

Attendance and AC Chat - RPM Subteam for URS Providers 29 August 2018

Attendance: Susan Payne, Phil Corwin, Michael Karanicolas, Justine Chew

Staff: Ariel Liang, Julie Hedlund, Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies: none

AC Chat RPM Subteam for URS Providers

Nathalie Peregrine: Dear all, welcome to the RPM Sub Team for URS Providers call on Wednesday 29 August 2018 for 90 mins

Nathalie Peregrine: Agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/fgGNBQ>

Ariel Liang: Super

Consolidated: <https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/93127038/RPM-CLEAN%20SUPER%20CONSOLIDATED%20URS%20TOPICS%20TABLE%20%2824%20August%202018%29.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1535509455000&api=v2>

Michael Karanicolas: sounds good

Susan Payne: great, thanks

Susan Payne: well, I think registrant is in the best position, but I'm assuming it's not difficult for the providers to check?

Justine Chew: Sure, thanks, Phil

Susan Payne: seems ok

Michael Karanicolas: looks ok

Susan Payne: GDD and RySG should develop rules for the timely response by Registries to requests for non-public information from Providers

Susan Payne: Query though whether this is actually policy?

Susan Payne: fine. I'd actually amend this then to suggest that Providers ought also to be involved in this discussion

Susan Payne: so, GDD, Providers and Registries

Susan Payne: yep

Justine Chew: Yes, good

Ariel Liang: Yes, staff are capturing notes on the side

Justine Chew: With translation!

Susan Payne: yes

Justine Chew: Per the rules

Michael Karanicolas: doesn't that come later?

Susan Payne: ah yes good point Justine, there was also an issue with translations

Michael Karanicolas: I agree - no harm

Justine Chew: Let's repeat it for consistency

Justine Chew: What does "(reached by Providers)" mean?

Julie Hedlund 2: ICANN's email addresses for Registry contacts (reached by Providers) should be kept up to date

Justine Chew: At bottom of page 1

Justine Chew: LOL

Justine Chew:Right. So long as it makes better sense.

Susan Payne:ok

Justine Chew:I would support Susan's suggestion for an overarching statement on need for ICANN Compliance proactive monitoring ... something along those lines.

Susan Payne:Yes - agree on F3

Justine Chew:Sounds good, on F3

Ariel Liang:original wording in the super consolidated doc on page 27

Susan Payne:ok

Justine Chew:ok

Susan Payne:M1 - ok

Julie Hedlund 2:This is the text, "● As a compliance issue, WG to consider asking ICANN to check Providers for compliance with technical requirements "

Ariel Liang:again, the super consolidated doc link

is: <https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/93127038/RPM-CLEAN%20SUPER%20CONSOLIDATED%20OURS%20TOPICS%20TABLE%20%2824%20August%202018%29.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1535509455000&api=v2>

Susan Payne:great

Ariel Liang:with new updates

Ariel Liang:in pink

Susan Payne:happy with the proposal

Michael Karanicolas:i'm fine with it.

Justine Chew:Yes

Justine Chew:Agree with Susan on "informal note" to EPDP

Susan Payne:yes - thanks Phil good point

Susan Payne:yes

Julie Hedlund 2:Yes, we got it Phil.

Justine Chew:E. Not seeing any issues

Justine Chew:Do we need to mention ICANN Compliance role at all?

Justine Chew:Okay

Susan Payne:ok

Julie Hedlund 2:Text is: "● WG to discuss whether any of the late Response fees create a burden for the Respondent "

Susan Payne:not from me

Justine Chew:Not from me either

Michael Karanicolas:No - we can move on

Justine Chew:K1. okay

Michael Karanicolas:Give me one moment please

Justine Chew:Both Complainant and Respondent, yes to that

Justine Chew:To go for public comment. Agree.

Ariel Liang:Perhaps an action item for the WG to consider?

Michael Karanicolas:That sounds good to me

Susan Payne:yes

Justine Chew:Point taken, Susan, the subteam sort of dealt with allegations of abuse of process by Complainant -- our "position" could be that this examination be for both

Complainant and Respondent for fairness. But okay to action item to WG rather than as a recommendation.

Julie Hedlund 2:Here's the text Ariel mentioned: ● WG to consider whether, in light of FORUM and MFSD feedback on use of WHOIS to help determine Respondent language, policy recommendations should be developed to handle language and related GDPR concerns

Justine Chew:Yes, I would agree with Susan that GDPR should not be a concern insofar as country of Registrant is concerned

Susan Payne:L1 - looks good

Justine Chew:Yes to L1, add "should" as suggested

Michael Karanicolas:Fine with me

Michael Karanicolas:I suggest we remove the eg.

Justine Chew:M1. I feel on account of fairness, not just standards for "removal" but reprimand before removal? Agree with Susan on action item to WG rather than a recommendation.

Michael Karanicolas:I agree @Justine

Justine Chew:+1 Phil, thanks!

Susan Payne:provided we're not saying they SHOULD be developed

Susan Payne:happy with softening

Justine Chew:Yes to "considered"

Justine Chew:Thank you for hard work Phil!

Susan Payne:Excellent, yes, thanks Phil

Susan Payne:Good doc

Ariel Liang:I have hand up :)

Ariel Liang:one more thing to ask

Justine Chew:Ariel, could you please forward that email to me again please?

Justine Chew:Thanks!

Ariel Liang:sure

Ariel Liang:will do

Justine Chew:Sure, just highlight it in the redline copy

Justine Chew:Cheers, all! Thanks for the excellent discussions and coordination in this subteam.

Susan Payne:thanks all!

Michael Karanicolas:sounds good. thanks.