Attendance & AC Chat EPDP DT call 5 July 2018 at 12:00 UTC

Attendance:
Heather Forrest, Rafik Dammak, Donna Austin, Ayden Federline, Susan Kawaguchi, Pam Little, Julf Helsingius, Stephanie Perrin, Rubens Kuhl, Paul McGrady, Darcy Southwell, Marie Pattullo, Arsene Tungali, Keith Drazek, Tony Harris

Staff:
Marika Konings, Berry Cobb, Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies: Michele Neylon, Philippe Fouquart, Tatiana Tropina, Carlos Gutierrez

Nathalie Peregrine: (7/5/2018 13:36) Dear all, welcome to the EPDP DT call on Thursday 5 July 2018
Rafik Dammak: (13:47) hello all
Nathalie Peregrine: (13:47) Welcome!
Ayden Férdeline: (13:55) hi all
Nathalie Peregrine: (13:56) Welcome!
Heather Forrest: (13:56) Carlos Gutierrez is delayed on a train in Switzerland
Nathalie Peregrine: (13:57) Thanks, noted.
Marika Konings: (13:57) Please note that as a result of the conversion to pdf from google doc, you cannot see the names of those that used the comment / edit function in Google doc (apparently this is a known issue), but all the links to the google docs are also posted in the notes pod so you can review as needed.
Susan Kawaguchi: (14:01) Good morning all
Julf Helsingius: (14:02) Morning/afternoon/whatever
Martín Silva: (14:04) hi all, fyi, my connection might drop
Nathalie Peregrine: (14:05) Noted, Martin. Please let me know if you need the Argentinian access numbers for you to join the audio bridge.
Heather Forrest: (14:10) Thanks Keith - high level summary is a good start
Ayden Férdeline: (14:12) That seems a fair summary to me; thanks, Keith.
Heather Forrest: (14:13) @Susan - your audio is a bit scratchy
Stephanie Perrin: (14:13) I think we need to set realistic expectations....namely that even with a right good will, we are unlikely to get everything which Rubens just described as a "laundry list" in the appendix accomplished. Principles for accreditation and access would, in my view, still be a stretch.
Rubens Kuhl: (14:13) Paul, a good number of your suggestions seem to imply that only legal reasons matter. While legal reasons do matter, assuming this is the only reasons is assuming that the policy as is is already what it should be. So this is making policy by charter.
Donna Austin, RySG: (14:15) @Susan, it seems up till now the terms accreditation and access have been used interchangeably. Can you explain the distinction you're making here please?
Heather Forrest: (14:15) Keith - I'm sorry - I saw Paul's hand before yours
Heather Forrest: (14:15) Adobe playing tricks
Keith Drazek 2: (14:15) Thanks Susan, agree that much of the accreditation work will be done outside ICANN, but the contracted parties will need to be engaged in the discussion of who gets access to the data and who the accrediting bodies are.
Keith Drazek 2: (14:16) Everything in the Temp Spec is in scope. Everything.
Susan Kawaguchi: (14:16) Access relies on RDAP being enabled to accept tokens and allow responses from the registrars and registreis. This part we need to include in scope.

Susan Kawaguchi: (14:18) Accreditation requires outside entities validating and certifying requestors of the information. There will be limited ICANN policies needed for that piece. But we can't tell Interpol for example how to determine if one of their members are validated or certified.

Ayden Férdeline: (14:19) Yes, I think it is better to go through the document line by line

Rubens Kuhl: (14:20) Every time someone refers to the Temp Spec, some think of it as including the Annex, some don't. So whatever we define, should be explicit in order to avoid misunderstanding.

Julf Helsingius: (14:20) I agree with Rubens

Stephanie Perrin: (14:20) Ditto.

Ayden Férdeline: (14:20) Yes, fair point by Rubens

Heather Forrest: (14:20) Yes good point, Donna - and I'm also worried about the time that line by line will take

Ayden Férdeline: (14:21) What other way is there to review this document, other than a line by line review?

Marika Konings: (14:21) @Ayden - the line by line review currently does not capture what the IPC and BC have suggested, nor the approach that Keith has outlined.

Ayden Férdeline: (14:21) I do not find it helpful receiving a radically different proposal 7 minutes before a call begins.

