like to see changed from or maintained in the current Whois system.

Greg Shatan:Yes, less jargon, more plain English/Finnish.

Carlton Samuels:@Chuck Got you. just that I'm always keen to establish context first.

Holly Raiche:Maybe let's stop using the term Whois - as the SAC suggestion a while ago - and start using RDS

Lisa Phifer:@Steve, it that a reword for the first bullet on this slide?

Holly Raiche:I'll ask for Jim's help

Carlton Samuels:@Holly That would be helpful. And in my view a way to [re]frame their headspace.

steve metalitz:@Lisa, yes, and more balanced because it also

asks what they want to see preserved in status quo.

Kathy Kleiman:I'll try Privacy

Carlton Samuels:Would love to volunteer but I won't be in Helsinki...and the timing is bad for me

Carlton Samuels:Ask Michele

Kathy Kleiman:I think we should cover the big 3 - Data Elements, Privacy, Users/Purposes

Carlton Samuels:@Scott - would you volunteer for Gated Access?

Holly Raiche:Agree with volunteering Scott

Carlton Samuels:At least I know you were deep into that aspect in the EWG Subteam

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):No

Ayden Férdeline:Please remind me which ones we are looking for volunteers for still?

Carlton Samuels:@Scott Aaaah, pity!

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):Sorry ;)

Holly Raiche:We are also sorry

Lisa Phifer:accuracy

Lisa

Phifer:<https://community.icann.org/display/gTLDRDS/WG+Charter>

Carlton Samuels:This A/C room kick me out time and again!

Ayden Férdeline:I support the proposal from the Leadership team. Two initial reports

Holly Raiche:Happy with that

Carlton Samuels:@Chuck - How are the Initial Reports connected? DO we have a scope for each already determined?

Lisa Phifer:@Carlton, the first initial report would just address the 5 fundamental questions; the second would address all phase 1 questions

Carlton Samuels:@Lisa - Thanks

Ayden Férdeline:re: 1 b) ii) rather than "supported by most" can we indicate which stakeholder groups have either rejected or accepted something?

Kal Feher:will the WG pause during the comment period for the initial report, or do we continue work in parallel?

steve metalitz:@Lisa, this doc suggests that the first initial report would cover 5 charter questions, "General Requirements," and "Fundamental Questions". For those of us who have not committed the charter to memory, could you list these 7 questions?

Sana Ali:Agree with Kathy

Carlton Samuels:@Kathy - +1 Makes perfect sense

Kathy Kleiman:Can you remind us what 4 and 5 are?

Ayden Férdeline:+1 @Kathy

Lisa Phifer:The 5 fundamental questions posed by the board are: user/purpose, gated access, data accuracy data elements and

privacy

Holly Raiche:ThanksKathy - not everyone - even on this WG - haveYEARS of experience with the Whois issue

Carlton Samuels:@Chuck This is what I was feeling for in my question on scope!

Vicky Sheckler:should we include accuracy in the initial phase?

Ayden Férdeline:@Vicky: I would suggest otherwise

steve metalitz:Since we were first presented with this document 10 minutes ago it is premature for some of us to express agreement or not.

Holly Raiche:@ Lisa - I think that is part of the privacy issue

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Lisa. We can't make decisions on data in a vacuum. What is or is not gated is an important framework to the question of elements.

Fabricio Vayra:+2 Lisa

Vicky Sheckler:agree w/ lisa

Ayden Férdeline:My feeling is that there should be a general policy of openness about developments, practices, and policies with respect to the collection of data, and for that reason I like the idea of having as many opportunities as possible for public comment. I think we should be establishing, however, the nature of what (if any) personal data is collected before we go into the specifics of whether it should be accurate or not, or whether there should be gated access.

Lisa Phifer:fyi, draft 3 contains roughly 780 possible requirements, drawn from 46 sources

Vicky Sheckler:apologies. got to run.

