Adobe Connect: 25

Alan Greenberg (ALAC)

Alan Woods (RYSG)

Alex Deacon (IPC)

Julf Helsingius (NCSG)

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC)

Kristina Rosette (RySG)

Amr Elsadr (NCSG) Kurt Pritz (Chair)

Ashley Heineman (GAC) Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alternate)

Ben Butler (SSAC) Marc Anderson (RySG)
Benedict Addis (SSAC) Margie Milam (BC)
Esteban Lescano (ISPCP) Mark Svancarek (BC)
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG) Matt Serlin (RrSG)

Georgios Tselentis (GAC) Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison)

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC) Stephanie Perrin (NCSG)

James Bladel (RrSG) Tatiana Tropina (NCSG Alternate)

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP)

Audio Only:

None

Apologies:

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG) Diane Plaut (IPC) Emily Taylor (RrSG)

Audio Cast (FOR ALTERNATES AND OBSERVERS)

Peak: 10 joined

View Only Adobe Connect:

24 joined

Staff:

Berry Cobb
Caitlin Tubergen
Daniel Halloran (ICANN Org Liaison-Legal)
Marika Konings
Trang Nguyen (ICANN Org Liaison-GDD)
Terri Agnew
Andrea Glandon

AC Chat:

Andrea Glandon: (12/6/2018 06:59) Welcome to the EPDP Team Call #32 held on Thursday, 06 December 2018 at 14:00 UTC.

Andrea Glandon: (06:59) Wiki Agenda Page: https://community.icann.org/x/wrVBQ

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (07:42) where can I FIND PURPOSE o in the work which page pls book Marika Konings: (07:48) @Kavouss - Purpose O was circulated to the mailing list by me on Tuesday.

Marika Konings: (07:51) It is also posted here: https://community.icann.org/x/_wrVBQ

Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison): (07:57) hi all

Julf Helsingius - mobile: (07:57) Again doing audio from smartphone, but display on desktop, so twice in AC.

Tatiana Tropina - NCSG: (07:58) hi all

Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (07:58) Happy (101th) Finnish Independence Day!

Mark Svancarek (BC): (07:59) Congratulations!

Kurt Pritz: (08:00) Finnish Independence Day is coincident with the end of WWI?

Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (08:01) Kurt: ish. Lots of independence days in Europe related either to end of WWI or to Russian Revolution.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:02) Hi all. Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:02) Hi all! James Bladel (RrSG): (08:02) Hah!

Stephanie Perrin: (08:04) Happy Independence day Julf! must be one of the great things about being a Euro, so many holidays to celebrate. Eat your hearts out, Brexiters....back to just Guy Fawkes day.

Benedict Addis - SSAC: (08:05) I won't be able to talk for ~20 mins

Caitlin Tubergen: (08:05) one moment

Hadia El Miniawi: (08:05) hi all

Benedict Addis - SSAC: (08:06) Also Stephanie as a Remoaner I'd like you to please kindly avoid the B word on this chat, I find it triggers me;)

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alternate): (08:07) Same goes Benedict!

James Bladel (RrSG): (08:09) I support Ashley's recommendation. Domain Name System is more succinct and accurate.

Benedict Addis - SSAC: (08:09) +1

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:09) Same here. +1 @Ashley. Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alternate): (08:10) Agreed.

Margie Milam (BC): (08:10) +1

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:10) Actually, there are stakeholders who must be considered in my view. Failure to police the scraping of data by third parties is a matter for liability.

Hadia El Miniawi (ALAC): (08:10) I support the proposed edits too

Ben Butler (SSAC): (08:11) Good point Stephanie.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alternate): (08:11) I appreciate that we want to let the EDPB know that we have published the interim report but why do we have to write this letter?

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alternate): (08:11) We can't ask for legal advice and I am not sure this is the time.

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (08:12) But do the policies "govern" those folks?

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:12) Sorry Remoaners....could not resist. Must be the former colony thing...

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alternate): (08:12) We forgive you Stephanie. Stop saying Remoaners though!

