Adobe Connect: 27

Alan Greenberg (ALAC)	Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC)
Alan Woods (RySG)	Julf Helsingius (NCSG)
Alex Deacon (IPC)	Kristina Rosette (RySG)
Amr Elsadr (NCSG)	Kurt Pritz (Chair)
Ashley Heineman (GAC)	Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alternate)
Ayden Férdeline (NCSG)	Marc Anderson (RySG)
Ben Butler (SSAC)	Margie Milam (BC)
Benedict Addis (SSAC)	Mark Svancarek (BC)
Chris Lewis-Evans (GAC Alternate)	Milton Mueller (NCSG)
Diane Plaut (IPC)	Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison)
Emily Taylor (RrSG)	Rahul Gosain (GAC Alternate)
Esteban Lescano (ISPCP)	Stephanie Perrin (NCSG)
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG)	Theo Geurts (RrSG Alternate)
	Thomas Rickert (ISPCP)

Guests:
David Plumb (CBI)

On Audio Only:
Chris Disspain (ICANN Board Liaison)
Leon Sanchez (ICANN Board Liaison)

Apologies:
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC)
Georgios Tselentis (GAC)
Matt Serlin (RrSG)
James Bladel (RrSG)

Audio Cast (FOR ALTERNATES AND OBSERVERS)
Peak: 16 joined

View Only Adobe Connect:
37 joined

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

AC Chat:
Andrea Glandon: (10/9/2018 07:08) Welcome to the EPDP Team call #18 held on Tuesday, 09 October 2018 at 13:00 UTC.
Andrea Glandon: (07:08) Agenda Wiki Page: https://community.icann.org/x/KwWrBQ
Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (07:56) Hi all
Theo Geurts RrSG Alt: (07:57) hello
Chris Lewis-Evans (GAC Alt): (07:58) Hello all
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:00) Hi all.
Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (08:01) Julf (NCSG) will be joining shortly, when the GNSO Council's INGO call ends - it might be running a few minutes late
Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (08:02) Here
Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison): (08:03) hi all
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:03) I am only getting support for hotel, not airfare, just FYI
Berry Cobb: (08:03) Travel support wiki page: https://community.icann.org/display/EOTSFGRD/EPDP+Travel+Support
Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:03) Hi all, I am at a conference, am listening, but likely cannot speak.
Berry Cobb: (08:04) Please note there are budget limitations to the request as well as approval process via the PCST. More details provided tomorrow.
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:13) Some of the "thick" whois issues are important in the context of this discussion.
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:14) unavoidable
David Plumb (CBI): (08:15) Yes, we will get there. Let's see how Berry's sheets help us get there
Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:16) We need to look at the individual data elements and not at the sets of data elements in "thick" vs. "thin"
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:16) I wish we could also talk about moral reasons why registrars should not transfer data to registries... thick registries were just bad for privacy.
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:16) yes we should look at individual elements ...
Benedict Addis - SSAC: (08:18) @Farzi empirically, registrars have been breached more than registries. Data breach = massive privacy disaster.
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:19) well thick registries double the breach risk . for no good reason really
Alex Deacon - IPC: (08:19) I'll note in this EPDP we have not defined what "minimal registration data" is (we did in the RDS PDP)
Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (08:19) Benedict: wouldn't a transfer mean the data is held by both?
Benedict Addis - SSAC: (08:19) Haha Julf yes!
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:19) I don't doubt your stats Benedict, but that is not a rationale to consolidate the data. Scale of the loss is also important.
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:19) well Stephanie said it better than me! as always
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:20) Benedict, there are thousands more registrars than registries, and most of them hold fewer records than a thick registry
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:20) I thought you said it better Farz....you are doubling the risk for no reason
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:20) @Alex: I believe a distinction between what is redacted and what is not serves the same purpose of what the RDS called the MPDS, doesn't it?
David Plumb (CBI): (08:21) Folks, I encourage you to listen to Berry's presentation
Alex Deacon - IPC: (08:21) @amr - yes
Benedict Addis - SSAC: (08:21) Sorry David
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:21) I lost audio.

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (08:21) i have lost audio; did others

Mark Svancarek (BC): (08:21) lost audio

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:21) lost audio

Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (08:21) Lost audio

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (08:21) i lost audio too

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:21) Looks like we lost Berry.

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:21) collect or not by whom? collect by registrar at point of registration

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (08:21) lost audio

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:21) berry is back

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (08:21) back again

Benedict Addis - SSAC: (08:22) Guess who's back?