Marika Konings: (14:22) as some of the comments are diametrically opposed, it is difficult to integrate it into one version.

Stephanie Perrin: (14:22) I would also like to point out that while the contracted parties are the ones on the hook when giving access to data to third parties in terms of legal risk, we in the NCSG have very decided views on the determination of the parameters of how the policy sets out how contracted parties should comply with the law.

Stephanie Perrin: (14:23) If contracted parties regard that as a picket fence item, they should make that clear now so we can clarify.

Donna Austin, RySG: (14:23) @Ayden, we have some fundamental concepts that we do not agree on, so I'm not sure going through line by line on scope at this time is helpful.

Ayden Férdeline: (14:24) @Donna we are rehashing debates that have been had extensively already in Panama - it is hard to move forward when we do not move on

Keith Drazek 2: (14:24) For the purpose of the EPDP WG Phase One, "Temp Spec" does not include the Annex. The Annex can be considered in Phase Two following the publication of the Phase One initial report.

Donna Austin, RySG: (14:26) @Ayden, I agree we had a lot of debate in Panama, but I don't believe we reached agreement on much, and that's what we're trying to do now.

Ayden Férdeline: (14:26) "avoiding fragmentation of WHOIS" - WHOIS is already fragmented

Rubens Kuhl: (14:26) "Avoiding further fragmentation" - WHOIS is already fragmented no matter what we do in gTLD space.

Stephanie Perrin: (14:26) Can we delete avoiding fragmentation please? States a policy goal we do not agree with.

Ayden Férdeline: (14:27) @Keith - I agree with the first sentence ("For the purpose of the EPDP WG Phase One, "Temp Spec" does not include the Annex."); I can not support the second sentence; we would need to discuss this first with our stakeholder group.

Rubens Kuhl: (14:27) The two parts are opposed between them, since there are policies that might need many changes, like transfer policy and thick WHOIS>

Keith Drazek 2: (14:29) Happy to work further on fine-tuning the scope language.

Susan Kawaguchi: (14:29) I am happy to help too

Keith Drazek 2: (14:30) We need someone from NCSG

Stephanie Perrin: (14:30) I would volunteer

Keith Drazek 2: (14:30) Please add Marika too!

Paul McGrady: (14:30) yes

Marika Konings: (14:31) What would be a reasonable deadline for the small group to come back to the DT with proposed language?

Keith Drazek 2: (14:31) I also submitted suggested edits. And I'm sure others did as well. Can we please get an accounting of all the inputs received so far?

Ayden Férdeline: (14:31) As did Stephanie - an extensive redlined document, that received nearly no feedback from others

Marika Konings: (14:31) All inputs received, apart from IPC, should be in the document up on the screen

Donna Austin, RySG: (14:32) @Ayden, I think you need to be respectful of the work that other groups have been doing in the time available and the challenges of pulling comments together. If this was easy we would have settled this in Panama.

Ayden Férdeline: (14:33) @Donna thanks as always for the condescending note - not sure why you'd think i did not know that

Donna Austin, RySG: (14:37) Sorry if I have offended Ayden, it certainly wasn't my intent.

Rubens Kuhl: (14:39) My suggestion is that we look next at group composition, since this is a requirement for EOI calls to join the EPDP.

Stephanie Perrin: (14:39) Please do

Ayden Férdeline: (14:39) makes sense @Rubens

Nathalie Peregrine: (14:39) Of course

Paul McGrady: (14:39) Yes, although I can make myself available nearly anytime over the next several days.

Marika Konings: (14:39) so doodle for Monday so that everyone has today and tomorrow to review and provide their input?

Stephanie Perrin: (14:40) I think that would work well Marika, please

Marika Konings: (14:41) we'll also include some options for Friday so that we could already start conversations earlier, if possible.

Stephanie Perrin: (14:41) Lets have a hard deadline for further comments of SUnday cob UTC

Heather Forrest: (14:43) I assume in Donna's penultimate dot point 'respective' should be 'respect'

Marika Konings: (14:43) Not yet - it has been integrated into a draft call for volunteers that we hope to share shortly after this meeting for review.

Paul McGrady: (14:44) I don't see anything problematic in the text that Donna has suggested here.

Paul McGrady: (14:45) Dates and where, since where can be an issue for some.

