

Adobe Connect: 24

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

Audio Only:

None

Apologies:

Chris Disspain (ICANN Board Liaison)
Leon Sanchez (ICANN Board Liaison)
Matt Serlin (RrSG)
Ashley Heineman (GAC)

Audio Cast (FOR ALTERNATES AND OBSERVERS)

Peak: 8 joined

View Only Adobe Connect:

31 joined

Staff:

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

AC Chat:

Andrea Glandon: (1/22/2019 07:11) Welcome the the EPDP Team Meeting #38, held on Tuesday, 22 January 2019 at 14:00 UTC.

Andrea Glandon: (07:11) Wiki Agenda Page: <https://community.icann.org/x/8pUWBg>

Kavouss Arasteh: (07:20) Hi Terri

Kavouss Arasteh: (07:20) I think today is 22 Jan. and NOT 21

Terri Agnew: (07:42) greetings Kavouss - the date adjustment is noted in the share pod on the agenda.

Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison): (07:46) hello all
Georgios Tselentis (GAC): (07:56) Hi everybody
Julf Helsingius: (07:56) Hello all
Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (07:57) Having connectivity issues with my computer, so will have AC running on the phone too (but with hopelessly small display)
Terri Agnew: (07:58) @Julf, we can dial out to you if needed on the telephone
James Bladel: (07:58) Good morning.
Ben Butler (SSAC): (07:58) greetings everyone
Mark Svancarek (BC): (07:59) Good morning!
Sarah Wyld (RrSG Alt): (07:59) Good morning all!
Emily Taylor (RrSG): (08:00) Good afternoon!
Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:01) Hi all!
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:02) Hi to everybody
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (08:02) Hello all
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (08:03) Thank you all for a productive f2f meeting
Marika Konings: (08:03) PCRTs and discussion tables can be found here: <https://community.icann.org/x/U4cWBg>
Emily Taylor (RrSG): (08:04) Thank you Kurt and the staff team for an amazing turn around in the documents since last week's meetings. Really, in awe of the work you have done
Diane Plaut (IPC): (08:04) Yes, it was great seeing and working collaboratively with everyone.
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:07) There is some echo when Thomas speaks
Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (08:07) Will type
Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (08:07) Most of us can't change our Kobe schedule at this point
Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (08:07) Dialing in but will type comment
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:08) The issue of travel support should have been brought up a long time ago. Should it be approved at some point over the next few weeks, those requiring visas will (again) be at a serious disadvantage.
Terri Agnew: (08:08) Alan has joined audio
Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:09) Kurt, I do not expect an answer now, so we do not have to spend time on it here.
Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:09) Just asking to reconsider.
Margie Milam (BC): (08:09) I don't need travel support
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (08:10) ARS to be considered under purpose 5 instead of next phase
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:10) I think Alan was suggesting a simple wording change that we may be able to handle today
Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:10) I am representing eco Association as an ISPCP member and I am conscious of budget for them.
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:10) Any chance you can come up with that change now, Alan?
James Bladel (RrSG): (08:10) I thought we were trying to separate "accuracy" (in the GDPR context) from "data quality" (which is what ARS measures).
Georgios Tselentis (GAC): (08:11) No travel support but I need confirmation ASAP on the exact date/meeting requirements so I can make the mission planning
Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (08:12) It was the practice of the CCWG-Accountability.
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (08:12) @Milton to make purpose 5 more general so as not to be limited to the compliance department
Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (08:12) (to fund only those who had no other option)
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:13) Alan+1

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (08:14) @ Milton, it requires no change to the wording of the Purpose. The Rationale needs a change, and the workbook probably.

Marc Anderson (RySG): (08:14) Question - was recommendation 3 covered by either of the small teams?

Marika Konings: (08:15) @Marc - no, it was not.

Ben Butler (SSAC): (08:15) @Marc, I don't believe it was.

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:15) silence is golden

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:16) Will Ruth (Bird & Bird) be on these calls?