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:22) Sorry David, cannot read the slides, and lost the reason for us dealing with this in this way rather quickly

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:23) @Benedict: LOL!!

Marika Konings: (08:23) @Stephanie - all these materials were shared by Berry yesterday on the mailing list.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:24) Sorry, took the weekend off for the holidays.

Berry Cobb: (08:28) Sorry, over to you David. ;-)

Berry Cobb: (08:29) It's important that we are answering the Charter Questions C, so they should be in mind when we discuss this today.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:30) I'm not sure I understand the question.

Berry Cobb: (08:35) It's important to read the rationale in the light green section of the 6.1.b vs. 6.1.f

Berry Cobb: (08:35) under lawful basis

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:37) yes, 6.1.b seems reasonable but I don't see a 6.1.f case at all

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:38) 6 I b as basis for transfer of domain name and name server (which might be PII), 6 I f for full registrant data, 6 I b for data where eligibility requirements exist (validation).

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:39) Yet another purpose.

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:39) why 6.1.f for "full registrant data?"

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:39) no what is not technically necessary to transfer should be just discarded!

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:39) for this purpose!!

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:39) In a data ecosystem, it is necessary to map the various processors. The registry is a processor, and disclosure to them is necessary, in order for the primary purpose of data collection, namely to make the name resolve properly and function.

Mark Svancarek (BC): (08:40) So long as all the purposes are disclosed at the time of collection, we are fine: "For purposes of business continuity, we will transfer the following data to Register X", etc

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:40) However, it is still a disclosure to another company, with attendant breach liability allocation requirements (and risks, as was discussed earlier in the chat).

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:43) @Stephanie: Not all the data is required to be transferred/disclosed to the Registry Operator for the domain name to resolve. What would be necessary is what we used to call the MPDS on the RDS PDP.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:43) We have discussed earlier that the Ry may assert to have an interest in obtaining regsitration data to fight DNS abuse. That woiuld be an OK reason accordging to 6 I f in my view.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:43) ..., which is basically the unredacted data post temp-spec.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:45) I need to step away for a few mins....

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alt): (08:45) It should only be data that is necessary that is transferred and yes agreed Stephanie, it is disclosure. Is it required to register or administer a domain name or to protect the DNS? If so, then possibly.

Rahul Gosain-GAC: (08:47) Sorry for being late

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (08:48) what i meant that in order to establish the rights of a registrant we need to transfer the data from the registrar to the regsitry to protect or preserve the registrants' data

Terri Agnew: (08:48) finding the line

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:49) Purpose A is about estalbishing the _rights_ of a RNH in a name

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:49) and allowing the registrants to exercise those rights

Berry Cobb: (08:49) But doesn't a Ry need minimal data to populate the domain in the zone to make it resolve?

Benedict Addis - SSAC: (08:49) Yes Berry but that isn't personal data

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:49) Hadia, data escrow is a normal requirement for business continuity. However, it is still a disclosure to a processor.

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (08:49) @Milton we need to establsih the right and protect it

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:49) Domain name allocation to names holders worked fine for many years before "thick" whois became a thing. So in the context of purpose A, transfer doesn't see applicable to me at all.

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (08:49) @Berry - to make the domain work, a registry only needs domain name and name servers.

Marc Anderson (RySG): (08:50) is purpose A just allocation or is it allocation and activiation - or is it broader as Margie is discussing.

Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (08:50) Emily +1

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (08:50) But there are other registries which may have eligibility criteria, or do upfront checks, and they may need to process the data

Berry Cobb: (08:50) @Emily so that is two data elements. Any others?

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (08:50) As Theo said, it all comes down to the purpose

Berry Cobb: (08:50) @Emily - then that is Purpose N, which we hope to get to later.

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (08:51) And that will depend on the registry rules, but if we're looking at the minimum data required to make a domain name actually work, it would only be domain name and nameservers

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (08:51) +1 Margie

Theo Geurts RrSG Alt: (08:51) Keep in mind a purpose is not a legal basis though, neither are ICANN bylaws or ICANN policies in some cases.

Marika Konings: (08:51) All groups have been asked to review the lawful basis memo and identify if they want their groups name associated with any of the footnotes.

Mark Svancarek (BC): (08:52) We don't need to look at "the minimum data required to make a domain name actually work" if other purposes also apply

Alex Deacon - IPC: (08:52) Agree margie.

