

Adobe Connect: 26

Alan Greenberg (ALAC)	Kavouss Arasteh (GAC)
Alan Woods (RYSG)	Kristina Rosette (RySG)
Alex Deacon (IPC)	Kurt Pritz (Chair)
Amr Elsadr (NCSG)	Laureen Kapin (GAC Alternate)
Ayden Férdeline (NCSG)	Leon Sanchez (ICANN Board Liaison)
Chris Disspain (ICANN Board Liaison)	Marc Anderson (RySG)
Diane Plaut (IPC)	Margie Milam (BC)
Emily Taylor (RrSG)	Mark Svancarek (BC)
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG)	Matt Serlin (RrSG)
Georgios Tslentis (GAC)	Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison)
Greg Aaron (SSAC Alternate)	Stephanie Perrin (NCSG)
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC)	Tatiana Tropina (NCSG Alternate)
James Bladel (RrSG)	Thomas Rickert (ISPCP)

Audio Only:

None

Apologies:

Ben Butler (SSAC)
Benedict Addis (SSAC)
Julf Helsingius (NCSG)
Ashley Heineman (GAC)
Trang Nguyen (ICANN Org Liaison-GDD)

Audio Cast (FOR ALTERNATES AND OBSERVERS)

Peak: 9 joined

View Only Adobe Connect:

22 joined

Staff:

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

AC Chat:

Andrea Glandon: (1/31/2019 07:19) Welcome to the EPDP Team Meeting #41 held on Thursday, 31 January 2019 at 14:00 UTC.

Andrea Glandon: (07:19) Wiki Agenda Page: <https://community.icann.org/x/h5oWBg>

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (07:44) Hi andrea

Andrea Glandon: (07:44) Hello Kavouss!

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (07:45) Hi Marika, Caaitlin and Terri
Marika Konings: (07:51) Hi Kavouss
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (07:54) Hi all
Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (07:55) hello everyone
Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison): (07:56) hi all
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (07:58) Terri
Terri Agnew: (07:59) Welcome Kavouss
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:00) Hi kurt,may you address travel support
Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:01) Hi all!
Chris Disspain: (08:03) Greetings All
Margie Milam (BC): (08:03) Could you also address the schedule to get to final report
Tatiana Tropina - NCSG: (08:03) hi everyone
Marika Konings: (08:05) As a reminder, the schedule to get to the final report was shared together with Tuesday's agenda.
Leon Sanchez: (08:07) Hello everyone
Kristina Rosette (RySG): (08:07) I'd like to request that we're ruthless in making sure that the wording of the purposes and recommendations are crystal clear and not open to any interpretation other than our intended one. We may know what we meant, but that won't help much if the wording isn't clear.
Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (08:08) Perhaps I missed it, but is there a definitive list of the outstanding issues needed to be resolved for publication?
Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:08) @Kristina: +1. We don't want the intent of our recommendations to be diluted or amended as they are being implemented. Would also be ideal if time isn't wasted debating what the EPDP intended in the first place.
Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:09) Kristina and Amr +1
Matt Serlin (RrSG): (08:09) +1 with Amr and Kristina...thanks for making the point
Diane Plaut (IPC): (08:09) +1 Kristina and Amr
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (08:10) +1 Kristina absolutely
James Bladel (RrSG): (08:11) As someone who regularly deal with ICANN Compliance and their often "creative" interpretations, a hearty +1 from me.
Emily Taylor (RrSG): (08:13) Yes. Thanks for raising this point Kristina.
Ayden Férdeline (NCSG): (08:15) Marika has her hand raised too
Kristina Rosette (RySG): (08:17) yes, aspirational. to dream the impossible dream.
Marika Konings: (08:21) Do note that although there are some recommendations that have not been finalized yet, there are many parts that are static and as such you should already be able to review those.
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:24) Pls confirm the start of phase 2 pls
Marika Konings: (08:26) @Kavouss - that will need to be confirmed by the GNSO Council as following submission of the Final Report, they will need to non-object to phase 2 starting.
Kurt Pritz: (08:28) @Kavouss - I will get back to you later today with an email on travel support
Marc Anderson (RySG): (08:28) Everyone please double check that your mic is on mute
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (08:30) Tks for that ,KURT
Georgios Tslentis (GAC): (08:32) On top of what Kavouss asked about phase 2 I would like if possible to know the timeline for the legal counsel answers
Berry Cobb: (08:37) Note that ICANN Org has pointed out in the RAA Data Elements retention specification, also includes other reasons for why this data should be retained. https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_en_system_files_files_raq-2Ddata-2Dretention-2Delements-2D10aug15-2Den.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3Pj6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=k7uKdjSb7_ZjItyVqrCYHo