Kurt Pritz: (08:17) @Milton - generally nobut can be called in as required.

Kurt Pritz: (08:18) @Milton - and we will refer questions that come out of each meeting to her

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:22) Have I lost audio?

Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (08:22) works OK for me

Andrea Glandon: (08:23) @Amr, I am able to hear AC audio. Please let me know if you need a dial out.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:23) The question for us is whether public comments warrants changes to the initial report. I do not see any new informaiton on the public comments

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

Sarah Wyld (RrSG Alt): (08:24) +1 Thomas

Alan Woods (RYSG): (08:24) +1 Thomas

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:25) In addition to my more technical / procedural point, experience with ccTLDs showed that the accuracy goes up when data is not disclosed. Maybe it is worthwhile monitoring this for a bit.

Ben Butler (SSAC): (08:25) Good point Thomas

Ben Butler (SSAC): (08:27) @Milton. That is not what I was trying to convey.

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:27) good

Georgios Tselentis (GAC): (08:28) I see no answer regarding compliance with article 5.1.d so far and THIS is our job

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:29) aCCURACY IS AN IMPORTANT ISSUE AND MUST BE ADDRESSED

Farzaneh Badii: (08:29) well how about we say we should comply with 5.1- obviously we have differences of opinion in its interpretation but 5.1 should be complied with.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:29) Georgios, we had numerous discussions of this, particularly the different views held on the accuracy requirement in Art. 5. Our group then came to the conclusion that is found in the initial report.

Farzaneh Badii: (08:30) we have had discussion about this a billion times. I don't know why we are reopening it. obviously we have different legal interpretation.

Alan Woods (RYSG): (08:30) and the consequence of that hadia, is suspension of the domain...simple

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:31) I would need to dig out transcripts, but I think I even quoted legal literature saying that the party collecting data must make sure that the data is accurately put into their system. So this is a requirement for the registrars in particularly to ensure that the data - as provided by the data subject - is processed accurately.

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:31) correct Thomas. So disappointing that we are relitigating this for no reason

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:32) @Alan W.: But the measure of suspension of the domain, as required by current ICANN policy, is not required for GDPR compliance. Just stating this, but not saying that you were suggesting otherwise.

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:32) Kurt, you are dropping out

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (08:32) we lost the sound

Georgios Tselentis (GAC): (08:32) @ Farzi we need to say how: the article says "...where necessary, kept up to date; every reasonable step must be taken..." As we talked and defined reasonable for access, where necessary etc. for other issues we need to do this here as well

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:32) you are coming in and out intermittently

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (08:32) yes we can kurt

Farzaneh Badii: (08:33) Georgios we can just copy paste the text of the law 5.1 . which is redundant but maybe that would alleviate your concerns?

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:34) Under current policy Alex inaccurate data that was discovered in the course of a disclosure would be cause for suspensions of the domain, no?

Georgios Tselentis (GAC): (08:34) No Farzi because we need to clarify what we mean by all those terms "where necessary", "up-to-date", "reasonable step"

Alan Woods (RYSG): (08:34) Agreed Amr. My point is that our policies support accuracy, and where inaccuracy is found there are consequences. The GDPR requires reasonable accuracy, and means to remediate inaccuracy, I think that we have already had this discussion and that the inbuilt 'accuracy' requirements of ICANN policy, are compatible and sufficient for GDPR concepts of accuracy. but your point is very well made and taken! :)

Farzaneh Badii: (08:34) accuracy won't go away... we have a policy for accuracy ...

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:34) I don't believe it is our job to make sure that Compliance can do its job. Our job is to make sure that RNH are able to take measures to rectify inaccurate data, which they can.

Sarah Wyld (RrSG Alt): (08:35) +1 Alan!