Darcy Southwell: (14:45) Agree with Donna's proposed changes.

Marika Konings: (14:45) It may be chicken/egg situation, as location is likely dependent on the composition of the EPDP Team - so that the most cost-efficient location can be found.

Marika Konings: (14:46) it also will depend on the eventual size of the group

Marika Konings: (14:46) as Heather noted - other offices may also be able to accomodate, but it will depend on the overall size.

Marika Konings: (14:47) and yes, LA would be a likely default option.

Ayden Férdeline: (14:47) rough dates are perhaps more important

Rafik Dammak: (14:47) for location, isn't it should be something to be put under resources (not sating that is needed). dates are already mentioned in the other section

Heather Forrest: (14:47) I would rather see the f2f location and timing accommodate the participants, rather than the participants accommodate the f2f location and timing

Donna Austin, RySG: (14:47) @Susan: Be willing to work, in good faith, toward consensus ....

Paul McGrady: (14:48) how about "solution orientation"?

Ayden Férdeline: (14:48) yes, it is a small typo
Donna Austin, RySG: (14:48) Yes, it should be 'treat'
Paul McGrady: (14:48) Have a solution orientation required to work...
Susan Kawaguchi: (14:48) that makes sense to me
Susan Kawaguchi: (14:49) Thanks Donna
Rubens Kuhl: (14:50) Criteria test: if the criteria excludes ne, Stephanie, Paul and Ayden, then the criteria is good. ;-)
Rubens Kuhl: (14:50) (me)
Paul McGrady: (14:51) @Rubens - ha! Love it.
Heather Forrest: (14:52) There's consensus and there's Consensus Policy
Donna Austin, RySG: (14:55) :-)
Heather Forrest: (14:56) I wonder if we're overengineering
Stephanie Perrin: (14:57) old hand
Paul McGrady: (14:57) No objection
Ayden Férdeline: (14:59) I am ok w/ the language from Donna
Darcy Southwell: (14:59) Agree.
Donna Austin, RySG: (14:59) Will do Heather
Heather Forrest: (15:01) Thanks Donna - much appreciated
Heather Forrest: (15:02) Noting here as per the list that Cherine has confirmed the Board's preference is for 2 Board liaisons
Ayden Férdeline: (15:02) There was NOT agreement there.
Stephanie Perrin: (15:04) I certainly objected strenuously in the comments I sent to the list on Thursday, and which we discussed in part at our wrap up. I was rushing to get those comments in in time for the meeting, or I would have prepared a summary. Stick to GNSO representation numbers.
Ayden Férdeline: (15:05) The NCSG *must* have parity with the CSG
Rubens Kuhl: (15:07) Ayden, Stephanie: do you believe NCSG would be able to find 6 willing victims... I mean, volunteers to the EPDP ?
Keith Drazek 2: (15:07) For the record, we originally had NCUC and NPOC with 3 representatives each, but I was told that the NCSG wanted to remain at SG level. There was never an intent to under-represent anyone.
Rafik Dammak: (15:07) @Rubens the verb voluntell comes to mind
Stephanie Perrin: (15:09) People can do work behind the scenes in their own SGs.
Ayden Férdeline: (15:09) the NCSG has members who are not attached to any constituency; we do not just have members in two constituencies
Rubens Kuhl: (15:09) NCSG is not a single constituency. So if that would be split at constituency level, it would be 2 NCUC, 2 NPOC, 2 non-NCUC-non-NPOC.
Marie Pattullo: (15:10) As I said on list Ayden, however you choose to cut your cloth is of course down to the NCSG!
Stephanie Perrin: (15:10) Rubens, we will voluntell. And we can cover necessary absences with alternates. However we already have a strong contingent of worker bees signed up for this....
Stephanie Perrin: (15:10) (or will to volunteer once the call is open)
Rubens Kuhl: (15:10) ccNOS would be 1, wouldn't it ? Not 3 ?
Rafik Dammak: (15:10) @Rubens NCSG fucntions as SG here, so it wont be necessary such split, rep will be all NCSG members
Ayden Férdeline: (15:11) @Rubens - the proposal is for all SO/ACs to get 3 members, though i would prefer 1 member max + 1 alternate
Stephanie Perrin: (15:11) (Some of us are crazy, as has been pointed out before in this forum)

Paul McGrady: (15:11) The fact that the BC and ISPs share a different view than the IPC on this just proves my point.