[_rKms9SFxlmbYEJqG-y9I&m=JKxfCCv4J6vt-n2L8Fk0ju6Su5sxFz8MDXclEiInjGI&s=zw_26_MwkiHh5FtyrBScA5m4ugUymaysWbTW3VcacBc&e=](#)

Andrea Glandon: (08:39) Finding line

Terri Agnew: (08:39) finding the line

Stephanie Perrin: (08:41) apologies for being late. DOubtless you have it all sorted?

James Bladel (RrSG): (08:41) @Berry - that document is a head-scratcher. Does anyone think we collect Billing Contact Info in order to bill our customers? Why would Registries need it? And so on....

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (08:41) Yes, we're done and we're all going to Disney World.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:42) I was sure that would be the case, Kristina!

Alan Woods (RYSG): (08:42) oops other alan lol

Alan Woods (RYSG): (08:43) happy to answer that Kurt

Laureen Kapin (GAC): (08:45) +1 Alan G. I agree and note that cyber security researchers protecting the public interest also have an interest in a sufficient time period for data retention. This is also an important issue for further research. As Alan G. notes, it often takes time for cyber security researchers and law enforcement to detect and investigate cyber security threats.

Marika Konings: (08:45) @Alan G. - do note that the small team considered the input (see page 5) but noted that any retention period would need to be linked to existing ICANN requirements. However, that does not prevent longer retention periods by CPs for other requirements or local laws.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (08:47) @Marika, Purpose 2 is an ICANN purpose and must factor in the specific needs of those 3rd parties that have lawful needs.

Berry Cobb: (08:47) @James - since the group has agreement around billing, this seems like it doesnt apply. The point though there are other reasons ICANN requests retention of the data beyond TDRP and Compliance. The sheet offers a few other purposes for data being retained. I have no opinion on whether they apply or not. Org just wanted to point out the specification and for the group to perhaps acknowledge that the EPDP recommendations affect this specification.

James Bladel (RrSG): (08:48) K, thx. Berry

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (08:48) Well said, Marc

Marika Konings: (08:49) @Alan G. so maybe in the context of the phase 2 discussions, new retention requirements are determined that would overwrite this language, but as far as I know, there is nothing yet that one could point to when DPAs ask why x years was chosen as a retention period?

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (08:49) +1 Marc...I'm not aware of security researchers having the ability to access escrowed data at all so this would seem to be an expansion of what's available today, no?

Marika Konings: (08:49) Note that the Org questions can be found on page 3 as well as some of the responses that were received on list.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:50) @Marc: +1

Berry Cobb: (08:51) Per Marc's comment, the review of that retention specification at least inform's the Org's view on possible legitimate purpose for retaining that data.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (08:52) @Matt, we are still in a mode where old data is still captured and archived by third parties. So we have no real history where the data is not available.

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (08:52) if ICANN has a rough retention period related to the SSR of the DNS then we could add "The EPDP team recommends that ICANN identifies the appropriate retention period required to maintain the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS as mentioned in its mission "

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (08:54) @Alan, so if that is the goal of what you are trying to achieve by extending the retention period, that really is an expansion of the purpose of escrow in the first place and something that needs to be tackled outside of our work

Marika Konings: (08:55) As a reminder, the small team also emphasized that this retention only relates to ICANN requirements, registrars / registries may have other requirements, such as tax requirements, for which data needs to be longer retained.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (08:55) Why are we discussing the merits of a longer retention period??? The Rec is to STUDY the needs. That is where the investigation and pro/con should be!