Diane Plaut (IPC): (08:35) +1Alex

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:35) @Alan W: +1

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:35) Agree with Alan. I am mystified as to what the concerns are of people who want to spend more time on this.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:36) The EPDP Team recommends that the accuracy of registration data shall comply with requirements as stipulated in paragraph 5.1d of GDPR

Alex Deacon - IPC: (08:36) @milton - the recommendation as currently written says ..."current ICANN contracts and consensus policies shall not be affected by this policy. "

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:37) Kavouss, that wording doesn't work. It is ICANN contracts and policies that have to comply with 5.1.d,

Alex Deacon - IPC: (08:37) +1 Alan - that also (not all data will be redacted)

Marc Anderson (RySG): (08:39) Agree with Alan - Fine as is - I don't think any comments warrant changes to existing language - we should move on

Mark Svancarek (BC): (08:39) Let's move on

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:39) Agree too

Ben Butler (SSAC): (08:39) +1

Mark Svancarek (BC): (08:39) But I do think we should seek clarity from Ruth regarding the 51d question so it can be put to bed

James Bladel: (08:39) Agreeing with Alan. Really don't need this one, but it's here out of an abundance of caution.

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (08:40) +1 the recommendation as written is fine

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (08:41) This is a very narrow Rec on contracts and policies and was not intended to address all aspects of accuracy.

Trang Nguyen (ICANN Org Liaison): (08:41) All, flagging that ICANN org had raised a question regarding the interplay between this recommendation and recommendation 22.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:41) Still wouldn't hurt to point out how RNHs may rectify any inaccurate or outdated data. This, to me, seems like a reasonable ask in the public comments. But this doesn't need to change the recommendation in any way.

Trang Nguyen (ICANN Org Liaison): (08:42) We understand that the EPDP Team will discuss ICANN org questions at a later time so looking forward to the discussion at the appropriate time.

Diane Plaut (IPC): (08:42) +1Mark and Thomas

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (08:42) Good idea re a briefing call with Ruth on this

James Bladel: (08:43) +1 Thomas. And if we're asking about "validation and verification" we need to add that there are other 3rd parties/processors involved in those functions.

Georgios Tselentis (GAC): (08:44) Sorry but what is exact the question to Ruth?

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (08:44) I agree that we need advice, but it does not affect this Rec unless she says that current rules are not allowed under GDPR - which I strongly doubt.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:44) The EPDP Team recommends that ICANN shall ensure that the accuracy of registration data are met consistent with paragraph 5.1d of GDPR

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:44) What do we need to ask Ruth about? Everyone agrees to the recommendation and most of us believe it isn't even needed

Marc Anderson (RySG): (08:45) Trang Nguyen (ICANN Org Liaison): All, flagging that ICANN org had raised a question regarding the interplay between this recommendation and recommendation 22.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (08:45) @Georgios, whether GDPR accuracy is ONLY to allow a data subject to correct their data or if the controller has a responsibility or is allowed to evaluate and question accuracy.

Marc Anderson (RySG): (08:45) Trang, I missed that questions, can you flag if for the group... or raise it now if appropriate?

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:45) We do not need external view unless we admit we are unable to propose a proper text why we need to ask external view\$

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (08:46) Legal opinion is not in relation to this Rec.

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (08:46) @what needs to be investigated (later phase2) is how to implement accuracy requirements and make it possible

Trang Nguyen (ICANN Org Liaison): (08:46) @Marc, here's the question that we raised: "Preliminary Recommendation 22 states that during implementation, updates may need to be made to specific policies and procedures to ensure consistency with the EPDP Team's policy recommendations, "as a number of these refer to administrative and/or technical contact which will no longer be required data elements[.]" Can the EPDP Team confirm that this recommendation is not meant to restrict review and update of ICANN policies and procedures to admin and tech contact only (and that this necessary change was merely listed as an example of a change that will be required during implementation)? Also, what is the relationship, if any, between this recommendation and Preliminary Recommendation 3 ("...requirements related to the accuracy of registration data under the current ICANN contracts and consensus policies shall not be affected by this policy.")?"

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:46) @Milton: +1

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:47) no it doesn't mean we don't care about accuracy. It means we won't change current accuracy requirements

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:47) No sorry you are wrong about that Kavouss

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:48) a legal opinion about what???