Stephanie Perrin: (15:12) Paul, I don't know if you have noticed, but within the NCSG we often disagree.

Stephanie Perrin: (15:12) Struggling to reach consensus within the SG is challenge number 1....

Paul McGrady: (15:12) @Stephanie - I have noticed which is why I have no problem with you guys having 3 seats for each of your C's. I just want parity for my C.

Rafik Dammak: (15:13) any reason why having ccNSO ?

Rafik Dammak: (15:13) as they have no stake on this issue

Pam Little, RrSG: (15:13) different

Marika Konings: (15:13) and to clarify, there would be no requirement for other SO/ACs to appoint, they would just be invited to do so, correct?

Ayden Férdeline: (15:14) correct Marika

Heather Forrest: (15:14) @Marika - yes, I understand invitation but not compelled

Donna Austin, RySG: (15:14) @Rafik, they have not stake but they may have experience that could be helpful. perhaps the ccNSO could be a resource rather than a member?

Marika Konings: (15:14) Also, would SO/AC reps participate as members and as such participate in any potential consensus calls, or participate as liaisons?

Nathalie Peregrine: (15:15) Ayden I unmuted you

Julf Helsingius: (15:15) I also had the funny noise

Rafik Dammak: (15:15) @Donna maybe , but Ithink ccNSO didnt appoint anyone to RDs review.

Ayden Férdeline: (15:15) sorry i can't unmute

Julf Helsingius: (15:15) I hear someone typing/breathing

Ayden Férdeline: (15:15) i will type instead

Keith Drazek 2: (15:18) The key is to ensure that a member/liaison from another SO/AC can't block consensus because they can't reach consensus within their own group.

Marika Konings: (15:18) it would be important in that case to make clear what the difference is between a member and a liaison. Is the only difference that a member would be expected to participate in a consensus call?

Heather Forrest: (15:18) +1 Darcy - perhaps this is mitigated by giving other SO/ACs the option to serve as liaison

Paul McGrady: (15:18) +1 Marika.

Paul McGrady: (15:19) @Marika - also there is a different level of work expected

Paul McGrady: (15:19) Members have to committ to work. L's can listen or work.

Keith Drazek 2: (15:20) I'm fine with the non-GNSO SO/AC participants being liaisons and not members, and not required for reaching consensus, but I think Heather's suggestion about giving a choice is a reasonable approach.

Pam Little, RrSG: (15:20) No worries, Heather

Marika Konings: (15:20) Based on your feedback, I can include something in the call for volunteers for your review.

Heather Forrest: (15:21) To handle the concern about consensus impossible, we need to include this in the Statement of COmmitment

Rafik Dammak: (15:21) @Keith I think making consensus shuld be the perorgative of GNSO groups only

Ayden Férdeline: (15:21) +1 rafik

Rafik Dammak: (15:21) ACs have their means to make advices

Susan Kawaguchi: (15:21) I would assume that any member would have to agree to the commitment we discussed earlier

Donna Austin, RySG: (15:21) @Darcy, I've tried to address that in the Statement of Participation.

Stephanie Perrin: (15:22) I think we need to make it clear that we cannot accept 3 wild cards on this forced march. They have to be liaisons if they cannot commit to procedure.

Martín Silva: (15:22) +100 Steph

Tony Harris: (15:22) Agree with Stephanie

Donna Austin, RySG: (15:22) We may need to explain what a 'consensus call' is.

Darcy Southwell: (15:23) @Donna, I'm not sure I see the ability to participate in a consensus call specified.

Stephanie Perrin: (15:23) They are of course entitled to think what they like, they get another kick at the can in their advice to the Board later.

Darcy Southwell: (15:24) +1 Heather - and we should spell that out.

Stephanie Perrin: (15:24) i would certainly like to spell this out as clearly as we can.

Heather Forrest: (15:24) Let's reference WG Guidelines provisions on consensus call

Heather Forrest: (15:25) I think we might need to set up a call to explain this to the GAC

Heather Forrest: (15:25) I think we need a better understanding of the GAC's intentions for its reps

Stephanie Perrin: (15:26) I agree Heather, we need to spell it out to them.

