BUENOS AIRES – GAC Plenary 9 (EWG)
Tuesday, November 19, 2013 – 10:30 to 12:00
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

CHAIR DRYDEN: All right. So let us begin our session to discuss the issue of generic top-level domain directory services. So, for those of you that are not following this closely, an Expert Working Group was set up to look at this issue and came out with a report. Some of you may have submitted comments to a public comment process that was held on the report. And today we can perhaps receive an update on the status of that and have some discussion here on some of the main issues associated with that report.

We're being joined by the Expert Working Group, and the chair sitting to Australia's right. And he is going to kindly help us to assess where we are in this particular effort. And we have a lead to lead on this session, Peter Nettlefold from Australia. So some of you might recall that Australia participated in the WHOIS review team.

So I think he has some good background to help us look at the kinds of issues associated with the directory services work undertaken by the expert group.

So, if I can turn over, perhaps, to Australia. And then you can take us away.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

AUSTRALIA:	Thank you, Chair. And I'll be very quick. I'd just like to welcome the Expert Working Group for coming to speak to us today. And this is, obviously, an issue which is of great interest to the GAC. We're following this work very closely. We really enjoyed and I think it was extremely useful our discussion that we had at the previous meeting. So really looking forward to the update.
	I understand that you're prepared very well for this meeting and try to focus in on issues which are going to be of interest to governments. So really looking forward it, and I'll pass over.
JEAN-FRANCOIS BARIL:	Thank you very much, Peter. And thank you very much for this invitation to the GAC session. This is for all of us within this EWG a great opportunity to exchange on the latest status report that we have just published on the next-generation gTLD RDS.
	I have with me, just behind me, a few of my colleagues. Denise, Margie, Lisa, Rod, Carlton, Stephanie -- I'm not sure Chris is here. I'm not sure Steve is here -- but Fabricio, Susan. And Michele could not make it this time.
	And I'm also there to say in a very humble way that they -- they, not me, they have done a fantastic job. And, hopefully, much more to come.
	Apologies also for the late publication of this status report that we put along with the response to all of these formal comments.

ICANN 48 · 17-21 Nov 2013
Buenos Aires

And this was posted last November 11th. But I'm sure you have already -- are already getting the excitement to read and digest all these 84 pages, at least the two or three pages from the executive summary will be very, very useful, I'm sure.

One thing I'd like to truly mention, this is a work in process. And I really insist a work in process that's been very genuine and very open-minded spirit behind this one.

And, in order to promote the full transparency, we had the dilemma either we establish this report much more in advance but with limited information. Or we wait for the last minute until we -- you get the full picture of what is happening with this group. So, basically, a tremendous amount of work since Durban when you have invited us for a similar session in Durban. We have been also boosted and emulated into this new status report by a lot -- a lot of public comments that we have received. 35. Maybe I should underline that, maybe if I'm not mistaken, only one country from this group has responded. Thank you very much.

Niue. We've also got 100 response on the online questionnaire. And -- and also, more generally, a lot of discussions in the corridor or in the email and informal and casual way that has helped us. So huge amount of work on further analysis that we have and listening to many inputs refining, explaining, testing, investigating different alternative solutions as it was highly recommended also with the pro and cons. We have also realized that in Durban the

level of detail was missing into our report, which is also understandable for this level of complexity that we are working on. And this is what we have, basically, worked on very actively since then.

We have prepared a few -- a little set of slides to set the scene. And I will invite during this session a few of my colleagues to comment on more deeply on some issue that we find relevant to share more explicitly with the GAC today.

So first slide is, basically, one year, since ICANN board has made this directive to implement the WHOIS RT team recommendation, in particular, this RAA 2013 and redefine the purpose and provision of the gTLD registration data. So, as such, EWG was formed and really having the spirit of starting from a clean slate.

So, if you can go to the next slide.

Right.

So initial report was published just before Durban June 24th. We have really recommended a paradigm shift. Specifically, was very important for us to address privacy, accuracy, and accountability.

We had also a few consultations from the previous ICANN conferences and, as I said before, received a lot of comments from the public comments and online survey. And this latest status is -- has been posted November 11th. I strongly, strongly recommend that you have a look at this one in any case.

