

Adobe Connect: 27

Alan Greenberg (ALAC)	James Bladel (RrSG)
Alan Woods (RYSG)	Julf Helsingius (NCSG)
Alex Deacon (IPC)	Kavouss Arasteh (GAC)
Amr Elsadr (NCSG)	Kristina Rosette (RySG)
Ayden Férdeline (NCSG)	Kurt Pritz (Chair)
Ben Butler (SSAC)	Laureen Kapin (GAC Alternate)
Benedict Addis - SSAC	Marc Anderson (RySG)
Chris Lewis-Evans (GAC Alternate)	Margie Milam (BC)
Diane Plaut (IPC)	Mark Svancarek (BC)
Emily Taylor (RrSG)	Matt Serlin (RrSG)
Esteban Lescano (ISPCP)	Milton Mueller (NCSG)
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG)	Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison)
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC)	Stephanie Perrin (NCSG)
	Thomas Rickert (ISPCP)

On Audio Only:

Leon Sanchez (ICANN Board Liaison)

Apologies:

Georges Tselentis (GAC)
Ashley Heineman (GAC)
Chris Disspain (ICANN Board Liaison)

Audio Cast (FOR ALTERNATES AND OBERVERS)

Peak: 23 joined

View Only Adobe Connect:

49 joined

Staff:

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

AC Chat:

Marika Konings:Welcome to EPDP Team Meeting #12 on 11 September 2018

Terri Agnew:agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/1gONBQ>

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):Hi all.

Chris Lewis-Evans [GAC]:Hi and hello to all

Milton Mueller (NCSG):thanks, Terri
Ayden Férdeline (NCSG):Hi all
Kurt Pritz:I have my copy of the Temporary Specification out and access to Thomas' and Margie's emails of yesterday, as well as the data matrices sent by Thomas and the ICANN team last week.
Julf Helsingius:GNSO councillors are just getting off previous call
Esteban Lescano (ISPCP):Hi everyone!
Julf Helsingius (NCSG):And seems I don't have an affiliation as I switched calls on the fly
Julf Helsingius (NCSG):Ah, thanks :)
Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Hi all!
Julf Helsingius (NCSG):Oh, we have a dog too :)
James Bladel (RrSG):Woof!
Emily Taylor:The doge!
Milton Mueller (NCSG):The dog SG deserves to be represented
Julf Helsingius (NCSG):On the Internet nobody knows you are a dog...
Milton Mueller (NCSG):we must be inclusive
Emily Taylor:Multistakeholder is not just for people!!
Milton Mueller (NCSG):The cats can never reach consensus with the dogs
Rafik Dammak:hello all
James Bladel (RrSG):Dont forget to wave when you pass my house.
Milton Mueller (NCSG):When diving into substance be careful not to belly flop
Amr Elsadr (NCSG):Maybe leave this EPDP to the dogs and cats..., possible that we'd make better progress? ;-)
Milton Mueller (NCSG):Something tells me it's all happening at the zoo...
farzaneh badii:Hi sorry I am late. Anything life threatening happened?
Milton Mueller (NCSG):no, just Kurt ...
farzaneh badii (NCSG):well Kurt is pretty peaceful and nice. so we are all in the peace zone :)
Marc Anderson (RySG):I just got droipped from the call, dialing back in
Ayden Férdeline (NCSG):I have expressed concerns regarding the GDPR training on the list. Is that the appropriate platform, or should I raise at the end of this call?
Marc Anderson (RySG):back in
Julf Helsingius:I had an AC burp too
farzaneh badii (NCSG):well we have to be clear that we are not working on registrar and registry purposes that are not ICANN purposes
Milton Mueller (NCSG):An immediate comment: Thomas's and Benedict's framework refers to "
Milton Mueller (NCSG):third party "INTERESTS" not third party "purposes"
Milton Mueller (NCSG):the difference is important
Benedict Addis - SSAC:Milton, it's third party purposes
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG):My dog is getting so bored with these calls I am having to bribe him with bones....
Milton Mueller (NCSG):The slide we just saw refers to "Third-party purposes for processing data" - this needs to be changed. There are no 3rd party purposes, only interests
Amr Elsadr (NCSG):@Benedict: Would "purposes relevant to third-party interests" characterize this correctly?
Benedict Addis - SSAC:The reason is that we are specifically not limiting ourselves to 6 (1) f
Diane Plaut (IPC):Stephanie - that is hysterical!
Benedict Addis - SSAC:Yes Amr, that would be exact!
Milton Mueller (NCSG):Wrong Benedict - look at the spreadsheet.