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:12) secretariat

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:13) The contract says it does....the temp spec replaces the RAA, not the non-existent policies.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:13) secretariat

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:13) I would not want to go into that level of accuracy in the letter though....just saying

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:13) My line is interrupted may you advise to redial

Terri Agnew: (08:14) @Kavouss, op will redial

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:14) @Ashley: I don't think the policy actually governs them, since they are not themselves contracted parties, but what it does do is determine the conditions underwhich data may be disclosed to third-parties. Right?

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:14) Just to be clear, I am not in favour of the letter, just want to keep it to the formal notice of progress level.

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (08:14) I agree Amr. But that is not what the sentence says, which is why i proposed those edits.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alternate): (08:15) I agree with you Stephanie.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:15) And I agree with your proposed edits, Ashley. They sound good to me. :-)

James Bladel (RrSG): (08:16) Are we "awaiting" their comments? Or just inviting them to do so?

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:18) I think it would be presumptuous to say we await their comments. They are pretty darned busy these days....

Margie Milam (BC): (08:19) I support Georgios' perspective

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:23) I'm personally fine sending nothing to the EDPB at this point. We should focus on seeking input from indepedent legal counsel. I know the two are not mutually exclusive, but don't see the point in sending anything to the EDPB right now.

Alex Deacon - IPC: (08:24) the only "ask" in this letter is the last sentence - it seems we could accomplish the same via a tweet vs. a formal letter and move on to more pressing issues.

Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (08:24) Amr +1

Margie Milam (BC): (08:25) So who supports sending a letter at this point?

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (08:25) No strong feelings

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:25) In conclusion, umtil the time that we have certain specific question agreed by the team to send and those question do not underestimate the reputation of the Team ,we do not send

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (08:25) I just don't want to rule out sending the EDPB a communication in the future.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:26) Ahley, there is no such worry.

Margie Milam (BC): (08:26) agree-- not ruling it out for later

Georgios Tselentis (GAC): (08:26) We should keep the channel open but we do not have something substantial and usefull now

Georgios Tselentis (GAC): (08:26) Probably after TOronto deliberation

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:27) I do not see any harm in informing them about our report. I would also indicate that WE are willing to engage with them and that WE are more than happy to answer all questions they might have.

Alex Deacon - IPC: (08:27) we need a "meh" button.

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (08:28) I didn't hear how we are to vote. Double tasking. :-) I'm with the group.

Farzaneh Badii (NACSG): (08:28) that would be an imoji Alex

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (08:28) @Ashley, Group was pretty much evenly divided!

Georgios Tselentis (GAC): (08:28) EDPB is dealing with many issues -we should not "add noise" and contact them when we have clear and concise questions

Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (08:29) Agree with Georgios

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (08:29) OK. I'll say, I'm with Georgios. How's that? :-)

Hadia El Miniawi (ALAC): (08:30) I agree with Kurts argument in relation to sending the letter

Berry Cobb: (08:33) I will note, that there are budget implications regarding this request. It also will need to follow approval process via the PCST and Council.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:34) @Kurt: Would you please go over the process by which we will be doing futher work on the SOW? Not sure I understand it, and would appreciate it being clear.

Marika Konings: (08:34) as a reminder, a set budget was allocated to the EPDP within the confines of which the EPDP Team is expected to work.

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (08:34) Did the budget factor in outside legal guidance or no?

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:35) I hope that if we demonstrate that additional budget will be required for us to do our work effectively, that this will not be a problem.

Marika Konings: (08:35) See factsheet posted here for further details on resources available: https://community.icann.org/x/2opHBQ

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (08:35) @Berry: The Council should be expecting it (in theory). During the GNSO Council working sessions in Barcelona, the Council asked what the EPDP WG needed. Several of us went to mike and said \$ for outside legal expertise.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:36) @Kristina: +1. This also came up during the HIT session.

Berry Cobb: (08:36) The allocation from the Board, came in 5 buckets: 1) travel 2) Independent facilitator (CBI) 3) Telcom services 4) Limited use of experts 5) Contingency Total \$590K.