Next slide.

So this one is probably the most important one. And I will get the support of my colleagues to engage into the interactive dialogue discussion on these nine topics that we have assembled for -- from this status report, which we believe are much more important. Also, wanted to repeat myself saying that this is still a work in progress and really, really inviting every one of you in this room for ideas and challenges, ideas to shape up our next report.

So, without further ado, I will invite probably Susan for the first topic on public and gated data elements.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Thank you. So we've continued our look at the -- oh, next slide. Are there slides? No.

JEAN-FRANCOIS BARIL: No slides.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: So we've continued to look at use cases. Okay. There. Can you hear me now?

We've continued to look at use cases to drive our discussions and to make sure that each data element that we're looking at and including in the list has a clear purpose and there's an actual need

for that data element. And then we've also looked at the rationale of what is -- why someone might need to see that data and determine that gated data elements and those that should be available to anyone anonymously. And we've kept to a high bar on that to make sure that we're protecting the consumers on the Internet and also protecting registrants. And then we've also -- we're ensuring that the data elements are mapped to the 2013 RAA and that we use consistent language so that we're not calling something different than what's identified in the RAA and making sure that we're complying -- that this data would comply with the RAA.

We continue to go back to the rationale for why do you need to see the data, who needs to see the data. And then -- and making sure that we have validation points that, if users need to see the data, that they actually have to log in to look at it. And if you -- when you read the report, I think it's in the appendix, it's -- it makes it a little more clear if you look at the data sets in the appendix pages 61 through 65. We've given some good examples of what a new record would look like in comparison to the old WHOIS record.

So I urge you to review the appendix and use that when you're reading the report.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you very much for that update.

Obviously, this is an area, I think, which is of critical interest to governments as it relates to many issues but clearly individual registrants, privacy, and the legitimate needs of access to WHOIS information, which governments are very interested in, obviously. The GAC has some principles here.

I'll note that in the U.S. government's submission, which I think is the only one that an individual GAC member made on the first draft of the report, makes some comments in this direction. Are there any GAC members who would like to comment on this sort of broad area of public and gated data elements, which is clearly a key part of the current Expert Working Group's thinking? France?

FRANCE: Thank you. And France will speak French.

I would like to thank the working group, Mr. Baril, for his presentation. It was real clear. My question is simple: The European regulator's committee on personal data addressed on June 2013 to the board in which it recalls that it seems that the duration of data retention in projects exceeds what is established in the European law and that the unlimited access by the public and the private data and the database of the project is the root of the problem.

So I would like to know how you are going to address this difficulty. I confess that I haven't read the 84 pages of your report. And I apologize for that.

AUSTRALIA: Is there a member of the Expert Working Group who would like to comment on that question?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Actually, that doesn't fall within the remit of the Expert Working Group because that remits to the RAA and not to the WHOIS directory. So I'm afraid we wouldn't really be able to respond to that question.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Stephanie, we can talk about that in a minute. But you might want to talk about what we are doing with respect to privacy issues. That's one of the topics we'll get to. Because I think that's, essentially, one of the benefits of the proposals that the Expert Working Group has made that it's trying to address the specific, you know, privacy issues in various countries. But we'll get to that when we get to that bullet point.

AUSTRALIA: Okay. Thanks very much.

I think this probably usefully highlights some of the linkages and the difficulties associated with this topic area. And I think one of the questions which we'll probably broadly ask towards the end, when we look at, potentially, what the next steps in this process are and so on, are some of the linkages with the parallel work. We have a new RAA. But there is also a new RAA PDP on the way. And one of the issues it's going to look at is proxy and privacy accreditation and so on. We'll probably come back to the Expert Working Group and talk about some of the next steps and linkages as we go. And there will probably be a fuller answer to the French question as we go. Any other questions at this stage from the GAC? Belgium. Thank you.

BELGIUM: Thank you. Good morning, everybody. I'm the Belgium GAC member. And I have to say that I am also a member of the privacy committee in Belgium. And I will speak in French as well.

We are really sensitive to the proposals. I didn't have the time to read this report. So I hope that we can make comments soon. But I think this is also an issue that needs to be addressed inside the GAC because we also have specific laws and regulations on this matter.