Mark Svancarek (BC): (08:52) +1 Margis

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:52) what are these strong good reasons?

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:53) Alan, can you produce the privacy impact assessment or legal opinion that was produced during the thick PDP?

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:53) if it's illegal, it's illegal. regardless of what has been discussed. we raised the problem then as well.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alt): (08:53) ICANN's policies are not law. They may need to change to be compliant to the law.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:53) I have not been able to find it in my research.

Theo Geurts RrSG Alt: (08:53) We could not really come up with those good reasons during the thick WHOIS IRT in te end, most of the reasons were solved by other policies.

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:53) But Alan, that purpose is surveillance or third party interest - it has nothing to do with purpose A!

Marika Konings: (08:53) Please confirm on the mailing list in response to Caitlin's email with the latest version of the lawful basis memo, if your group needs to be added to any of the footnotes.

Mark Svancarek (BC): (08:53) @Theo, what about the thin data - was that more clear?

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (08:54) @Milton, maybe it isn't "purpose A". Then move it!

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:54) Well we are talking about purpose A now, right?

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:55) (as usual, Milton has arrived at my point rather more directly. Let me be clear.....the Thick transition group did not examine the privacy and TBDF implications of their work)

Theo Geurts RrSG Alt: (08:55) Mark S it was a discussion that started in 2012 to move thin to thick, lots happend :)

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (08:55) For any business, there are many ways of carrying things out. If you are responsible, some of those methods may be ruled out. ICANN has chosen ways that may result in a more resilient DNS.

Mark Svancarek (BC): (08:56) @Theo, I wasn't here in 2012... let's take ofline

Margie Milam (BC): (08:56) @Marika- - it shouldnt be a footnote at all - it should be elevated as part of the text above since we are not requuired to be limited to one legal l basis

Marika Konings: (08:57) @Margie - the group can determine that based on the # of parties that want to associate their name with the footnote position?

Marika Konings: (08:57) for the Initial Report, it may be helpful to start calling out where there is agreement and where certain groups may be supporting a certain position, but this is not shared by others?

Mark Svancarek (BC): (08:58) @Marika - I agree with Margie. I don't perceive that otherconstituencies realized that they needed to explicitly addd their names to the footnote in order to elevate it to equal text in the document

Marika Konings: (08:58) @Mark - Caitlin pointed that out on the list and I've stated it here again in the chat. It is not too late for that :-)

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (09:00) The issue for me is that I thought we had reached general agreement on what Purpose A meant in LA (which was along the lines of what Margie articulated), so I'm trying to process the arguments that are being made now.

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (09:00) +1 Ashley

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:00) Email from the "thick" whois IRT to the GNSO Council (sent by me, as I was the Council liaison to the IRT at the time): https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__gnso.icann.org_mailing-2Dlists_archives_council_msg19629.html&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=k7uKdjSb7_ZjItyVqrCYHo_rKms9SFxImbYEJqG-y9I&m=OP-v9oUcATx6nga0IAXJ8mUwf6XsxkDcMMOSXLpeWfA&s=JOv0ogc2IY9fybIuq2QOkHx92C9obbaKkdO2GaJ6wxg&e=

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (09:02) Perhaps we should list out the understood "rights."

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:03) That is not specified in Purpose A, Benedict

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:03) Nothing about a "clean ecosystem" in there that I can see

Marc Anderson (RySG): (09:03) agreed Ashley - I think part of the problem we are running into is its not super clear what is mant by "excercise its rights"

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:03) I think that Benedict has it right.

Theo Geurts RrSG Alt: (09:03) What I am missing in this discussion is RDAP and it's role how it can support the purpose without transfers.

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:04) Apologies for late Adobe joining. Have been on phone since call started, though.

Terri Agnew: (09:05) @Kristina, we had you noted on audio only until you joined AC

Berry Cobb: (09:05) @Theo - agreed. In discussion of all purposes and processing activities, it does need to be in the light of RDAP and its features.

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:06) it's not all of the work. it's just transfer ..

Theo Geurts RrSG Alt: (09:06) we agreed on collection, transfering is another ball game though.

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:06) yes I would like to see this purpose that requires thick registries ...

Alex Deacon - IPC: (09:06) rdap doesn't make any assumptions where the data may live (or be transfered).