Marika Konings: (08:48) @Trang - note that in the draft Final Report and edit has been suggested to recommendation #22 by adding 'for example' in reference to admin/tech contact as there may be other aspects of the recommendations that could impact existing policies / requirements as it is our understanding that the recommendation was not intended to be limited to tech / admin but any aspects of existing policies that are affected by these recommendations.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:49) In the current text . we could change the last part saying that shall be maintained

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:51) What miracle we expect from external legal view that we are unable to come up here

Trang Nguyen (ICANN Org Liaison): (08:52) @Marika, that answers one of our questions. Thank you!

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (08:52) James was kicked out of AC

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (08:52) James is having trouble with his mic, he asked to be skipped for now

Mark Svancarek (BC): (08:52) very faint
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:52) Very weak signal
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:53) James, pls 10 Decible morte
Georgios Tselentis (GAC): (08:54) @ Kurt support team Can we please see the drafted question before submitted and comment if needed?
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:57) 25 qualified , experienced and knowledgeable persons ,except me are here and after 40 mints they admit that the view of an external person is needed???
Kurt Pritz: (08:58) @Kavouss - an experienced, knowledgeable and neutral person
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:58) there were several good proposal to resolve the matter such as that submitted by Farzaneh which was quite precise and concise which some people disagree why`?
stephanie.perrin@mail.utoronto.ca: (09:00) my apologies for being late, was double booked. and the dog is not mine
Georgios Tselentis (GAC): (09:01) Sorry but I do not see in the response of ICANN an explanation why via a city field we can identify a registrant -just a statement.
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:02) No we did not Alex
Diane Plaut (IPC): (09:02) Yes, wev did Alex
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:02) It's interesting how you consistently maintain that the position of an entire SG doesn't count
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (09:02) Georges + 1
James Bladel (RrSG) 2: (09:03) request: Can we say "redacted" and "published". Saying things like "unredacted" or "not unredacted" makes my non-caffeinated head spin
Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:03) We did have consensus (but not unanimity) on publishing city. The question is whether this reply changes that.
Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:03) @James +1. I like "published", "redacted" and "disclosed" as a taxonomy
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:04) @James @Mark: +1
Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:05) City DOES provide important information for some large states/provinces
Diane Plaut (IPC): (09:05) Based on Chris' comments, it does not change that Alan G. - therefore, we are able to continue with the momentum in Toronto on consensus that it is acceptable to have it unredacted and move forward.
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:06) We do not have consensus Diane.
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:06) and we did not in Toronto, we had a big argument about it.
stephanie.perrin@mail.utoronto.ca: (09:06) +1 Amr. We went through all of this on the RDS group
Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:08) @Milton, Only one group disagreed in Toronto. That meets charter def'n of Consensus (but not Full Consensus).
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:09) No, it doesn't
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:09) And we have RySG speaking in favor of redaction now
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:09) @Alan W: +1
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:10) And be careful about that claim to have consensus when "only one group" opposes, because IPC and BC are only 2/3 of an SG group and if we can easily override their position by just ignoring it then things will go a lot faster
Diane Plaut (IPC): (09:11) As raised in Toronto, the need for city is supported by litigation needs for the purpose of rightful process and public policy
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:12) yep Kurt. counting noses is a terrible idea. my nose especially counts for three!
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:12) LOL
Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:12) to confirm Mark - I was speaking for the RYSG
Diane Plaut (IPC): (09:12) We reviewed the legal risk involved and the balancing of interests

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (09:15) On behalf of Rr SG we support the points made by Alan W

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:15) But at some point we need to discuss how consensus is established. This is a GNSO PDP with wider participation, but not a CCWG.

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:15) Georgios is this not the reason why data protection is now much more important? We still have a duty to consider how modern technology has impacted the likelihood of identification.