Our concern is that the rules that are to be implemented should respect these regulations and laws, that we should not have a date centralization system located only in one territory that

doesn't abide by the applicable laws in other countries. So I will participate in this effort, and I will try to make contributions with critical comments.

AUSTRALIA: It's my understanding there will be some more clarity on the issue you've raised as we move through the Expert Working Group's presentation. I believe we're going to have a particular discussion about jurisdictional issues. So this will come back in some more detail shortly.

Perhaps we could, if there are no further GAC comments at this stage, move to the next topic which the Expert Working Group would like to talk to us about. So we're going to move through each of the topics on this slide one by one in particular detail. And then, as I said, there may be some questions which come out at the end as well as an overall comment.

JEAN-FRANCOIS BARIL: So Rod will address the validation of data within this also including the reusable contacts. Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thank you, Jean-Francois. Rod Rasmussen speaking in English.

The initial report included several kind of high-level concepts around how we would do validation and create this concept of

pre-validated user information. We've taken a lot -- much deeper look into how this would work. It is still a work in progress. I encourage those of you who are interested in this topic area to take a look at these sections in the report that cover this. There are a couple of fairly major concepts that we have proposed in here and are going to be further working on to get a fuller reporting out when we're done.   But they include concepts around providing validation services for contact information. Both pre and post application and creation of data registration. Or of domain registration.

But an even bigger concept that's included in here is, actually, in a sense, separating the contact information from the domain registration information and creating a reusable contact element or set of elements -- kind of think of it as a data blob, if you will. But it could be managed directly by individuals and organizations so that their contact information is maintained and actually controlled by them and then applied to the domain name registration information that's needed to actually have a domain name active in the system. So there's a lot of information there. And that also helps us address some of these other issues that have even been raised today around privacy and data protection.

There are many other principles that we've enumerated in there. We've clearly enumerated how to do validation within the scope of SAC50. That's an SSAC report around the taxonomy of data

validation. We've also had several meetings with different organizations that can provide or have information and current process around validation of data that those discussions have been extremely promising in answering some of our questions and some of the community's questions about the ability and the scalability of doing validation on a global basis. I think I will hold my comments at that point.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you, again. And, obviously, another one that is of key interest to governments. Validation of data is, obviously, something that was canvassed in the law enforcement recommendations which the GAC had endorsed and which was considered as part of the development of the new 2013 RAA.

I'm just wondering if you can clarify it -- so this is, obviously, moving -- this is a separate issue moving beyond just the validation requirements in the 2013 RAA. Is the Expert Working Group contemplating additional requirements on registrars? Or is this something which would be contemplated at the step of the WHOIS repository, the central repository? Just as clarification for them. Because I know some of the sensitivities, as I understand it, for GAC members particularly accrue around this central repository. So it might be useful to understand.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Right. Okay. So the validation is steps that we're talking about are separate from the model that you choose. And we'll talk about models here in a few minutes.

But this is really looking at -- this concept of a validation service could be run by a registrar or could be run by a third party, for example. If there was a country that didn't have a registrar, you could actually have a validation service within that country. So we're looking at being able to provide that kind of level of granularity, if you will, around validation of personal and/or organizational data at that dispersed of a level, potentially. Again, this is a work in progress, not a final recommendation. But that is the direction we're heading in. Does that answer the question?

AUSTRALIA: Thank you very much. Again, are there any comments from GAC members on this particular subtopic before we move on to the next one? Noting that, obviously, there will be a chance for broader discussion towards the end. I don't see any. So perhaps we could move on to the next topic.

JEAN-FRANCOIS BARIL: So, in fact, we're going to regroup the next two -- better privacy and proxy services and secure protected credentials. And Stephanie will help us on this one.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Oui. Stephanie speaking. Brussels delegation was asking for four things, the protection of personal life. And my colleague, Carlton Samuels, is going to address this issue. It is a recommendation -- I can't remember the name in French. But this is something that was established in this committee.

Secondly, we have tried to make changes to the recommendations for proxy services, the privacy and confidentiality services. And, thirdly, we have a recommendation that was presented as a draft recommendation. It is an idea that focuses on addressing a special situation for certain members that are in that particular situation. And then we have to think about the accreditation of those who are in the repertoires. I'm going to continue in English.