Marika Konings: (08:36) See also https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-

3A gnso.icann.org sites default files file field-2Dfile-2Dattach chalaby-2Dto-2Dgnso-2Dcouncil-2D07aug18-

<u>2Den.pdf&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=k7uKdjSb7_ZjltyVqrCYHo</u>rKms9SFxlmbYEJqG-

<u>y91&m=6lMiLP_Gw2Z3HERG2R34Yd5iGOwLbu9nC_JEd4c1Lmc&s=PMAdl2LRs7uMWVIR1DG9DGeiOq77k</u> <u>cYwR8nw5byGlw4&e=</u> - 50,000 for external expertise.

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (08:37) Thanks Marika

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (08:38) +1 Marc

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (08:38) I'd hate to see us waste alot of time on something that isn't feasible.

Marika Konings: (08:39) The more specific the EPDP Team can be on what an external expert is expected to do (e.g what are the specific questions), the easier it will be to determine the \$\$ needed (and whether existing allocation is sufficient).

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (08:39) A la CCWG Accountability, ICANN Reserve has plenty of money! Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (08:39) Can we get a comment from out Board liaisons?

Marika Konings: (08:39) any additional budget allocation would need to go through a Council / Board approval process.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (08:39) With apologies to our Board members not on this call!

Marika Konings: (08:42) Note that for the RDS PDP WG engagement, the RDS PDP WG developed a detailled questionnaire on the basis of which specific quotes were received from different external experts on the basis of which a decision was made.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:42) I trust we do not take a decision on the letter today, right? I for one need a bit of time to review.

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (08:43) I think "understanding the industry" is less important. Actually, I'm worried about that as it could lead to bias.

Georgios Tselentis (GAC): (08:45) +1 Ashley the more "understanding the industry" the less independed legal advice. we get Instead we need GDPR proficiency

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:46) Apparently the RDS REview team has not spent all of its 600 + budget. I would humbly submit, as a member of both teams, that getting independent legal advice to answer basic questions and stop us coming up with new words that obfuscate the issues is a more important priority for ICANN.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alternate): (08:47) Agreed Stephanie

Margie Milam (BC): (08:47) I am worried about bias -- so I guess "understanding the industry" is not as impt as GDPR proficiency

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (08:49) Thomas - that sounds interesting

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:49) Even if waiting for public comments, in your view Kurt, may be late but if and only if we raised the question in a prpfper form reply from the External Lgeal Expert would not be taken as received. we are expert on what we say and what we believe thus we may accept partly or totally or reject the legal view totally

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:52) Thanks, Kurt.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:54) @Kavopuss: You wrote: "we are expert on what we say and what we belive thus we may accept partly or totally or reject the legal view totally." I think we should not assume we are experts on what we are experts on what we say with respect to GDPR. We should be open minded and accept legal advice. Rejecting legal advice when it comes to compliance is a dangerous thing to do.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:55) Frankly, we need this independent legal advice. I have been going on about it since this was being debated at Council. We will not find a skilled team who has not given advice to members of the business constituency, and practitioners who have advised civil society are few and far between, so I think we should not over worry about conflicts of interest here. Lawyers are supposed to know how to deal with conflicting client relationships.

Mark Svancarek (BC): (08:55) Benedict - Please speak up a little

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:55) SHout, Benedict.

Mark Svancarek (BC): (08:55);-)

Farzaneh Badii (NACSG): (08:55) Benedict is being a whisperer...

Farzaneh Badii (NACSG): (08:56) oops I spelled NCSG wrong

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:58) Whart do we mean by "Secondar PURPOSE"?

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:58) Why we should bypass the process' who determine that as secondary purpose?

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:59) It's about access James not collection

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:59) How can ICANN only using this data internally for research be guaranteed? Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:02) Benedict and I had a discussion on this on the phone a while back.

Whilst I think that ICANN has an interest in doing research, it would be good for ICANN to make the case and explain exactly what they need and why they need it.