Diane Plaut (IPC): (09:16) +1 Georgios

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:16) We can avoid the question, however, if we get full consensus on all points.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:16) Time for the "die in the ditch test"

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:17) To you point re over compliance. Over compliance is just a more risk averse compliance, but in this instance it is still compliance and it worries me that this 'over compliance' buzz word remains being kick around - or focus is on compliance simple. Additionally, surely the degree of compliance are really only to be assessed by the authorities.

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (09:17) Georgios, thanks for your time. In the interests of time, I will put some comments here in the chat. There is a respected and long line of academic research which demonstrates that with as few as three data points, it is trivially easy to de-anonymise data. I believe that this is the reason why the GDPR talks about 'pseudonymisation' rather than anonymisation

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (09:18) For example, In an experiment carried out at Carnegie Mellon University in 2000, researchers were able to de-anonymize 1990 US census data for 87 percent of the population based on three data items: zip code, gender and date of birth (Sweeney 2000).

stephanie.perrin@mail.utoronto.ca: (09:18) Is our independent legal counsel on the call? This is a very well understood concept in data protection, as I attempted to point out during our meeting in Los Angeles

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:19) of course we won't achieve full consensus on everything

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:19) but we need to try

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (09:20) when AOL released 20 million items of search data in 2006, researchers identified individuals by correlating different items in their search history, and, in 2008, 10 million movie rankings by 500,000 anonymized Netflix customers were de-anonymized by comparing rankings and time stamps with the public International Movie Database's rankings and time stamps (Schneier 2015)

Georgios Tselentis (GAC): (09:20) @ Alan I am just asking the simple question what is in practice the danger of revealing a person's identity through the city field vs. the benefits of this set to non-redacted

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:20) Again, the question here is procedurally whether public comment warrants changes to the initial report.

stephanie.perrin@mail.utoronto.ca: (09:20) I see very little point in us arguing about this....the contracted parties and ICANN are simply going to be sued by someone like NOYB on this very simple point.'

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:20) that was not the point Alan, and it was clear. We support the text of the Temp spec in this instance, and all this discussion is wholly unnecessary.

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:21) So given Alan's and Emily's statements now CSG is the only GNSO group that supports publication of city

stephanie.perrin@mail.utoronto.ca: (09:21) And they are going to lose. I would like once more to formally object, and say that if we are going to cave in on this very simple point on address data, we might as well quit and get back to our lives, leaving this to a lawsuit.

Georgios Tselentis (GAC): (09:22) @Emily: To my understanding anonymisation is non-reversible while pseudonymisation is. so exactly the opposite if I understand you well

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:22) "live with it either way" is ok. It just means that group does not participate in the decision.

Georgios Tselentis (GAC): (09:22) I do not want to lose more time on this though

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:22) We did not address CITY explicitly in the PC. We are on our own and need to make a decision.

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:23) on "legal advice" Kurt I agree w Georgios that this is more a policy/balancing question than a legal one.

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (09:23) @Georgios, I have the same understanding re anonymisation v pseudonymisation. I guess my point is that both offer a rather fragile level of protection for personal data

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:24) It kind of has to be the default position, doesn't it?

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:24) I am the only ISPCP rep on the call today, so I would need to take this back...

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:26) +1 when we can't agree the temp spec has to be the default position

Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:27) -1 that would be a new process

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:27) Be clear how you word this. GREEN CHECK = temp spec, RED X = change it

Diane Plaut (IPC): (09:27) Kurt - Margie is not on the call so we would not have her vote

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:28) @Diane - I think Mark S.'s vote would cover her.

Marc Anderson (RySG): (09:28) Margie is there

Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:28) Margie is back on and has voted

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:29) This is a major change from Toronto...

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (09:29) Pseudonymous data allows for some sort of re-identification, anonymous data cannot be re-identified

stephanie.perrin@mail.utoronto.ca: (09:29) I request (file under once more, into the breach) that you consult legal counsel on this rather simple and well understood point.

Terri Agnew: (09:30) 10 minute break (will be silence)

stephanie.perrin@mail.utoronto.ca: (09:30) So can the record please show my request. It is a formal request.