Are the improvements that we've made or that we are proposing on better privacy and proxy services. Frankly, we're looking for accreditation. We understand that there is a separate group that is working on accreditation of privacy and proxy services. But we are looking for improvements in the data that they are required to collect and the reveal process that would be required of them. Briefly. There's more detail in the report. In fact, there's quite a bit of detail in the report. So we would encourage you to look at that, if you're concerned about privacy and proxy services.

In terms of the secure protected credentials, there exists a capacity to get a pseudonymous credential that would provide

validation of certain attributes and that would fit within this system.

So we are proposing -- and we have the details in this interim version of the report -- of how individuals who under threat, who either have been recognized by their government already to be under threat and have been given a change of identity or individuals such as reporters in jurisdictions or in war zones, for instance, that might need protection so that they would have a heightened level of proxy registration of their domain names to avoid the situation where the -- either through human engineering or through demands, they show up and demand the identity.

So that is detailed in the report.

And I'll pass the mic over to Carlton Samuels to discuss the jurisdictional elements. But, if there are questions first, perhaps --

AUSTRALIA: Again, if any GAC members have particular questions at this stage, now might be a good time to raise them. Otherwise, obviously, there's, again, a chance at the end.

Just from my perspective, I'm really encouraged to hear that this issue is still being discussed, as you've obviously noted. We understand that there is -- or I understand that there is a PDP which has been initiated on this process. This is something which

has been, obviously, a very tricky issue for the ICANN community. It was addressed in the law enforcement recommendations. It was addressed by the WHOIS review team. And it's interesting that work is continuing. So I think this is, obviously, a very critical public policy issue and one which I expect that we'll be having further discussion in the GAC. Italy?

ITALY: Okay. Just a question. So the working group has the task of providing a solution, a project, let's say. But what is the interaction with the board? In other words, how -- when you can see an implementation of the new system? And so that is the -- I would like to know the finalization and end of your work. And then do this -- will have to be subject to some standardization issues or not? Thank you.

JEAN-FRANCOIS BARIL: Thank you very much, Italy. This will come in the next slide. Just to be precise, we're not going to say this is the solution. We are going to provide recommendation and input to the board and to the CEO and chair of the board.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I also just wanted to note that we have two members of the ICANN board that are liaisons and working very closely with the Expert Working Group -- Steve Crocker, the chairman of the

board, and Chris Disspain. They're both very active participants in the Expert Working Group. So we have a very strong linkage into the board.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you. So, if we move to the next slide, jurisdictional and applicable law issues, which I'm sure will be of interest to the GAC. And I understand that there may be, actually, some particular questions for the GAC or --

JEAN-FRANCOIS BARIL: Right. I think this is -- quite -- all the questions that we put on the slides and for your reflection and your recommendation are very, very important. But we believe this one is specifically interesting for us to hear from you. So Carlton Samuels will help us on this one.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, Jean-Francois. This is Carlton Samuels speaking.

So jurisdictional and applicable law issues and what we consider in terms of harmonized approaches to data protection. So you will have seen the previous report, which we recognize the role of jurisdiction and applicable law and the need to address local differences in data protection and privacy regimes.   You will

understand that this runs the gamut from the European concept all the way to China and Australia and beyond.

Since then, we've done some work to dig deeper and better understand the challenges posed by the jurisdictional issues. And we look at potential approaches to mediate conflicts in applicable law.

The update reports summarize the findings to date. Urge all of you to have a look at it. And then you will observe a few things there.

You will note that the jurisdictional concerns are not unique to registration directory services.

And they exist today. We have them in the gTLD space and with the expansion of the gTLD space they are just going to be exacerbated, they're going to be magnified.

And so we -- we think that we have to find a way to harmonize the approaches to that. The existing processes we don't think will scale very well.

So we're thinking that binding corporate rules might be a way to raise the level of data protection across the board. And this could be afforded by the new system, the new RDS we're surmising. And so in doing, you raise the standard of all of the data protection across the whole board. So that is our hope, that the binding corporate rules might be a very good way to address both

privacy concerns as well as to improve data protection from where it is today.