Milton Mueller (NCSG):There are legitimate interests of third parties, and there are ICANN/Ry/Rr purposes. full stop

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG):(Yes Diane, this is walk time as far as he is concerned)

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG):There should indeed be a separate column for the registrant's interests. EG escrow, transfer policy

farzaneh badii (NCSG):Yes I do have issues

Emily Taylor (RrSG):Alan - data subjects have a right to access information already under GDPR

Alan Greenberg (ALAC):@Emily, yes, but the question is how would one implement that if it is to be indep of their registrar. It may be sufficiently challenging as to warrant a focus on it.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC):The concept of matching the registrant who asks for such information to the actual record may not be trivial.

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG):Why does it have to be independent of the registrar?

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG):(Forgive my rather basic question, thanks)

Alan Greenberg (ALAC):@Ayden. I said *IF* we want it to be indep.

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG):What would be the argument in favour of it being independent though?

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG):Just trying to understand why you would find this useful

Alan Greenberg (ALAC):Remember, Even Registrar may not be able to do the match if there is a reseller (or a reseller chain) involved.

Milton Mueller (NCSG):Registrants are data subjects, not data processors/collectors. Therefore it makes no sense for them to specify a "purpose"

Benedict Addis - SSAC:Milton - my fault. I thought you were referring to the legal basis of "legitimate interest"

Milton Mueller (NCSG):thanks B, just trying to avoid confusion. Seems we keep getting stuck on purpose vs. legitimate interest, which impedes agreement

Emily Taylor (RrSG):@Thomas - I have lowered my hand. Just wanted to (1) thank you and Benedict for your analysis and (2) ask whether I'm correct in interpreting blank rows as indicating there is no purpose identified in the Temp Spec ?

Benedict Addis - SSAC:Blank rows in revised draft column = no changes

Diane Plaut (IPC):Yes, the data subject is a clear right and therefore I agree with Alan that it should be clearly laid out and independent - any business has to make this information clear but this could be put in a data subject right policy

Benedict Addis - SSAC:In purpose columns, no purpose identified in Temp Spec (according to a very quick run-though!)

Diane Plaut (IPC):Thomas and Benedict this is a great work and great step forward moving us in the right direction

Emily Taylor (RrSG):@Thomas @Farzi - is 'pattern of abuse' used in the same sense as it appears in UDRP and equivalent procedures

Benedict Addis - SSAC:@Emily not intentionally. Can you quote section?

farzaneh badii (NCSG):I am not sure Emily. I take it that they mean generally pattern of DNS registration that is abusive might even relate to pattern fighting in botnet

Kavouss.Arasteh (GAC):When people say " we do not want ... "Whom they refer as we?

Emily Taylor (RrSG):UDRP 4(b) Evidence of registration and use in bad faith... (ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name ***provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct***

farzaneh badii (NCSG):We have more comments which I will send to the list

farzaneh badii (NCSG):Pattern of abuse Emily invokes spec 11 so it's broader than that

farzaneh badii (NCSG):Cycling? I don't think about purposes when cycling, I will definitely crash and die