Theo Geurts RrSG Alt: (09:07) Exactly Alex :)

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:08) Then let's erase everything we did in LA and start over again.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:08) @Milton: +1

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:08) Alan no one is suggesting that

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:09) it's only about transfer! we are going by processing activities

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alt): (09:09) With regard to anti-abuse work, there is no reason to have registrant data, it can be done differently (and better) by analysing DNS.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:09) Milton insists on presuming the only reason for transfer to a Ry is data mining. I disagree. Using data for legitimate purposes associated with domain name registration and maintenance is not data mining.

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (09:09) +1 Alan

Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (09:10) Alan: the only data needed for that is name server information

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:10) yes, legitimate use under purpose A would be to allow the registrant to transfer their domain

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:11) May I suggest that this document may be useful here: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.icann.org_resources_pages_benefits-2D2013-2D09-2D16-2Den&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=k7uKdjSb7_ZjItyVqrCYHo_rKms9SFxlmbYEJqG-y9I&m=OP-v9oUcATx6nga0IAXJ8mUwf6XsxkDcMMOSXLpeWfA&s=-IWDefIdRhdnYEgMNwtGxAprH0Bl6YstJWl7Hm4ebvA&e=

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alt): (09:11) +1 Stephanie.

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:11) And then changing "rights" in Purpose A language to 'benefits".

Berry Cobb: (09:11) Mark S, coming in faint

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:11) Very low audio. Can't hear Mark.

Marc Anderson (RySG): (09:11) can't hear Mark - my volume is all the way up

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (09:12) no one mentioned data surveillance

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (09:13) @Stephanie no one mentioned data surveillance

Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (09:13) The only data needed to transfer a domain is domain name and name server addresses.

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:13) Yes, Julf - correct - so that's what needs to be transferred to the registry

Diane Plaut (IPC): (09:13) Agree with Mark S.

Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (09:14) Even name server addresses are usually not needed, as new registrar will usually provide new name servers,

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:14) under purpose A I mean

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (09:14) what about validating regsitrant's email contacts for transfers

Benedict Addis - SSAC: (09:14) @Hadia that's not currently done by the registry. And it's a bit broken at the registrars too :(

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:15) https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.icann.org_resources_pages_benefits-2D2013-2D09-2D16-2Den&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=k7uKdjSb7_ZjItyVqrCYHo_rKms9SFxlmbYEJqG-y9I&m=OP-v9oUcATx6nga0IAXJ8mUwf6XsxkDcMMOSXLpeWfA&s=-IWDefIdRhdnYEgMNwtGxAprH0Bl6YstJWl7Hm4ebvA&e=

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (09:16) Thanks Kristina

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (09:16) thanks benedict

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:16) @Benedict, true, but for hijacking it may be relevant.

Berry Cobb: (09:18) More specifically, Processing Activity = PA1. I was keying off the rationale provided under the lawful basis as created by that small team.

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:18) +1 Emily

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:27) "optional" in the sense that the RNH can have service without providing that data? (name servers?)

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (09:27) @Milton yes, that's correct. A significant proportion of domain name registration don't have active nameservers :)

Berry Cobb: (09:27) @Milton - yes. For instance the Rt only registers the name but does not indicate NameServers for resolution.

Theo Geurts RrSG Alt: (09:28) sure, if you only want it registered but no other services, no need to supply name servers.

Alex Deacon - IPC: (09:28) suggestino - if we need to clarity here then perhaps we should replace "registrant rights" with "registrant's contractual rights and expectations"

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:28) really I think it would be easier to argue for thick registries and registrar registry transfer under another purpose. this ain't working

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:28) Thanks, Marc, but I think you mean Emily. :-)

Marc Anderson (RySG): (09:28) oops, sorry Emily

Berry Cobb: (09:29) ...and we should remind ourselves, that we are viewing this as an ICANN Purpose...... meaning that what is decided here is eventually enforceable as a consensus policy.

Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:29) I like Alex's suggestion

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:31) The registrant's benefits and responsibilities (thanks for the link Kristina) needs to be rewritten in the light of GDPR. It is silent on privacy rights.

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:31) +1 Stephanie

Alan Woods (RySG): (09:31) there is another recommendation for the EPDP. But I assume it's not the EPDP's job to do that?

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:32) The ICANN doc I found (and linked) uses Registrant Benefits and Responsibilities. That's better than rights, I think.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:32) @Stephanie. Correct, One ore reason to make all CPs globally work according to the same standards and give all users world wide the same rights to exercise.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:32) the 2009 document was explicit about RNHs not having the right to sue ICANN. I find that very peculiar. I would certainly have had the right to sue ICANN under my local privacy law for a data breach, and no contract that I was not privy to could waive that right. Now of course, (usual caveat) I am not a lawyer.