Thank you.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you again. Again, at this stage on this particular topic, are there any GAC members that have questions or comments before we move to the next issue?

Okay. I see none. Perhaps we can move to the next issue.

JEAN-FRANCOIS BARIL: So the next issue is a bit more technical, and Rod will help us understand how we can leverage also on this technical protocol from what is already going to exist into the community.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thank you, Jean-Francois.

Actually, this is a fairly short topic to discuss, probably, here, but it's very lengthy in the appendix in the report in its technical implications.

One of the questions is how can we scale this from a moving-data-around perspective, communications, transfer of information, et cetera. And we took a look at the various models we've proposed and compared the needs of those with existing protocol, the EPP

protocol, and the RDAP that's being developed within the IETF as part of the WEIRDS work that's going on there, which is all coming down to release in a very relatively short time frame. And Scott Hollenbeck, who unfortunately couldn't be here, is also on the Expert Working Group and he is on that same group within the IETF. So we are closely mirroring our work here with the work that's going on there.

The bottom line is that the -- so far, the models we've proposed, the data elements we've proposed, et cetera, will work actually within the existing framework and within the RDAP framework. There may be some need to use some extensions and for those of you who are technical and want to go and take a look at what all may be involved, we have some of that information and of course we'll be fully explaining that when the report comes out.

And those are my comments in this section.

AUSTRALIA: Again, thank you.

Any GAC members on that particular topic?

Okay. We'll move along.

JEAN-FRANCOIS BARIL: For the next topic, we propose that we invert the last one and the second to last, because it really may be easier to understand what

are the different opportunities of alternate -- alternative model with the pro and cons before we compare with the current WHOIS system.

So I will invite Fabricio to discuss about these different models.

FABRICIO VAYRA: Thank you, Jean-Francois, and thank you all for having us here, an opportunity to discuss this topic. I'm Fabricio Vayra.

And as you all saw in our initial report, we had discussed an aggregated database, and it was a model that we thought was capable of allowing us to implement well the recommended principles and features that we want to put into practice.

No surprise. I believe that you all know that many of the comments that we received to our initial report focused heavily on the model, aggregated model, arguing strongly for or against this aggregated model. But what it showed us was that we needed greater clarity around why this was proposed.

So what have we done since then? Well, we worked very hard to really expand and deepen the analysis that we had into this model, and alternative models. We realized that we had done a great deal of analysis. It just wasn't put into the initial report. And we thought it was important to show that analysis now.

So what will you see in our updated document? Well, you're going to see about half a dozen alternative models that we considered prior to and after our initial report. You're going to see some great detail about the criteria we used to compare all the different models. And with regard to deepening the analysis and expanding the analysis, you're going to see a lot of the pros and cons that we've considered with two models in specific. One, the aggregated model that was our initial report, as well as a federated model that seems to show promise in answering a lot of the questions and concerns that we received to the initial report.

And open it up for questions on that.

JEAN-FRANCOIS BARIL: So I propose we roll out to the next topic, which is the last one, which is a comparison of the current WHOIS system with the model that we are proposing on this one.

So, Susan, if you can highlight and reflect all the level of thorough analytics that we've put around that.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: So very quickly, I think the biggest questions for us was how can we ask for accuracy and provide access. Right now you have free for all access to the WHOIS records, but there's -- the accuracy is a large problem.

So that guided a lot of our discussions. How do we make sure that we protect the individual with the domain name. Compare that to protecting or not protecting a company's use of a domain name and their data elements. And protecting the consumer on the Internet. And giving access to all of the data but making sure it's accurate data. And preventing misuse of that data.

So accuracy and access was the keys to comparing to the existing WHOIS system and what we are working on now in the EWG. And we did take a lot of guidance from existing ccTLD WHOIS policies and what the ccTLDs do in each of the countries. We've looked at that and incorporated some of that into our work.

We specifically talked to Nominet and the dot co, dot UK but also looked at other policies.