Berry Cobb: (08:55) A summary of the purposes from the retention period specification: 1) Registrar's internal use for administration of the contract with Registrant 2) Tax and accounting records 3) Fraud prevention 4) Billing disputes and chargebacks 5) Billing 6) Abuse mitigation 7) Facilitating domain name purchases and sales 8) Hijacking, theft, slamming, TDRP 9) Access by ICANN

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (08:56) what does SSAC think? How does ICANN carry its SSR responsibilities and is historic data used for this purpose

Margie Milam (BC): (08:56) Alan G- as long as the study includes the third party issues & not just the ICANN ORG uses

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (08:57) @Hadia as Barry put above, access by ICANN is already accounted for...what isn't accounted for is access by third parties...that entire notion is completely new

James Bladel (RrSG): (08:58) @Berry - Just a note that only a few of those (#8 and #9) require RDS data. Registrars typically maintain a different data set to support the other purposes.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:59) From my perspective, a study of the needs of third party issues on data retention is basically a study to determine a legitimate means to strip RNHs/data subjects of their rights.

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:59) request from whom Georgios?

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (09:00) @Matt correct, however some comments as mentioned by Alan referred to the Security requirements so I think a study is required

Margie Milam (BC): (09:00) +1 Georgios

Marika Konings: (09:00) I believe that CPs have indicated before that if an active investigation / request has been made, data is retained, but hopefully some of the CPs can confirm that?

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:01) If we are so time constyrained, why are we spending so much time discussing the possible outcomes of the study we are recommending?

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:01) marika ... absolutely! preservation orders are a fact of every business

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:01) so this is about prolongation of data retention so that third party with legitimate interest have access to it. sounds very problematic to me

Georgios Tselentis (GAC): (09:02) @ Marika : if this is the case then we are covered

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:02) it's not for us to claim a justification for 'law enforcement' we are businesses, not the police!

Tatiana Tropina - NCSG: (09:03) It is very interesting, certainly German legislators would not agree with the year data retention period - German legislators were sure that 10 weeks are sufficient (after extensive research and many discussion with LEA as well) - so I wouldn't say that a year is something that is commongly agreed.

Georgios Tselentis (GAC): (09:03) @ Farzi: if this is a lawfull request I do not understand why

Tatiana Tropina - NCSG: (09:03) (this is just a note, to show that there is no common opinion on this even among LEA and legislators)

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:04) We're not here to rewrite international law Greg!

James Bladel (RrSG): (09:04) Coorrect, Greg. We will not retain or disclose data on the orders of foreign law enforcement.

Marc Anderson (RySG): (09:05) Fair clarification Mark - didn't mean to imply otherwise

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:05) useful! but not related to the actual USE of registrar for thre data! We are still talking about USE vis a Vis 3rd parties.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:06) @James: +1

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (09:06) kURT ,we have sufficiently discussed the issue and now it is the time for concrete suggestions rather than comprehensive explanation

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (09:07) Alan Wood +1

Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:08) Soliliquy: "To retain or not to retain, that is the question..."

James Bladel (RrSG): (09:08) And given that Data Subjects can ask to be removed from retained data, we (Registrars) could just include that step in the process of canceling their domains/accounts.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:08) Folks, we should move on. Let's face legal realities. Alan's proposal is sound. We have asked over and over again how legal ways can be found to retain data. The 1 year beyond expiry is the best we could find.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:09) We are wasting valuable time.

Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:09) @Thomas, that was my session. I believe arguments have been appropriately made. I also recognize that the group landed on one year and we aren't likely to change it.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (09:09) Thomas +1

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:10) 1 year may well be where we end up, but why prejudice

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:10) It's a lot of fun to guess outcomes, but we do have other work to do.

Lauren Kapin (GAC): (09:11) Agree with Alan G's proposal to edit language to include "other lawful needs."

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (09:11) Can we see the proposed text on the screen please

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:11) ICANN did not come up with a rationale for more than 1 year. We did not, public comment did not. We should accept that this is the best we can do (for now).

Emily Taylor (RrSG): (09:11) To the extent that we are talking about the need for access by third parties, that is a task for the next phase of our work

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:11) 1 year is FINE for the placeholder!

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (09:12) Thomas reasonable instead of best

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (09:12) +1 Thomas

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:12) If "other needs" is included in this recommendation, NCSG will likely have a problem with this recommendation.