Alex Deacon - IPC: (09:33) +1 Kristina - Registrant Benefits and Responsibilities could also work.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:33) ICANN liability cannot be excluded validly (at least in the jurisdiction I am in)

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:33) Thanks Thomas, I thought not.

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:33) @Alex Meh. The language "registrant benefits and responsibility" was always a way for ICANN to avoid saying "registrant rights"

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:34) Yes and these are rights under DP law.....not benefits.

Benedict Addis - SSAC: (09:34) Stephanie +1

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:34) I'm happy to be part of that group.

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (09:35) I can join that group if needed

Berry Cobb: (09:36) @Kristina - would like to chat with you about Purpose N if you have a chance later today to chat.

Marika Konings: (09:37) Yes, I have Kristina and Emily listed for now. Any others?

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:38) @Marika: Is this new team for Purpose N?

David Plumb (CBI): (09:39) Hi Amr, no, it's a new small group for defining purpose A better, what do we mean by registrant rights

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:39) @Amr: I've asked for and have been receiving RO feedback on whether the data elements collected and used for validation should be in RDDS. Should probably give them another 24 hours to give the interested folks an opportunity to speak up.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:39) Thanks, David.

Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:39) I'd like to join the new small group with Kristina and Emily

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:39) Would love a co-owner (from IPC, preferably) for Purpose M.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:40) Thanks, Kristina. Standing by for feedback.

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:40) These small groups have to work asynchronously.

David Plumb (CBI): (09:41) Milton, can be mix of conversation and working document

Diane Plaut (IPC): (09:42) Kristina - I am pleased to assist on behalf of IPC

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:42) good, David.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alt): (09:43) Happy to volunteer for Group B.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alt): (09:43) Purpose B even

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:43) @Diane: thanks.

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:44) Able to do M and N with Diane's assistance on M

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:45) so is there another google doc we need put our name on?

Chris Lewis-Evans (GAC Alt): (09:46) Sorry for clarification are these going to be new groups?

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:46) LOL Marc

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (09:46) Yes on new google doc as I'm a bit lost on what we are doing now. I thought there was to be one lead. Are we now looking for a lead from each group or are we establishing small groups?

Marika Konings: (09:47) @Chris - these are not new groups but just a lead to review the latest version of the data elements workbook and identify what is missing/requiring further discussion.

Rahul Gosain-GAC: (09:47) I would also like to volunteer for Group B

Marika Konings: (09:47) a lead may decide that a small team discussion may be helpful or pose certain questions to the mailing list, but it is not the idea that complete groups are going to be spun up.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:47) @Ashley: +1

Berry Cobb: (09:48) @Marc - would assistance from GDD (Francisco) be useful? I recall him being one of the authors of the technical specification for Ry Escrow.

Rahul Gosain-GAC: (09:48) Ok I get the idea

Rahul Gosain-GAC: (09:49) @Marika- I am ok with Lindsey Working on it

Chris Lewis-Evans (GAC Alt): (09:51) Happy to help with the Purpose A ask earlier

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:52) I am on the A team.

David Plumb (CBI): (09:52) Thanks Chris and Milton for help with purpose A

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:54) So our goal is to clarify what are RNH rights in time for the Thursday call?

Alex Deacon - IPC: (09:54) Regarding Purpose B we agreed to discuss ICANN purpose for this after R&R discussed their purpose. Either way I'd like to be involved with B.

Alan Woods (RySG): (09:54) sorry was talking ... but you could ntot hear :(

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (09:55) we could not hear you alan

Alan Woods (RySG): (09:55) ha ha its so bad i only figured this out now... I celarly didn;t talk enough today ... or at all... that is a first

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alt): (09:55) Joint I think.

Alan Woods (RySG): (09:55) Joint ... if possible! :)

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alt): (09:56) Thanks Kristina

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:56) You're welcome, Lindsay.

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (09:56) thank you all bye

Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison): (09:57) bye all

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:57) Thanks all. Bye.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alt): (09:57) Bye all

Benedict Addis - SSAC: (09:57) Bye!

Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (09:57) Thanks all

Chris Lewis-Evans (GAC Alt): (09:57) Thanks bye all

Rahul Gosain-GAC: (09:57) Bye All ! Thanks!