And, you know, the new system we think would be more flexible to add data elements as new technology arise and current technologies that are out there that can't be included because right now, just like including a Skype name or an SMS, you know, providing a text capability. And then also looking at auditing the data, the system -- the system we are proposing would allow for -- because it's centralized, that we would be able to audit the data, and then also audit the use of the data. So a requester would have to, you know, give a purpose for requesting the data, and we would be able to know how they are using it or what -- you know, where it ends up in some ways.

So there's a lot of new functions that could be included, and I think that would improve the WHOIS, in general.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you very much. I think it's fair to say as an overall package, this is a substantial change of approach to WHOIS and addresses the major public-policy issues that have been identified with the current approach or at least seeks to address those. I think it's also fair to say, as we heard in our discussion that we had in Durban, that in doing so it potentially raises several new public-policy issues which will obviously need quite a lot of consideration. And I thank the Expert Working Group for sort of beginning to share with us some of the thinking that has gone into this.

In terms of the overall approach or broad questions, are there any GAC members who would like to comment at this stage?

U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Thank you for the comprehensive presentations here. It's very dense, a lot of detail. Trying to keep up. But I really appreciate it. It's very clear.

I just wonder if, at this stage, you could comment on how these two models stack up, the aggregated model and the federated

model, in terms of ensuring accuracy. I mean, to me it seems that the aggregated model has advantages in terms of a single point of reference and so on and a single -- but in a single jurisdiction, whereas the federated model, in multiple jurisdictions, closer to the end user, if you like. Perhaps that has advantages in terms of completeness and accessibility, if you like. If you see what I mean.

So is there at this stage, for purposes of this digest of the work in progress, is there any way you can say is one winning over the other?

Thank you, Chair.

JEAN-FRANCOIS BARIL: I will very, very shortly respond but the meat will come from behind my chair, from the people who are really, really knowledgeable of how things.

If you read the report, being then you will see that the six model that we have examined basically fulfill our recommendation regarding accuracy, privacy, data protection, ease of use. Some are better for this one and this one. So I think after that, it's a question of appreciation of how it is to use and how it is to put in place the overall system.

But I'm sure Fabricio or Rod would have much more insight on this one.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thank you, Jean-Francois. You stole, I think, a lot of the thunder as far as the answer there goes.

I think that regardless of the model you choose, you're going to have various issues of -- that get into jurisdiction, et cetera, that all need to be explored.

We have looked at the two in particular because they seem to address the needs better than the other -- six or so others we took a look at in the current model.

The primary differences between the federated and the aggregated are really storage of data, of the actual data at rest.

To some extent that solved some of the problems that we heard concerns from the community, but it doesn't solve them all in that you still have the issue of data in transit. And that still comes under very privacy protection regimes, et cetera. So it doesn't solve those problems, necessarily, that were raised in this room and in others in Durban and in other places.

So again, what we did is we took a look at those various models and we did a very long process to do kind of a scoring between them and look at various elements, how this affects system performance, security, and then those kind of technical issues as well as how does this address the various issues around privacy, jurisdiction, applicable law, et cetera.

And at the end of the day, you've got a couple of different models that we think will address those to the best that we can without getting into actually talking about how laws are formed around the world. So we don't want to get into that area. That's the job of folks of -- of the people -- of the organizations the folks in this room represent.

FABRICIO VAYRA: And this is Fabricio. So I believe that part of your question, also went to ensuring accuracy. So we proffer that we still have some of the verification requirements in the RAA. That's not going to go away, so hopefully that will ensure some accuracy, but some of the things that we've put in our report have to deal with independent validator. And with -- regardless of which of the models, especially the two that we highlight prominently and compare in the report, you can put that validation in different places, either locally or within the aggregation, you know. It just depends on where in the system you place that and how many independent validators you have.

So we don't believe any one of the models would change our goals to strive for accuracy, but we do hope that the models as presented and compared address some of the other concerns with regard to some of the jurisdictional and privacy concerns.

ROD RASMUSSEN: And let me just add on that accuracy issues, that is one of the areas where there is a difference slightly from a technical perspective on how you can better ensure accuracy between a federated versus an aggregate model, just from the ability to look at an entire database and do comparisons for accuracy checks versus having distributed databases. That's one of the reasons we originally proposed the aggregated model. It's.