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:02) if it's pseudomized i.e. ICANN accesses pseudomized personal data, is that even subjected to GDPR?

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:03) *subject

James Bladel (RrSG): (09:03) I'm sorry to be a pain, in the rear but my question was directed to Dan & Trang. Do you agree with Benedict's assessment?

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (09:03) Seems clear that most view this as something ICANN org needs to own, we should confirm with them they are on board with what Benedict outlined

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:03) The other point is that we should be very clear that this is internal research (if I understand correctly), so it should be clear to everyone that IT security companies, CERTS or other entities with an interest in the data will not get it.

Benedict Addis - SSAC: (09:03) Yes Thomas that is the intention.

Margie Milam (BC): (09:04) +1 Alan

Kurt Pritz: (09:05) @James - I think Benedict said he has recently asked Dan the questions you posed is waiting for an answer - but we can check with Dan and Trang here

James Bladel (RrSG): (09:06) Thanks, Kurt.

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:06) I gotta drop off. I only support ICANN access to hashed (pseudomized) personal info

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:07) Agreeing in a common standard for pseudonymization requires efforts and resources on all sides. It would be good to get information on requirements, if any, from ICANN org so that we know what we are talking about.

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:07) Irish DPA did a poition

paper. https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-

3A www.dataprotection.ie documents guidance 3gm4.htm&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSV zgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4l5cM&r=k7uKdjSb7 ZjltyVqrCYHo rKms9SFxlmbYEJqG-

y91&m=6lMiLP Gw2Z3HERG2R34Yd5iGOwLbu9nC JEd4c1Lmc&s=Is7ZbXCANoognqSfMfsABPWUFiputR7 ItTO jF2zF6w&e=

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:07) The "secondary purpose seems to apply to the situation where we already have ACCESS to the data. That is not the case here and the secondary purpose may be problematic.

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (09:07) Agree with Thomas. My only concern with this purpose is that it isn't clear what ICANN wants and needs. Gives pause.

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:07) Secondary purposes are a concept that has been developed under the Directive, GDPR did not actually change that.

Alex Deacon - IPC: (09:09) I support this new purpose but agree further specificity is required - especially regarding how ICANN plans to use it (what programs, etc.)

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:09) it's rather short and refers to tellecommunications ..

James Bladel (RrSG): (09:09) The mobile version of Adobe goes by alphabetical order, rather than chronological. Super helpful! :(

Benedict Addis - SSAC: (09:10) Try the pseudonymising proof of

concept: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-

<u>3A hmachasher.appspot.com&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4l5cM&r=k7</u> uKdjSb7 ZjltyVqrCYHo rKms9SFxImbYEJqG-

y91&m=6lMiLP Gw2Z3HERG2R34Yd5iGOwLbu9nC JEd4c1Lmc&s=E3m0DAH-

ovFq8PfdmEkwjzJK7W9cNwjfo -r2obk FI&e=

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:10) but it is clear that research and development is considered a viable secondary purpose for a controller. It would be up to the controller to identify and define and ensure that their use of the data is up to scratch!:)

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alternate): (09:10) Why would this purpose require personal data for research purposes? I do not agree with this purpose.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alternate): (09:11) +1 Marc

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:12) @Marc: +1. At a minimum, this is something we can defer to the next phase of the EPDP.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (09:12) Alan wood and lindsey +1

Alex Deacon - IPC: (09:14) A wellk nown secret.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (09:14) I suggest we defer to deal with this issue asking more valid reasons and justifications for its consideration

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:15) @Kavouss: +1

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alternate): (09:15) Agreed Kavouss - I think it should be deleted actually.

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (09:15) Agree with Kavouss at this point

Margie Milam (BC): (09:16) +1 Alan

Alex Deacon - IPC: (09:16) FWIW I have several questions which I'll Iput to the list.

James Bladel (RrSG): (09:18) +1 Kristina.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:19) I am very curious about how this purpose would affect ICANN's status as controller?