Marika Konings: (09:12) 1) The EPDP team recommends that ICANN, as soon as is practicable, undertakes a review of all its active processes and procedures, as well as other lawful needs, so as to identify and document the instances.....etc. etc.

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:12) Is this data retention discussion raised in public comments?

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:12) Whilst I do understand that it would be desirable to keep data for longer (and contracted parties can and will store legally for longer in many cases based on local legal requirements), we could not find anything that ICANN could base a longer retention on.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:12) @Amr, Purpose 2 allows it.

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:12) Other lawful needs is too expansive

Marika Konings: (09:12) @Farzaneh - yes, small team B reviewed the comments (see last page)

James Bladel (RrSG): (09:12) Sorry if I'm mis-remembering, but didn't the Art 29/EDPB caution against open-ended language like "and other users" or "

Margie Milam (BC): (09:12) Are we deleting the last sentence?

Margie Milam (BC): (09:13) in Paragraph 2

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:13) We have ploughed through policies and contracts and the 1 year retention in the TRDP was the only real hook we could find.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:13) TRDP it should read...

James Bladel (RrSG): (09:13) +1 Amr. Those 3rd parties should conduct their own studies (and on their own nickel)

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (09:13) @Farzi yes a lot of the comments speak to the retention period

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:13) +1 Amr

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (09:14) +1 Amr

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:15) Since the intent of this group is to prolong data retention for access of third party I object to any addition to the recommendation

Marika Konings: (09:16) @Farzaneh - the rest of the language would remain the same, it is just about gathering information that would inform future discussions on this topic, and possible modifications (if agreed to by the community)

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (09:16) it isn't a placeholder recommendation...this is what will be included in the final report as policy, no??

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:17) it is clear that this is an access issue.

Marika Konings: (09:17) @Matt - correct, that is my understanding, but it just indicates that it may get reconsidered at a later stage, either in the context of phase 2 information or based on the information that the review will provide. But again, as the result of a community discussion.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:18) @Kurt: What Alan G is saying is not the same thing you just said at all. He's talking about a commissioned study with ToR that will basically detail why data should be retained for longer than what the TDRP requires for third-party purposes, and grant them a basis to access this data. It's unreasonable to ask the NCSG to agree to this imo.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (09:18) Is it not a matter to be discussed at phase 2

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:18) @Matt. The "placeholder" part is #2 "In the interim..."

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:18) we can't change the data retention period because of all the lawful access request in the world. is this even legal?

Marc Anderson (RySG): (09:18) my computer is requireing me to reboot - I will be out of Adobe for a little while

Margie Milam (BC): (09:19) Makes sense to talk about it when we get to access

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:20) @Emily. Correct, but absent some mention here, we may end up in situation where there is NO third party access if we decide the reatined data is ONLY for ICANN's use.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:22) If we had budget to commission a study, I would, but my understanding is that we do not have such budget.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (09:22) Kurt pls kindly respond to my formal request for closure of debate

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:24) sorry how are we gonna wrap this up? are we sticking wtih Alan W language?

Margie Milam (BC): (09:25) Sorry -- disagree with Thomas

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:26) @Thomas, please stop talking about the length of the period. The question is whether to widen the study from ALAN W's proposal.

Marc Anderson (RySG): (09:27) back in Adobe

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:28) @Alan - I have stopped :-)

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:28) didn't we agree that we can't be speculative?

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:29) @Alan G: Haven't we been considering them already? Won't we continue to consider them moving forward?

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:29) Margie - no need to apologize. I am just trying to face legal realities and process in this very EPDP.

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:29) 'issues others than ICANN's" Is the entirety of the problem Alan lol! we have absolutely no legal basis to create such retention perios ... but i'm letting go!

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:30) Thanks, Alan W for clarifying

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:31) @Alan W, if ipurpos 2 gives us the legal basis for releasing current data to 3rd parties, why does that not apply to retained data? But regardless, that is for the study.

Terri Agnew: (09:31) 10 minute break (will be silence)

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:36) test

Terri Agnew: (09:37) @Stephanie, confirm we see your chat

Terri Agnew: (09:43) we have started

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (09:45) thanks just testing I had not fallen off due to inactivity

Alan Woods (RYSG): (09:48) gosh darn .. got kicked

Greg Aaron (SSAC Alternate): (09:49) Jameas, you will trust third party studies?