Darcy Southwell: (15:26) It's concerning that the GAC may choose to participate as members - consensus calls being a challenge - and then use the Communique to advise the Board in a different way.

Julf Helsingius: (15:26) I agree with Stephanie, we need to spell it out to them.

Darcy Southwell: (15:26) Maybe we push GAC into a liaison role.

Stephanie Perrin: (15:26) +1 Darcy

Tony Harris: (15:26) GAC has an advisory role in ICANN, this should not differ

Susan Kawaguchi: (15:26) On the RDS WG the PSWG members responded to polls and consensus calls the same way everyother member did

Stephanie Perrin: (15:26) Indeed they did.

Pam Little, RrSG: (15:26) +1 Tony

Stephanie Perrin: (15:27) WHich is why we need greater clarity here

Keith Drazek 2: (15:27) I heard the BC and ISPCP suggest a path forward on the numerical breakdown of the NCPH participants. Are we good with the 2+1 construct, and if so, do we need to reduce the number of members/liaisons from non-GNSO groups to deal with Paul's parity concern?

Susan Kawaguchi: (15:27) I would think we can expect the same behavior from the experienced GAC members

Stephanie Perrin: (15:27) If we get them.

Marie Pattullo: (15:28) Keith - if that is 2+1 per C, so 6+3 CSG and 6+3 NCSG, then sure.

Ayden Férdeline: (15:28) I think policy staff come under resources?

Keith Drazek 2: (15:28) We also have a precedent of GAC members participating directly in the SubPro WT5 group. It's something the GNSO Council has been encouraging for years. Hard to now say they can't participate.

Susan Kawaguchi: (15:29) @Keith agree

Marika Konings: (15:29) @Ayden - correct. And we do appreciate the concern for the workload for staff :-)

Julf Helsingius: (15:29) Keith +1

Ayden Férdeline: (15:29) :-)

Tony Harris: (15:30) Keith is right about GAC but there is the problem of expediency involved

Pam Little, RrSG: (15:31) Thanks.

Stephanie Perrin: (15:31) participation is encouraged, blocking consensus is not.

Ayden Férdeline: (15:33) Should we define what is an "expert contributor"?

Rubens Kuhl: (15:34) Observers - No need for SOI, can receive messages from the list, can listen to calls, can't join calls, can't post in chat during calls, can read transcripts.

Rubens Kuhl: (15:35) Liason - Needs SOI, can join the calls, can post in chat and speak during calls, doesn't participate in consensus calls but cat observe them happening.

Heather Forrest: (15:35) Let's suggest Monday

Pam Little, RrSG: (15:36) @Rubens - transcripts should be available to everyone (the general public)

Ayden Férdeline: (15:36) I think it was only a 90 min call today? though I can stay on until 1400 UTC

Rubens Kuhl: (15:36) Alternate - Is an observer until a SG/C/SO/AC member or leadership appoints them as member, either for an interim period or for the remaining run of the EPDP.

Ayden Férdeline: (15:37) observers don't require an SOI; alternates should require an SOI

Ayden Férdeline: (15:37) ohterwise I like your definitions Rubens

Rubens Kuhl: (15:37) Pam, transcripts should be published on the Wiki indeed. If mentioning observers can read transcripts might give the impression that they are not public, then we should strike the reference.

Stephanie Perrin: (15:37) Sounds reasonable. Time spent settling these matters is time well spent, will catch up later

Paul McGrady: (15:38) Timeline makes sense.

Darcy Southwell: (15:38) No objections.

Paul McGrady: (15:39) Lock down on Sunday. Small Group on Monday. Revised and back to Council on Monday evening. WG to review and regather on Wednesday.

Keith Drazek 2: (15:40) I suggest that we need to catalog all inputs by tomorrow.

Stephanie Perrin: (15:40) 1. Check all comments are in 2. Comment on new material that has been added of late 3. Finish by Sunday COB 4. Small team shakes out final draft, submits by Wednesday back to COuncil

Keith Drazek 2: (15:40) Ok

Keith Drazek 2: (15:42) Yes please, thanks Marika

Paul McGrady: (15:44) Thanks Marika. I just want to make sure I get it right the second time. :)

Marie Pattullo: (15:45) Safe travels Heather!