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:40) @staff is there any way of the phone system not kicking us off the calls @ the 2 hour mark?

Terri Agnew: (09:41) Update: 1 minute longer

Marika Konings: (09:41) @Alan - that is a local provider issue, not Verizon. I have the same problem when I am in Europe, but not when I am calling from anywhere else.

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:41) ohhhhhh so it's not you, its me ! :)

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:41) darn it's

Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (09:42) yes, I have that in NL

Andrea Glandon: (09:42) Correct, this is not on Verizons end

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:42) Thanks Marika :)

Terri Agnew: (09:43) 5 minutes to review (will be silence)

Terri Agnew: (09:48) time is up

Terri Agnew: (09:49) we have started

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:53) Maargie, eliminate your big Red X and you will be able to raise your hand

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:54) too soft , Emily

Marika Konings: (09:54) Emily, you are very faint

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:54) i can't hear you, Emily

Terri Agnew: (09:54) @Emily, difficult to hear you, can you speak up louder?

Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:54) beter now
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:54) Stephanie knows how to fix this recommendation but no one wants to listen ...
Emily Taylor (RrSG): (09:57) Yes, and that the CPH will need to have appropriate agreements with ICANN with regard to data processing
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (09:58) Would it be correct to say that the ball is in ICANN's court on this one?
Alex Deacon - IPC: (09:59) won't this table (Rec 14) be updated based on the input of the small team that will be discussing the data elements workbooks also?
Marika Konings: (09:59) Information about the data elements workbook call was shared with the list yesterday by Berry
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (10:00) great, we can blow our entire day on this! Thanks for the invite Kurt!
Diane Plaut (IPC): (10:06) +1Thomas
Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (10:08) Kurt, sorry I used the word "object" to your statement. I guess it is the first time I did.
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (10:11) "Would it be correct to say that the ball is in ICANN's court on this one?" Yes
Diane Plaut (IPC): (10:13) +1James
Marika Konings: (10:14) @James - isn't that covered by recommendation #13?
James Bladel (RrSG): (10:14) Thanks Kurt. The whole Jenga tower falls down without some agreement in place.
Diane Plaut (IPC): (10:15) It a game! Its a great analogy- a game where all the pieces need to fit together to create balance and cohension.
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (10:16) Starting with assertion of controller/join controller/processor heirarchy....unfortunately.
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (10:16) I think RPM team has to be involved
Marika Konings: (10:19) @Margie - in the small team B discussions that came up and BC/IPC representatives indicated that the pre-filing question should be considered by the RPM WG. Has that position changed?
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:19) Haven't we discussed what Margie is asking about on numerous occasions? This isn't new input provided via the public comments.
Marika Konings: (10:19) and as such, needed not to be addressed here.
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (10:20) +1 Farzy.
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:20) "in the small team B discussions that came up and BC/IPC representatives indicated that the pre-filing question should be considered by the RPM WG." - This sounds good to me.
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:21) Also +1 to Farzaneh.
Margie Milam (BC): (10:21) Phase 2 -- thats right
Milton Mueller (NCSG): (10:22) no objection
Marc Anderson (RySG): (10:22) no objection
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:22) @Kurt: Don't understand your question.
Terri Agnew: (10:23) 5 minutes to review (will be silence)
Terri Agnew: (10:23) @Amr, your audio is low
Mark Svancarek (BC): (10:23) very low
Alex Deacon - IPC: (10:24) Are these "General Comments" related to question #145?
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (10:24) +1 Marika
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:25) @Kurt: Thanks. Sounds good to me.
Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:25) I have to leave now. Bye all.
Terri Agnew: (10:26) 5 minutes to review (will be silence)

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (10:26) I have to drop from Adobe to transit to the office. I'll also drop from phone while in elevators.