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (09:51) James, what is the beginning and the end date of the transition period that you have discussed

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (09:53) Also the relation of any of these two dates with 25 May 2019

Tatiana Tropina - NCSG: (09:55) I was trying to make GNSO to send a formal request to reaffirm what was discussed.

Tatiana Tropina - NCSG: (09:56) am not sure this would happen, but my understanding is that EPDP should come up with the solution. It's within the mandate of EPDP and should stay there.

Chris Disspain (ICANN Board Liaison): (09:56) I don't have the facility to speak...Is there a specific question the Alan wants an answer to?

Matt Serlin (RrSG): (09:58) I know JJ spoke on the subject a bit in Toronto, but did we get written guidance from ICANN Org regarding how we might include something in the Final Report to address and what their preferred path forward was?

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:58) My question was that ICANN had first proposed a compliance framework, but was replaced by the Temp Spec. Why did the Board feel that the compliance model was not sufficient.?

Chris Disspain (ICANN Board Liaison): (09:59) Got it Alan....Will see if I can find an answer

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (09:59) If we are going to propose "interim" policy, does it not have to be in our report issued 11 Feb?

Marika Konings: (09:59) @Matt - the EPDP Team could recommend to the GNSO Council that the Temporary Spec requirements are adopted as an interim policy which would expire automatically on the implementation effective date of the new policy, for example.

Marika Konings: (10:01) Note that the Council can only do this at the recommendation of the EPDP as it would concern a new policy, even if it is an interim one (at least that is my understanding)

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:01) It would be enacted as an "Interim Policy"

James Bladel (RrSG): (10:03) @Alan - if it was the Temporary Spec under a different name, then it could be challenged. And perhaps should be, lest we give the Board the ability to indefinitely extend Emergency Policies so long as they undergo a name change every year.

Chris Disspain (ICANN Board Liaison): (10:03) I think Marika is correct - adopting the temp spec as an interim policy makes it clear that it is not an out of by law extension of the temp spec...and it can remain in place until the full policy recs from the EPDP are implemented

Chris Disspain (ICANN Board Liaison): (10:03) Or, I should say, adopting the REQUIREMENTS of the temp spec

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:03) IT WOULD BE A FORMAL RECOMMENDATION OF A pdp, AND APPROVED BY THE gnso AND BOARD. THAT IS THE BYLW PROCESS.

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:03) Sorry for caps.

Tatiana Tropina - NCSG: (10:04) Oh. Alan :)

Chris Disspain (ICANN Board Liaison): (10:04) in essence I think that is correct...

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:04) If we had decided in this EPDP that the Temp Spec was perfect, we could have recommended that as the long-term policy and it would not be considered an "extension" of the Temp Spec.

Chris Disspain (ICANN Board Liaison): (10:05) That is correct Alan

James Bladel (RrSG): (10:05) Essentially, Contracted Parties are asking this group to formally validate whatever we come up with, to prevent ICANN Org from contending something other than our intentions.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (10:06) If there is an interim solution, we need to put an expiry date on it.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (10:06) Thomas +1

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:07) @Thomas, Sure. Perhaps until the implementation date set by the IRT, but under no circumstances longer than 1 year (or whatever seems reasonable).

Margie Milam (BC): (10:07) I think JJ said he didnt want a drop dead date on the extension

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:08) We get a strong consensus from contracted parties of the impl. time and then add a good buffer.

Marika Konings: (10:08) Linking it to the implementation effective date of the new policy would give you a clear point in time, without the risk of a gap (and with an incentive to complete implementation as soon as possible ;-)

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (10:08) The problem is that our community is working best when there are deadlines. Absent an expiry date, I am afraid there is no sufficient pressure to compromise / get to consensus

Margie Milam (BC): (10:08) I have to go offline to drive

Margie Milam (BC): (10:08) I'll remain on the phone

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (10:09) drive safely, Margie

Diane Plaut (IPC): (10:09) Agreed Thomas, it would be best to have time frames

Marc Anderson (RySG): (10:09) I think we (CPH) understand we have homework to go back to our stakeholder groups and will try and get clearer direction on how to proceed.