Not impossible to do, though.   It's just -- you know, from a technical perspective, and an operational perspective, it's more challenging.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you.

Belgium

BELGIUM: Thank you. Once again I will speak French.

I think that one is always concerned about where to store the data. Did I understand correctly you anticipate authorization and who should provide this authorization for access?   Is this a committee that needs to be implemented?

Thank you.

AUSTRALIA:	Thank you, Belgium. Is there anyone from the working group who is able to address that question?
STEPHANIE PERRIN:	I am going to speak in English. I am presuming this question relates to the manner in which an individual or a group is accredited to access the RDS. Is that correct?

Okay. So basically we have been consulting law enforcement agencies to see if they can recommend methods to accredit the organizations that they work with. We're not trying to reinvent the wheel, but obviously whoever is operating the RDS has to know that when a law enforcement agent comes in, that, indeed, they are a law enforcement agent; that they're not just posing as one. And the same applies for private sector organizations that are either investigating cybercrime, for instance, or investigating on behalf of a company.

So we're looking in and we're seeking proposals for those accreditation schemes. And then once accredited, then the audit and control would come in. At the moment, we don't know who is asking. It's just out there.

With this system we, should have better control for the purposes of data protection. And it has to be fitted to purpose. So there will be an examination of whether the purpose suits.

FABRICIO VAYRA: And just to expand, we've put considerable effort and thought into verification because it goes right to the root of one of the principles, which is accountability in the system. We're great believers that increased accountability in the system for everybody will increase accuracy and will increase -- or I should say increase privacy and decrease the concerns we have today.

So this is a very, very important piece of our analysis, because it really strikes right at the heart of accountability.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you very much. And thanks for that question, Belgium. This is an issue that, in the WHOIS Review Team, which I still recall very fondly, spent some substantial time looking at. And I think here it appears that there's a number of issues interlinked. We had the public and gated data elements, so some information will be public and then there will be some sort of gated access to additional data elements. So the means of verifying who can gain access to those gated data elements is very important from both sides, or for various perspective, from a privacy perspective, from a data protection perspective, but also from the user perspective to ensure that legitimate law enforcement agencies, for example, can gain access to the data they needed. So it's a very important balance to get right.

Are there any further questions from the GAC?

I have U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes. Thank you, Peter.

It's just a quick segue from that, because we're not just talking about law enforcement agencies, are we. We're talking about authorities dealing with trade practice, people dealing with complaints to consumer advisory agencies and so on. It's a very complex area. And mapping the accreditation, and so on, I guess is going to be quite a challenge. And even within law enforcement, you have different authorities. I mean, the U.K. is very complex. There isn't sort of a single national police authority. You have the system of law enforcement in the U.K. goes back many centuries and it's not all in a single, simplified system.

So it is a real challenge. And I guess it's important to ensure that you're consulting all the key actors, if you like, in this area effectively.

Thank you.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you, U.K.

And I think that highlights a very important challenge.

I note that of course the GAC's WHOIS principles identify various legitimate uses of WHOIS data by different sorts of entities. So I think the U.K. has highlighted that it's not just law enforcement, obviously. And in terms of even within law enforcement, I'm reminded the U.S. submission identified at least 20,000, I think it said, law enforcement agencies within the U.S. So the accreditation is obviously a very important issue.

If the GAC would indulge me, I might ask my own follow-up question from working in the WHOIS Review Team.

I was particularly interested in the verification and accuracy issues, and I'm interested -- one of the things the WHOIS Review Team grappled with in terms of accuracy is looking at accuracy of new registrations, which is a particular issue. You can verify registrants as they register and so on.

But one of the issues we grappled with is there is a very large, obviously, existing data set which has a level of inaccuracy. Is this something that the Expert Working Group has been able to look at or does the model address this legacy data set, the existing WHOIS data sets, in any way?

ROD RASMUSSEN: So, yes, the Expert Working Group has been looking at this as part of the entire process. There are some 270 million to 300 million

domain names in existence in the world and a good chunk of those are gTLDs, which would come under this regime.

Clearly, with the different elements of the verification system and this concept of contact data that is actually managed by the individual organization that data represents, there's going to be a bit of a retrofit or a look at that existing data as part of this process.