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:27) Finally back on adobe

Terri Agnew: (10:29) @Kristina, thank you for the heads up and noted

Julf Helsingius: (10:30) I think the number of people dropping off is an indication that 3 hours is too much

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:32) George K.'s comment is the one that doesn't intrigue me at all!! :-)

Diane Plaut (IPC): (10:33) Agree Amr- WOW!

Marika Konings: (10:36) as the current recommendations stand in the Initial Report, it does not appear to affect Thick WHOIS as all thick data elements are required to be transferred to registries. However, should that change as a result of changes to recommendation 5, it could affect the Thick WHOIS policy.

Marika Konings: (10:36) but there is a separate IRT dealing with the implementation of Thick WHOIS in which other issues are being considered, as far as I understand.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (10:37) Data minimization applies to Thick WHOIS. IMHO, previous policy did not consider that element sufficiently, although it might be outweighed by competition considerations.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:37) @Marc: Helpful clarification. Thanks.

Terri Agnew: (10:38) finding the line

Mark Svancarek (BC): (10:38) I think that means you must sign your intervention

Mark Svancarek (BC): (10:40) I am having trouble hearing Alan - Kurt, can you summarize when he has finished? Sorry!

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:41) @Alan W.: +1

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:43) I lost the sound

Terri Agnew: (10:44) @Hadia, I still have sound. Try to logging back in

Diane Plaut (IPC): (10:44) Agree Kurt, this is a larger issue

Andrea Glandon: (10:44) @Hadia, I also see that your phone connection is still good

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:45) Yes it is

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:45) I can hear you well over the phone - the adobe connection is too slow

Terri Agnew: (10:46) @James, audio is low

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (10:46) Speak up James

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (10:46) what does respond to "full WHOIS data" mean? all the data? for what purpose should be disclosed? isn't that access again? Goodness. back to that topic ... this belongs to phase 2

Georgios Tselentis (GAC): (10:46) Can't hear James

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:46) Yeah, James' volume is quite low.

Marika Konings: (10:46) This is what is currently in the Temp Spec re. P/P: 2.6. Notwithstanding Sections 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of this Appendix, in the case of a domain name registration where a privacy/proxy service used (e.g. where data associated with a natural person is masked), Registrar MUST return in response to any query full WHOIS data, including the existing proxy/proxy pseudonymized email.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:47) @James: +1

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:47) For transfer policies i guess we need to wait until there is a secure method for the transfer of the data (RDAP) - phase 2 which discusses access would be the time for that
Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (10:48) thanks for that reminder Marika. That would not meet GDPR in my view. The inquiry has to have merit.

James Bladel (RrSG): (10:49) Sorry folks. I'm on the iOS app and screaming at the mic.

Margie Milam (BC): (10:49) I have to go offline

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (10:50) yeah me too sorry. good luck everyone.

Ben Butler (SSAC): (10:50) +1 to the triage approach for general comments

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:50) @Kurt: Sounds good.

James Bladel (RrSG): (10:51) Hard stop at the top of the hour. Thx.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (10:51) The temp spec does not comply with GDPR. IF we had been mandated to do a legal review of the Temp spec at the getgo, then perhaps we could have focused on a markup of the temp spec....but I for one am not happy with several chunks of the temp spec

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (10:52) and grateful to Marika for reminding me of one of those chunks!

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:52) The comment Kristina is referring to was made by Valideus, if I'm not mistaken.

Marc Anderson (RySG): (10:53) It's comment 27

Marc Anderson (RySG): (10:53) that's a good point from Kristina, I agree

Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (10:53) Several of us have the GNSO Council strategy workshop on Thursday. Can we please keep thursday to 2.5 hours?

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:55) what Kristina was referring to is the definition of "Registration data"

Kurt Pritz: (10:56) @Hadia - it is comment 27 in the PCRT (as pointed out by Marc)

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:57) @kurt yes thanks

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:57) Thanks, Marika.

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:57) thank you marika

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:57) thank you all - bye

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:57) Thanks all. Bye.

Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison): (10:57) thanks all

Georgios Tselentis (GAC): (10:57) bye