Chris Disspain (ICANN Board Liaison): (10:09) @ Thomas...Point taken but what would the position be if the deadline was not met?

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:10) @James I think we need you to come back with a draft recommendation for a transition period

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (10:11) Interim period should not be longer than one year

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (10:11) Then we need to talk again and justify to the community why we have not met our own goal. I think this is needed to ensure that we are working towards consensus as quickly as possible and thereby be efficient with community resources and budget.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (10:11) Last comment was a response to Chris!

Marika Konings: (10:12) Here is the link: <https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-epdp-team/2019-January/001321.html>

Marc Anderson (RySG): (10:12) @ Kurt - Trang is not on the call today

Terri Agnew: (10:12) 5 minutes to review (will be silence)

Chris Disspain (ICANN Board Liaison): (10:13) Thomas, I appreciate that but what would actually happen if the interim policy expired? The EPDP team may no longer exist and so how would we deal with it? Surely extending it would be a policy and therefore have to go through a PDP - no?

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (10:16) I do not underestimate the issues, but not having a time limit poses the bigger risk of not completing this. I agree it would need to be a PDP, but we can recommend that that PDP should then have the format of an EPDP.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (10:17) My point is that we (yes, all of us) need to carefully consider what time we need and then we pencil that time into our plan. If we miss our own plans, we need to go be accountable to the community and explain why we failed.

Terri Agnew: (10:17) we are starting back up

Chris Disspain (ICANN Board Liaison): (10:18) Thomas, I understand what you're saying but this runs the risk of creating a vacuum...which is in no ones best interest..Anyway, let's discuss when we know what the proposal is.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (10:20) There is that risk, yes. Let's wait for the proposal.

Alex Deacon - IPC: (10:22) +1 Marc - affirmative decisions are important in cases where temp spec language isn't addressed in our report.

James Bladel (RrSG): (10:23) Registrars are reviewing this spreadsheet and nearly complete, will send our results asap.

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (10:29) Marc, Alan and I are also reviewing, but are not as far along as RrSG.
Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (10:29) @Marc, happy to be wrong, which just means we need to do the work now.

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (10:30) Ruthless in clarity and precision = anti-squishy

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (10:31) +1 Marc

Alex Deacon - IPC: (10:31) +1 Marc - I'll note the current wording of Rec 12 does that - it has never been clear to me what it really means in terms of setting policy.

James Bladel (RrSG): (10:32) Agree with Marc. No squishy

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (10:33) If for issue addressed in Temp. Spec. we remained silent, it would be interpreted that the text of Temp. Spec. prevails

Alan Woods (RYSG) 2: (10:34) need to step away for a few!

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (10:35) Policy extends to a lot more than concepts....includes procedures. I realize that does not match the ICANN interpretation, but we need to be very careful where we draw this line, from a DP perspective.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (10:35) Must leave for another meeting, sorry.

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (10:36) I HAVE TO DROP IN ABOUT 10 MINTS FROM NOW

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (10:37) Sorry for cap

Andrea Glandon: (10:37) Thank you, Kavouss. We will let the operator know not to call you back

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC): (10:38) I drop from ac but remain on Audio Bridge

Andrea Glandon: (10:38) Okay, understood, Kavouss

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (10:43) We don't need to mention RDAP.

Margie Milam: (10:46) If that language still exists after our policy work -- I am ok

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:47) Is it in all the contracts? I thought it was just in 2013 RAA and new gTLDs RA. Might be wrong.

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:48) If it is in the contracts then we are fine - the point is we need to ensure that we have an implementable policy

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:48) @Farzaneh: +1. Implementation of RDAP is not our core issue.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:49) @Kurt: Even if there are recommendations we make that can only be implemented using RDAP, wouldn't that be an implementation issue? Not a policy one?

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (10:50) @Marc as long as we end up with an implementable policy we are fine

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:50) @Hadia: +1

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (10:53) I gotta drop off

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (10:53) have a great day night early morning

Georgios Tselentis (GAC): (10:54) I need to drop off as well 5' earlier apologies -thank you and bye

Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC): (11:03) thank you all bye

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (11:03) Thanks all. Bye.

Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison): (11:03) thanks all