James Bladel (RrSG): (09:20) Apologies, but need to drop in 10 min. Thx.

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:21) no prob! :)

Trang Nguyen (ICANN Org Liaison): (09:24) A point of clarification re: BRDA, the requirements pre-Temp Spec was that at minimum thin data must be transmitted. Some registries do exceed that minimum requirement sent ICANN full thick data. The Temp Spec clarified that only thin data can be sent via BRDA.

Benedict Addis - SSAC: (09:25) Ah thanks Trang

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alternate): (09:26) Can you speak up please Dan?

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:30) Can someone please answer my question on controllership, I can raise my hand if not

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alternate): (09:32) +1 Marc

Margie Milam (BC): (09:32) Its not new -- they did it before May 25

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:32) @Marc: +1

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:33) I would submit that there is still significant breach risk. Hashing may be simple, as Benedict said, until it fails. Then somebody is liable.

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (09:33) This research purpose is in line with the transparency principle

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:33) @Marc: Exactly right on the scoping issue, and the difference between this EPDP and the RDS PDP!! +1

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alternate): (09:34) Agreed Stephanie.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:34) Part of OCTO's job is to respond to SSAC and if SSAC reps feel there may be a need, then OCTO may have no way to not respond.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:34) This issue is not even mentioned as one of the topics in the temp spec annex that requires further community work!!

Benedict Addis - SSAC: (09:34) Alan I don't represent SSAC here

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:34) What OCTO needs to do is not in scope, in my view. We have not finished our chartered work.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:35) Which is not to suggest that Benedict's work is not important....just not in scope

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:36) "Which is not to suggest that Benedict's work is not important....just not in scope" +1

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:36) but this is nt a shared primary purpose ... aagin sem far more to be a secondary purpose for ICANN

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:36) We are here to ensure that ICANN can do its job considering GDPR. That is not limited to what was in the Temp Spec. It may be defered, but still within our area.

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (09:36) @Stephanie how come OCTO needs are not in scope - this relates to how whois data was and is used

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:36) This is a classic example of where independent counsel could help us advise on whose purposes are in scope, and whose are not....

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:36) *again seems (my typing is so bad today)

Margie Milam (BC): (09:37) +1 BBenedict

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (09:38) Don't disagree this may be a purpose but shouldn't ICANN org be driving this??

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:39) The GNSO Council recognized in its public meeting in Barcelona that there are RDS issues that are beyond the scope of this EPDP, and that these still require further work.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:39) @Matt: +1

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (09:39) I tend to agree with Matt. I think this is in scope, but we need some input from ICANN.

Benedict Addis - SSAC: (09:40) We decided that we didn't want a briefing from OCTO in LA after meeting Goran. That's why we're here:)

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:41) I suspect we will not be dealing with every possible purpose on this EPDP. But not all purposes need to be settled on the EPDP. The urgency we need to focus on is replacing the temp spec, and stick to the scope within the EPDP's charter.

Margie Milam (BC): (09:41) I have been advocating for an OCTO briefing since LA

Alex Deacon - IPC: (09:41) ilt is very mportant for ICANN org (OCTO/GDD/whatever) to be involved in issues that impact the ability for them to do their work.

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (09:41) Lets get briefing from OCTO, where we can take input from ICANN on this

Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:42) old hand sorry

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:43) Didn't we already ask ICANN org about this purpose? To me, their response seemed slightly evasive, as opposed to demonstrating urgency in us fixing a problem they're experiencing.

Margie Milam (BC): (09:43) sure -- I can do that to prep the call

Margie Milam (BC): (09:43) I can send an email

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (09:43) seeing something in writing would really speed things along I think. Marc Anderson (RySG): (09:44) we did, it is in the body of the email Markia sent along with Purpose O

Marc Anderson (RySG): (09:44) also on the wiki page

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (09:44) Ah, thanks!