Heather Forrest: (15:46) Thanks Marie - long day ahead

Heather Forrest: (15:46) Thanks everyone for huge efforts to move things forward over the past week

Stephanie Perrin: (15:46) Good idea Donna

Rafik Dammak: (15:47) yes

Rubens Kuhl: (15:47) Can staff comment if we have already received EOIs for EPDP Chair ? Not mentioning names at this point, just numbers.

Paul McGrady: (15:47) +1 Donna. I didn't have any problems with what was sent, but I think it is a good idea to clear the air.

Keith Drazek 2: (15:47) Sorry if I missed it, but when are we expecting to approve the Charter? Do we have a new target date, and will it be an email vote or a voice vote during our next formal meeting?

Marika Konings: (15:47) @Rubens, one EOI has been received so far.

Susan Kawaguchi: (15:48) @ Rubens comment on alternates we should have a defined process for alternates stepping in when needed.

Ayden Férdeline: (15:49) Perhaps names re: Chair candidates could be published as they are received? I note that Review Team applications are published to the wiki the moment they are received

Susan Kawaguchi: (15:49) Alternates should provide SOI's and agree to the membership commitments just as a "regular" member of the ePDP.

Rubens Kuhl: (15:49) Ayden, publishing as they are received could hinder further applications.

Susan Kawaguchi: (15:49) Will a notice similar to what we use on Council be required?

Marika Konings: (15:50) Note that the current language includes a reference to two vice-chairs (see third sentence).

Rubens Kuhl: (15:50) Susan, I think it could be a notice either from a member from that SG/C/SO/AC or from a SG/C/SO/AC leadership.

Tony Harris: (15:51) ISPCP supports two vice chairs

Rubens Kuhl: (15:51) In this case I prefer having the leadership structure defined from start, since we are already appointing the Chair.

Ayden Férdeline: (15:51) Perhaps we could have a form, a la the Council alternate form

Ayden Férdeline: (15:52) No agreement on Annex text

Rubens Kuhl: (15:52) Note that there is the Temp Spec Annex different from the Annex Donna is mentioning now.

Rafik Dammak: (15:52) yes Rubens, that is from the draft charter

Ayden Férdeline: (15:53) In the annex I am trying to find the problematic line, will advise when I find it

Paul McGrady: (15:53) Tension breaking joke: Is the Annex part of the EOI? :)

Ayden Férdeline: (15:53) point iii) please delete "and trademark law", and my concerns with this particular Annex are alleviated

Ayden Férdeline: (15:54) thanks

Paul McGrady: (15:54) @Marika, can you note that some want "and trademark law" in the Annex? I don't think it makes sense to have a Chair who is ignorant of one of the primary purposes for Access.

Stephanie Perrin: (15:55) yes

Rafik Dammak: (15:55) yes

Marika Konings: (15:55) @Paul, noted in the notes.

Marika Konings: (15:56) Sorry, I missed the timing comment.

Stephanie Perrin: (15:56) except as already noted in comments.

Paul McGrady: (15:56) I'd like to say thank you to everyone for the hard work today on a day where everyone is tired from travel and last week.

Ayden Férdeline: (15:57) sounds like a plan

Stephanie Perrin: (15:57) Marika, Donna was suggesting everyone make sure everything is in by Friday

Marika Konings: (15:57) Thanks Stephanie :-)

Ayden Férdeline: (15:57) Thanks all - good call today

Stephanie Perrin: (15:58) we have not had time to respond to the IPC comments, so there may be further points (just a caveat)

Rubens Kuhl: (15:58) Agree with Heather, I'm not confident this will be ready in 7 days.

Stephanie Perrin: (15:59) agreed as well.

Rubens Kuhl: (15:59) Unfortunately, but we are at where we are.

Rafik Dammak: (16:01) @Rubens still planet earth, vai malandra :)

Ayden Férdeline: (16:01) good bye

Tony Harris: (16:01) Will action items be sent to mail lisi?

Marika Konings: (16:01) thanks all

Darcy Southwell: (16:01) Thanks, all. Bye.

Rafik Dammak: (16:01) bye all, thanks

Marie Pattullo: (16:01) Thanks!

Marika Konings: (16:01) yes, email with action items coming shortly