James Bladel (RrSG):I think about cycling when I'm cycling.
Milton Mueller (NCSG):I think about gasping for breath
James Bladel (RrSG):I think about ePDP while mowing the lawn, tho
farzaneh badii (NCSG):Milton looks like your mic is on
Diane Plaut (IPC):I relate to Benedict completely - I am an avid runner and cyclist and have my clearest thoughts when when doing sports - freedom of the mind.
Amr Elsadr (NCSG):I like to swing my boken around, while thinking. Just sayin'.
Milton Mueller (NCSG):@Alan - We are concerned about how the purpose expansion would affect both additional collection and the terms and conditions of access
Milton Mueller (NCSG):I repeat @margie: Registrant is a data subject, not a processor
Chris Lewis-Evans [GAC]:Agree the data owner has the right to see that their own data is recorded properly
Milton Mueller (NCSG):that right is already granted by nearly all privacy laws
Milton Mueller (NCSG):we don't need an additional column
Benedict Addis - SSAC:Agree with Milton
Benedict Addis - SSAC:Purposes are for controllers
Amr Elsadr (NCSG):Not sure how adding a column on registered name holder purposes helps at all. Data subjects already have the legal right to access their own data. To try to justify processing purposes by claiming they are processed for the sake of the registrant is not something I am comfortable with.
Milton Mueller (NCSG):Parking is the correct move, I agree Thomas
Alan Woods (RYSG):agreed with many observations re 'registrant purposes'. This is clearly pointing out an issue that there is a continued misunderstanding as to what a 'purpose' actually is.
Milton Mueller (NCSG):indeed
Benedict Addis - SSAC:+1 Alan
Milton Mueller (NCSG):Most of our disagreements and problems can be traced to that
Milton Mueller (NCSG):It is logically bizarre to say that the purpose of collecting data is to disclose it
Benedict Addis - SSAC:Correct Alex
Milton Mueller (NCSG):That would justify collection of ANYTHING
Margie Milam (BC):agree with Alex
Mark Svancarek (BC):Disagree with Milton
Benedict Addis - SSAC:Milton - if the data is not collected (a type of processing), then it is meaningless to talk of access (another type of processing that relies on collection)
Milton Mueller (NCSG):Right, Benedict, but what determines what data is collected? Answer: purposes
Amr Elsadr (NCSG):4.4.2 is way too broad, vague, and honestly..., adds no concrete value to the temp spec.
Milton Mueller (NCSG):so it's absurd to say that a purpose is to disclose
Benedict Addis - SSAC:Milton - yes
Diane Plaut (IPC):Agree with Alex and this does not translate into the the "collection of anything" due to the specifed language within the further sections
Milton Mueller (NCSG):All you are saying Diane is that you want access to existing whois data.
Milton Mueller (NCSG):So let's deal with that when we deal with access
Benedict Addis - SSAC:But ... it doesn't say disclose without control
farzaneh badii (NCSG):almost all the data that is being collected in whois at the moment is in ICANN purpose. but if you keep it open to interpretation then you might be allowed to process more data elements
Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:Thomas why did you say that it is a third party interest - we don't knoe yet that it is a third party intetrest
Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:know

Benedict Addis - SSAC:Hadia - you may be confusing the language 'third party interests' with 'legitimate interest'

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG):the key point is that it is not a purpose

Benedict Addis - SSAC:The latter has a specific meaning in GDPR

Benedict Addis - SSAC:It is a lawful basis for processing, found in 6 (1) f

Daniel Halloran (ICANN Org Liaison - Legal):@Thomas/Kurt: Please note that we haven't had time to review and discuss this document with our colleagues, so if you're looking for agreement from ICANN on this table of purposes please don't take silence to equal agreement from the ICANN liaisons -- thanks.

farzaneh badii (NCSG):what happened to slicing dicing?

Benedict Addis - SSAC:Conversely, when we talk of 'third party interests' (note the plural) that is a generic recognition that third parties have an interest in the data

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):@Farzaneh - we still have work underway to slice and dice, right? I am thinking of 4.4.8 for example.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):example

James Bladel (RrSG):Too faint

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):@Mark: Couldn't hear what you were saying.

Mark Svancarek (BC):I was in violent agreement with Benedict :)

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):OK. Thanks. :-)

Mark Svancarek (BC):Please let us not argue about every row that contains "x" in the 3rd party column.

Milton Mueller (NCSG):speak up B

Mark Svancarek (BC):If a third party has expressed an "interest", it is captured in that column.

