Donna Austin, RySG
Keith Drazek
Paul McGrady
Stephanie Perrin
Susan Kawaguchi

Apologies:
Caitlin Tubergen - staff

Staff:
Marika Konings
Nathalie Peregrine
Terri Agnew

Terri Agnew:Welcome to the small team EPDP scope call on Friday 06, July 2018 at 16:00 UTC.
Keith Drazek:Hi Terri, thanks! I'll join the bridge shortly.
Stephanie Perrin:Hi there!
Stephanie Perrin:I am sure everyone will be curious.....suggest recording.
Keith Drazek:Agree to recording
Susan Kawaguchi:sounds good
Paul McGrady:STSDTEPDP
Marika Konings:Note that what is up on the screen is what I circulated yesterday what aims to reflect what was discussed on the call yesterday - noting that not everyone has signed off on this yet.
Marika Konings:last bullet on the first page
Nathalie Peregrine:Just re joining, line dropped
Marika Konings:I think I'll switch to AC audio - there is delay on my line
Nathalie Peregrine:i m having massive delays on the phone too
Donna Austin, RySG:You do have some delay Marika, sorry.
Marika Konings:I've connected to AC audio now so hopefully it is better
Keith Drazek:We would need to remove that language, that's old.
Marika Konings:CSG and NCSG have 6 vs. 3 for RySG and RrSG each
Keith Drazek:Correct Marika.
Marika Konings:how about clarifying it as 'GNSO SG/Cs at Council level'?
Paul McGrady: 'GNSO SG and Cs at Council level'
Stephanie Perrin:How about SG or Cs? we in NCSG do not organize ourselves the way the other side of our house does, and we do not need to open that subject here.
Marika Konings:Note that a proposed definition has been added to page 3 of the document
Marika Konings:those definitions are based on what is included in the call for volunteers
Marika Konings:I should say 'proposed' call for volunteers - so this is open to further definition / changes
Paul McGrady:I'm fine with just deleting the concept as Susan suggests.
Marika Konings:Maybe something like 'if a member is not able to express a position on a consensus call, this should not hold up a consensus call if other members are able to express a position on behalf of their groups'.

Keith Drazek:I agree it can be removed. If no one objects to consensus, citing the need for further work, consensus shall be deemed reached. The language was intended to underscore that if a non-GNSO SO/AC can't reach consensus themselves, it shall not block the rest from reaching consensus.

Keith Drazek:Marika's proposed language works for me.

Donna Austin, RySG:Thanks Marika

Marika Konings:it is on the first page

Marika Konings:'the EPDP team may invite expert contributors and other resources as deemed necessary by the EPDP Team Leadership'

Susan Kawaguchi:In Marika's language can we change "should not" to "will not"

Marika Konings:Noted Susan

Keith Drazek:I recommend we have ALAC and GAC at the same level of participation of 3 each. ccNSO and SSAC can probably get by with 1 each.

Paul McGrady:I think the goal is to end up with a result that the participants from the SOs & ACs are behind and use their gravitas to get their SOs & ACs behind as well in order to avoid chaos after we send the new Policy to the Board (e.g. countervailing GAC advice). So, we need for them to be able to meaningfuly participate and feel their voice counted at consensus time.

Keith Drazek:Or maybe 2 for ALAC to ensure they're not single-threaded.

Donna Austin, RySG:agree Keith, one representative doesn't make sense

Marika Konings:what about increasing numbers but making them liaisons?

Keith Drazek:The original plan was 3 each from the SO/AC, but with the CSG constituencies getting 2 each now, perhaps 2 each is the right number.

Marika Konings:to address Stephanies concern?

Marika Konings:So for GAC 3 + 3 and 2 + 1 for others? Did I understand that correctly (for the notes)?

Stephanie Perrin:How about one member one liaison?

Donna Austin, RySG:Can we make a distinction that it is GAC and not PSWG?

Susan Kawaguchi:agree

Keith Drazek:Hi Marika. Yes. Or it could be 2+2 for others.

Marika Konings:Yes, they are in the notes. I will circulate these after the call to the small group so you can review.

Paul McGrady:Too few. We will get accused of not allowing real participation.

Susan Kawaguchi:agree with Paul

Paul McGrady:2 is already a skeleton crew.

Stephanie Perrin:ok, lets move on

Keith Drazek:Agreed Donna

Keith Drazek:Yes

Susan Kawaguchi:agree

Paul McGrady:Yes

Stephanie Perrin:me too...

Keith Drazek:That's significant progress!

Marika Konings:Yes, I can update the language and circulate it to the small team after this call.

Stephanie Perrin:old

Marika Konings:Keith, I don't believe this includes your input yet - apologies if I missed it.

Stephanie Perrin:Unified Keith, Unified....

Susan Kawaguchi:Consistent process for continued access to Registration Data, including non-public data, for users with a legitimate purpose, until the time when a final accreditation and access mechanism is fully operational, on a mandatory basis for all contracted parties.

Keith Drazek:Thanks Marika. We can still get it in.

Keith Drazek:For those who haven't already seen it, we need to factor in the latest Euro Data Privacy Board letter to ICANN, as published yesterday.

Keith Drazek:Agree we'll need to continue this on our Monday call.

Marika Konings:I downloaded this 30 minutes prior to the meeting - it does include some of the IPC comments (see first blue language) but maybe other parts were included after I downloaded it from Google Doc.

Donna Austin, RySG:and the 90 day confirmation is not addressed either.

Keith Drazek:The trigger for pivot from Phase 1 to Phase 2 is the publication of the Phase 1 initial report.

Keith Drazek:I think we need to pull together the delineation and timeline of tracks based on the recent input from IPC, BC and what I submitted earlier this week. That's where we're currently lacking detail and clarity.

Keith Drazek:Yep

Keith Drazek:I agree we need to address this in scope so the WG doesn't lose time.

Keith Drazek:Agree with the distinction between policy and implementation as Stephanie described.

Susan Kawaguchi:I would like it on the record that I oppose Stephanie's statement that the EWG report was unethical in the manner it was drafted and revised.

Susan Kawaguchi:Let's keep this discussion relevant to the ePDP charter

Stephanie Perrin:I will listen to the recording.

Paul McGrady:I think we need a strawman on parrallel /phasing of this ePDP as soon as possible to see if we can get something sorted in our next call on Monday.

Stephanie Perrin:We do not have the bandwidth to manage parallel track. I realize that some SGs have motivated folks and staff behind them to do the work but as I keep saying, there has to be a price paid for leaving this work until after the GDPR has come into force. This process must be fair.

Susan Kawaguchi:I can draft a document on phasing or parallel track

Susan Kawaguchi:and send it out later today

Paul McGrady:@Susan, that would be terrific. Thank you!

Paul McGrady:Thanks Marika. I think if we see it all together, I expect that much of it will be OK and we will end up with a very narrow set of issues remaining.

Keith Drazek:Thanks Marika. If you can build the package, it'll be up to us to reconcile the various inputs. I'm happy to review a table if that's simpler.

Paul McGrady:"The Group of 4" sounds like a super hero ensemble.

Susan Kawaguchi:I agree

Keith Drazek:Agree Donna

Paul McGrady:Agree

Marika Konings:I'll get out the notes and updated composition language out immediate after this call and as soon as you all sign off I can get this out to the DT.

Stephanie Perrin:Thanks.