Marika Konings: (09:44) Please see previous ICANN Org responses

here: https://community.icann.org/x/ahppBQ

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (09:49) YES

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:49) When 40% of randomly sampled domains have problems, I din't think we can ignore it.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:51) This is an ongoing program that needs to be re-evaluated under GDPR Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:52) In government, we have to look at a thing called response burden.

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (09:52) But accuracy (to a certain extent) is already a requirement in the contracts. Why not enable the program? Particularly if it isn't a burden on the contracted parties or data subjects?

Benedict Addis - SSAC: (09:52) Stephanie can you articulate why whois (in)accuracy is linked to the loss of a domain?

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:52) I think ICANN ought to as well

Alex Deacon - IPC: (09:52) +1 Ashley.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:52) RAA requirements, no? Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:52) (in response to Benedict)

Trang Nguyen (ICANN Org Liaison): (09:52) Here is the link to the cycle 6 ARS

report: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-

3A whois.icann.org sites default files files whois-2Dars-2Dphase-2D2-2Dreport-2Dcycle-2D6-2D15jun18-

5F0.pdf&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4l5cM&r=k7uKdjSb7_ZjItyVqrCYHo_rKms9SFxlmbYEJqG-y9l&m=6lMiLP_Gw2Z3HERG2R34Yd5iGOwLbu9nC_JEd4c1Lmc&s=9Df-ZejSTafqFX16t3dAKb3NwgQuFJi836LjhB0bKOl&e=

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:53) Accuracy, as a contractual obligation, is not changing as a result of our work, and a purpose already exists to address the needs of Compliance.

Benedict Addis - SSAC: (09:53) I think inaccuracy is grounds for further investigation. This might lead to a suspension (serverHold) but not loss of the asset.

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:54) Hadia, that completely meissed Stephanie's point. The resonable efforts at accuracy should be proportional to the potential harm caused. But I also agree . this is completely out of scope of our discussions (+1 lindsay)

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:54) @Lindsay, the accuracy clauses in the RAA ONLY apply to a subset of registrations.

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (09:54) Apologies i am not able speak up clearly i have terrible tooth pain

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (09:54) Perhaps we can just note that the existing requirements support and/or are in GDPR compliance? And... make sure ICANN has the tools to do their accuracy reporting.

Benedict Addis - SSAC: (09:54) Sorry to hear it Hadia

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alternate): (09:55) What do you mean Alan G?

Alex Deacon - IPC: (09:55) The (a) concern seems to be that ARS has stopped working because of GDPR - we should be able to address that in a gdpr compliant way.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:55) @Hadia: Salamtik!!

Julf Helsingius - mobile (NCSG): (09:55) Kavouss +1

Benedict Addis - SSAC: (09:55) Alex is correct

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:56) Calidation only applies to new registrations and when there are transfers. There is a HUGE number of registrations that are grandfathered.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:56) that is "validation"

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (09:56) @Amr thanks

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:57) Last estimate of grandfathered registrations was abourt 180,000,000

Margie Milam (BC): (09:57) yes -- I'll send an email

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alternate): (09:57) Validation? Care to be a bit more specific Alan G?

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alternate): (09:58) I hope not cross field validation - that needs to die.

Marika Konings: (09:59) See items #15, #16, #17 - the more specific you can be on additions and or recommendations to the report, the more focused the EPDP Team's conversation can be.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:59) @Lindsey, under WHOIS ACCURACT PROGRAM SPEC.

Alan Woods (RYSG): (10:00) Sorry guys I have a meeting and I have to drop!

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (10:00) I did?

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alternate): (10:00) My point is I don't know why we are discussing this further?

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (10:01) That would be helpful. thanks, kurt.

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (10:01) Yes I don't think this is the place to address overall accuracy issues...that feels out of scope of what we are trying to accomplish

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alternate): (10:01) Agreed Matt

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:02) I am discussing it because we clearly still have a significant issue with inaccuracy. And the ACCURACY PROGRAM SPEC will not address it.

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (10:02) Thank you all bye

Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison): (10:02) thanks all

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:02) Thanks all. Bye.

Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (10:02) Thanks

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alternate): (10:02) Bye