Mark Svancarek (BC):We will debate the legitimacy of the purposes related to those interests later

Diane Plaut (IPC):Mark and Benedict - very much agree and I think that Benedict's earlier comment regarding the controller evaluation in relation to third party interest(s) should be further discussed

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:@Benedict I am not confusing third parties interests with legitimate interests who ever said that Providing access to accurate, reliable, and uniform Registration Data based on legitimate interests is necessarily a third party interest;

Benedict Addis - SSAC:Sorry Milton, the answer was "yes (thick) registries occasionally get asked for data by cyber-security types and LE"

Benedict Addis - SSAC:Hi Hadia, I see. The language you quote from the Temp Spec doesn't accurately reflect GDPR. That's why we removed it in the draft. See column C.

farzaneh badii (NCSG):We believe there should be modifications to Ashley's paragraph. We will send comments to the mailing list.

Benedict Addis - SSAC:Farzi I agree

farzaneh badii (NCSG):I totally agree Thomas.

Kavouss.Arasteh (GAC):Thomas, you said Article 29 criticised ICANN that it mixed up its purposes by the purposes of third party. What is the answer of ICANN ? Do you support the views expressed by Article 29?. Moreover, after almost 18 years in function ,we do not yet know what is the purposes of Registry, Registrar, Registrant?

Benedict Addis - SSAC:@Farzi 4.4.9 falls into the trap of being exhaustive. We should keep it general in this section.

farzaneh badii (NCSG):yeah I think law enforcement should do it themselves and let us comment :)

Matt Serlin (RrSG):want to thank Thomas and Benedict for their work on this and guiding the conversation...very well done!

Kavouss.Arasteh (GAC):I have already given my views about Ashley's views in the mailing list

farzaneh badii (NCSG):I always said lets concentrate on collection for purposes then think about disclosure. total support

Emily Taylor (RrSG):+1 Matt

Kavouss.Arasteh (GAC):Thomas ,pls reply to my comments?

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):@Kurt @Thomas: Could this spreadsheet be placed in a google doc, so that comments may all be collected in one place?

Kristina Rosette (RySG):+1 Amr

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG):+1 Kurt. I support conversations happening in public on our archived list.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Hello Kavouss, afaik ICANN has not responded to that point and yes, I echo the comment made by Art. 29. The purposes need to be kept separate.

Kavouss.Arasteh (GAC):Thomas, pls slow down asking agreement or objection to what you have made which we appreciate that but we need time to digest that

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG):I would like to reiterate my request to have Peter Kimpian from the COE join this group as an independent expert. We are discussing purpose without the benefit of how the DPAs view purpose. It would be helpful to have that perspective.

Kavouss.Arasteh (GAC):pls put it in word doc.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):Problem with a word doc is that there might be several copies being passed around.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Kavouss, we can do a lot of things, but slowing down is not an option :-)

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG):+1 Stephanie - the input of the COE would be invaluable

Kavouss.Arasteh (GAC):to undertstand is the main option

Benedict Addis - SSAC:+1 Stephanie, was at COE last week and they are very sensible and knowledgeable

Kavouss.Arasteh (GAC):we should not be pushed to agree or disagree so quickly

Kavouss.Arasteh (GAC):Margie +1

Kavouss.Arasteh (GAC):but Alan also needs to kindly presents his counter argument

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:@Benedict I am not sure about the rewording (Column C)

farzaneh badii (NCSG):sorry I am a bit confused, we were supposed to discuss Appendix C anyway or are we discussing it because Margie (I think) brought it up?

Mark Svancarek (BC):Margie was asked to prepare ina previous meeting

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):@Margie: I thought "principles" made sense as an argument to retain Appendix C, but you kinda lost me when you went to "terms". Aren't these terms meant to be specified in the access model?

Kavouss.Arasteh (GAC):Mark +1

Marika Konings:@Farzaneh - this discussion relates to an open action that Margie delivered upon that came out of the previous discussion on Appendix C.

farzaneh badii (NCSG):Thanks Marika.

Milton Mueller (NCSG):Yes, @Amr I think Margie has just convinced me to support the deletion of Appdx C

farzaneh badii (NCSG):well it looks like we really should from this slide

Kavouss.Arasteh (GAC):The temporary (later become definitive) specification must be self sufficent, self contaioned, transparent document

James Bladel (RrSG):Good points, Emily. I share that concern.

farzaneh badii (NCSG):I wish we would just discuss appendix C on the mailing list. It sounds really confusing going back and forth to these issues

Kavouss.Arasteh (GAC):There would be a risk of future changes in the GDPR as well as different interpretation of the existing text and / or its future amendments that necessitate that we should have a clear, transparent, self contained and self sufficient specification rather than merely and simply cross refernce various articles of GDPR

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG):I thought the Charter was pretty clear on this. We have not answered the gating questions.