Vaibhav Aggarwal:@Ayden this is good - I also feel that if v can develop a short survey for the Genral public on some issues that we all differ, then we can collect some sample data During the Meeting from a LArger group

steve metalitz:isn't there some need to refine/triage list earlier in the process? There is a great deal of duplcication and overlap as well.

Holly Raiche:That wwould be really useful

Carlton Samuels:@Chuck NO I'm not!

Vaibhav Aggarwal:and then v can delebrate

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Steve

steve metalitz:When would this triage occur? Only after the first two initial reports?

Carlton Samuels:Staff is surely competent to do all that

Lisa Phifer:@Steve, that's what Chuck is suggesting we do now, before moving ahead to deliberation

steve metalitz:@Lisa, OK, confusing because it is listed as step 2.

Kathy Kleiman:Yes

Greg Shatan:I am happy for staff to take the first cut.
Holly Raiche:Yes - have staff take a first go
Kathy Kleiman:If staff takes a first crack and tracks the changes (or keeps notes in text), I think that will help a lot
Greg Shatan:Something we can agree on!
Ayden Férdeline:Perhaps staff could group similar requirements together, but not remove any?
Greg Shatan:Steve, I think Item 1 is not really a step -- it's an overview of the entire lifecycle of the process.
Farell FOLLY:I also agree on workin on grouping similar requirements together
steve metalitz:Agree with triage first. Is the doc being triaged the "draft 3" that Lisa sent out on Saturday?
Lisa Phifer:@Kathy, this would be moving possible requirements around but not deleting any of them. The numbering scheme allows for that, to ensure we don't lose anything in the process of organizing the list.
Lisa Phifer:@Steve, I think draft 4
Kathy Kleiman:Lisa, what I was recommending is that a note follow move (e..g, "originally in XYZ")
Lisa Phifer:All of the possible requirements have unique numbers assigned to them, including the source document, so moving them retains that context
Kathy Kleiman:@Lisa, I don't think that's enough. Sorry, but if someone wrote something and thinks it should be in X and you move it to Y, they should be able to find it quickly and recommend that it go back...
Marc Anderson:I have to drop off. thank you everyone.
steve metalitz:. @Lisa, thanks, was draft 4 distributed?
Lisa Phifer:Oh, you mean changing the question it's mapped to? The question is also part of the unique number, so would not be lost.
Lisa Phifer:@Steve, we have asked for additions to draft 3 and some WG members are stil turning in assignments, so I'm suggesting probably all of that goes into draft 4 and then we do that organization in one pass.
Ayden Férdeline:+1 @Kathy
Carlton Samuels:@Chuck I still believe it would be extremely useful for this WG to decide and recommend the baseline policy question: Is there a basis for collecting, validating and curating registration data and should ICANN mandate so in it contracts?
Fabricio Vayra:+1 Greg.
Susan Prosser:+1 agree with Greg
Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):Sorry, time to go - bye!
Ayden Férdeline:@Carlton - Yes... I tend to agree. It is not

too late to change our approach.

steve metalitz:@Lisa, thanks for clarifying status of drafts. For purposes of outreach #2, wouldn't it be more useful to have the "triaged" version of the document and ask our constituent groups to react to that?

Nathalie Coupet:@Greg +1

Carlton Samuels:@Greg Applying the law to the facts I'm suggesting we lay down the law first!

Lisa Phifer:@Steve, outreach message #2 already went out with draft 3, but no doubt you are right that feedback on the list at various stages will be helpful - and easier for reviewers later

Greg Shatan:Carlton, that's backwards.

Greg Shatan:PII is part of the legal analysis of potential data items.

Carlton Samuels:I think we must establish a policy first!

Sara Bockey:thank you all

Greg Shatan:Can't establish a policy in a factual vacuum.

Fabricio Vayra:thanks

Vlad Dinculescu:Thanks all

David Cake:Thank you all, good meeting.

Richard Padilla:thanks all

Vaibhav Aggarwal:Thanks Guys

Susan Prosser:thanks all bye

Carlton Samuels:Bye all

Nathalie Coupet:bye