Kavouss.Arasteh (GAC):aPPENDIX c IS DATA PROCESSING AND NOT dATA aCCESS

Milton Mueller (NCSG):wrong Kavouss, Margie just said it is the access model

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):@Kavouss - disclosing data is also data processing

Mark Svancarek (BC):Disclosing is also procesing

Mark Svancarek (BC):processing

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):The temp spec doesn't include specific terms for access, as far as I can tell. More like high-level principles, that in many cases are broad and vague. Moving from those to specific terms is a rather large leap imo.

Kavouss.Arasteh (GAC):Thomas , It is NIOT

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Kavouss, - sorry it is.

Mark Svancarek (BC):Yes, Margie's new language is ensuring that certain principles, which are mentioned nowhere else, are retained somewhere

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Caps do not make your statement correct :-)

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):@Mark: No objections to principles, but do have objections to terms.

Kavouss.Arasteh (GAC): Thomas, processing is entirely INDEPENDENT FROM ACCESS

Benedict Addis - SSAC:Kavouss - processing has a specific meaning in GDPR. It includes access.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):@Kavouss: Processing includes collection, use and disclosure/access.

Benedict Addis - SSAC:We are not using IT terminology here

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:@Milton appendix C does not only speak about access it speaks also about the activities

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Kavouss - please look at Art. 4 (2) GDPR: 'processing' means any operation or set of operations which is performed on personal data or on sets of personal data, whether or not by automated means, such as collection, recording, organisation, structuring, storage, adaptation or alteration, retrieval, consultation, use, disclosure by transmission, dissemination or otherwise making available, alignment or combination, restriction, erasure or destruction;

Kavouss.Arasteh (GAC):Dear Thoma, it was mistake ,I did not meant that sorry about that

Alan Greenberg (ALAC):This established that there will be an access process and that contracted parties are required to adhere to it.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):@Kavouss - all good. No problem.

Benedict Addis - SSAC:Alan +1

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:+1 Kurt

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):@Kurt: Good framing of the questions we need to answer.

Kavouss.Arasteh (GAC):GDPR IS NOT A HOLLY TEXT. it technology differentiates between processing and access

Milton Mueller (NCSG):Then Margie should remove the word "terms"

Mark Svancarek (BC):@Amr - "term" may be negotiated in contract updates. without an expression of principles, those updates may be inappropriate. Sorry for any confusion. To be fair, I think Margie only used "terms" in this context

James Bladel (RrSG):Then why don't was just say that? Seems like one or two sentences could replace APpendix C

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:I agree with alan and Kurt

James Bladel (RrSG):And I would reiterate that "requiring" contracting parties to adhere to an access model presumes that the model itself complies with the law(s).

Kavouss.Arasteh (GAC):IT itechnology differentiates between processing and access.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC):@James. Correct. Is there anyone saying anything else? I though everything we were sating was ultimately supposed to be compliant.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):@Mark: I appreciate your clarification, and would welcome it as an explanation, but that isn't what I understood from how Margie made a distinction between terms and principles. Would be happy to be wrong about this.

Mark Svancarek (BC):James, I thought we already agreed that slavishly reiterating that everything needs to be legal is unneeded at this point of the discussion

Benedict Addis - SSAC:@Hadia Yes. Appendix C is about processing, as described by Thomas above.

Alex Deacon - IPC:+1 Alan

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):@Kurt: Could you repeat what it is we're being polled on?

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):The root cause of this discussion is that we have a document (Temp Spec) that is badly written and structured as a basis for our discussion. The more I listen to these discussions (that do not take us anywhere) the more I think we need to divorce our discussions from the Temp Spec. We need to discuss a lot of points in the right sequence and I am sure that a legal and analytical approach will make even those happy that want Appendix C included.

farzaneh badii (NCSG):Totally Agree Thomas

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):@Thomas: +1

Kurt Pritz:@Amr : Whether the chart should be included (if corrected)

Amr Elsadr (NCSG):Ah..., thanks.

Milton Mueller (NCSG):EMILY PLEASE SPEAK LOUDLY

Diane Plaut (IPC):Alan and Kurt agree with you both, Appendix C is important and properly discussed within scope here and useful

Alex Deacon - IPC:@stephanie - I've assumed that this group needs to set the policy that allows for the creation of a framework.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG):I have my hand up. The points I want to make are: 1) I do not recall agreeing to a framework for disclosure. We are not there yet. 2) Whatever happened to answering the gating questions before we get to Appendix C?

Matt Serlin (RrSG):+1 Thomas...I continue to struggle with that issue...we need to move from the spec to policy creation really quickly

James Bladel (RrSG):A corrected chart will be helpful, but not appropriate to include in the spec.

farzaneh badii (NCSG):I took down my disagreement button not to be in constant disagreement mode. But I totally agree with Thomas. Temp Spec is not good basis ... we need to answer the gating questions etc

Kristina Rosette (RySG):+1 James and Thomas

Kavouss.Arasteh (GAC):Data processing and data release/disclosure are engineering terms and functions and should be delth by engineers

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG):I need to drop off; thanks all, see you Thursday...

Benedict Addis - SSAC:Cheers Ayden!

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG):Absolutely agree with James. Although I am not sure it should be anywhere

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG):Put in on the centralized WHOIS page then. But it should not have the force of policy

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG):This would absolutely constrain the ability of contracted parties to refine best practice.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG):Or comply with region specific data protection requirements

James Bladel (RrSG):And if one component of a chart or table were to be invalidated under the law, the entire thing is vulnerable.

Benedict Addis - SSAC:But worth keeping at least a framework?

farzaneh badii (NCSG):sorry I have to drop off. have a nice day.

James Bladel (RrSG):Benedict - are your concerns operational or legal/jurisdictional?

James Bladel (RrSG):And just so I'm clear: is this a GAC concern or an SSAC issue?

Milton Mueller (NCSG):do it via email

Marika Konings:@Benedict - the gating questions are in the charter.

Milton Mueller (NCSG):there are a lot of them

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG):would you like me to respond?
Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Question: Are we making the best use of our time?
Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:There is a difference between a framework and a mechanism and setting the rules through a framework is necessarily
Chris Lewis-Evans [GAC]:Need to drop out of the room will still be on the audio bridge thanks all.
Alan Greenberg (ALAC):The equivalent of App C needs to say that a mechanism will exist and be required to be used. Period. Not to set the rules.
Kavouss.Arasteh (GAC):There is difference between framework for access and access model
Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:+ 1 Alan
Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:@alan you are correct maybe we don't need a framework but we just need to be sure that a mechanism will exist
Alan Greenberg (ALAC):I find the term "framework" far to overused in ICANN!
Alan Greenberg (ALAC):It is an ill-defined concept.
Alex Deacon - IPC:is there a time for the Becky session on the 18th?
Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC:For clarification by a mechanism, I mean a tool
Caitlin Tubergen:@Alex - time for the Becky session will be confirmed as soon as possible.
James Bladel (RrSG):Registry proposal? Do you mean our (Registrar) work on Sec 4.4?
Alex Deacon - IPC:thanks caitlin.
Marika Konings:@James - that related to Appendix C
James Bladel (RrSG):ah, ok, thx.
Marika Konings:so that was a RySG proposal
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG):Methodology is a better word than framework. Management practices are required.
Marika Konings:but you did flag a missing item - input on Kurt's email in relation to the RrSG purposes
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG):It is not up to ICANN to build another whois model.
James Bladel (RrSG):Just to thank Thomas and Margie. I know that taking the wheel with this group is not easy, and appreciate their work
Emily Taylor (RrSG):+1 James
Matt Serlin (RrSG):thanks all
Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Thanks, Margie!!! Well done.
Benedict Addis - SSAC:Thank you all.
Julf Helsingius (NCSG):Thanks all
Amr Elsadr (NCSG):Thanks all. Bye.
Thomas Rickert (ISPCP):Thanks all and bye for now.
Alan Greenberg (ALAC):Bye all
Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison):thanks all