We will be -- This is, again, part of the work in progress is looking at how we would actually do this. But we also, I believe, have already discussed to some extent within the report -- if not there, it's in our own deliberations -- this concept of doing a regular audit, regular sweeping-up-of-the-street type of look at the data within the systems.

So we're certainly well aware of that problem.

This is not a problem -- It seems very large, but when you take a look at 300 million records or 200 million records, whatever it is that are out there, to a large extent a lot of those records will be fairly straightforward to deal with, especially if you have moved to a thick WHOIS model, as may be the case between now and then for the two remaining large gTLDs.

So there's a lot of moving parts in the process today that may make this not as much of a problem when you actually get to implementation.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Just to make one brief point. Currently, as a registrant, you have a duty to review your data once a year and ensure that it is correct and accurate. Now, there's no enforcement of that currently, but there could be going forward.

And then you wanted to make --

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, this is Carlton speaking. The SSAC also looked at the report and I'm happy to say that SSAC made some recommendations about the verification models and which we have adopted in the update report. So we are harmonized with some of the SSAC's view in this area.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you again to the review team.

Are there any further comments from the GAC at this stage?

Council of Europe.

COUNCIL OF EUROPE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just some information for you that the Council of Europe is an observer to the GAC, and it's also the home of the Budapest Convention on Cybercrime. And there's lots of work unfolding on transborder data flows, how law enforcement can help each other in accessing personal data but

with respect to safeguards and privacy. There's going to be a conference next month 4 to 6 December called the Octopus Conference on Cybercrime, and it will be looking at these access to data flows and next steps. I think it would be very good to try to incorporate this discussion into that conference, and vice versa for that matter.

But the other point is it's also the home to -- Council of Europe is also the home of a convention on the processing of personal data protection which has been signed by countries outside of Europe, including Uruguay and Morocco. And other countries are aligned to sign this convention, which also includes supervisory authorities which help to protect that on the domestic level.

So there's lots of expertise out there I think which needs to be apprised in these discussions. So I just wanted to point that to your attention. Perhaps the GAC can discuss that later.

Thank you.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Can I just follow up in response? Carlton again.

I'm happy you brought that up because those are some of the things that we looked at in looking at jurisdictional issues. We're very much aware of the European regime and the approach of that regime in terms of making sure that countries outside in terms of transborder flows of data are harmonized with them.

As a matter of fact, that information played a huge role in our consideration of what the jurisdictional issue should be and what approaches might be taken to harmonize the data protection regimes across the space.

So thank you for that.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you.

I'm mindful of time, that we're starting to get past our end date, but, Thailand, you also were interested with a question?

THAILAND: I have some very short comments on the translation or transliterations of contact information, and that's very crucial for a country that are not using the English because they have decide you need to make it in English. And I already make a comment in the working groups that the role of GAC in the country need to help to further that to be happen because the standardization cannot go to every jurisdic because there is a difference from one country to another. Only reference they have is UPU, which is a postal address. But when you talk about legally binding or registrations, the local GAC might have a best knowledge. And we need to work that out and helping to improve the WHOIS. Because if the validation would take place and you pushed the cost back to related string, it will cost them because it will need to

go to the new data model. So I think what -- I do see that the GACs that are involved in the country with the contact information that is not the English, the decision is made to go for changing the scripts into the common language. And I think I do see important roles of the GAC that need to help to facilitate that.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Thailand. Is there anyone from the Expert Working Group who would like to comment on that before --

JEAN-FRANCOIS BARIL: I don't know if I can have the final comment, but we took it very seriously within the Expert Working Group. By the way, we were having -- we were at consultation yesterday with UPU and trying to learn as much as we can from their experience also on these different languages, different countries, and how it works in practice.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you. In terms of wrapping up, I'd like to thank the Expert Working Group. I think this has been incredibly informative and useful for the GAC. There's obviously a lot of issues here for us to look at.

Before we close I think it would probably be useful for the GAC to understand what the next steps contemplated are.

JEAN-FRANCOIS BARIL: So this is a good way to lead to the next slide.

So this is work in process. Absolutely. And during this ICANN 48, we still expect a lot of lovely discussion, including from everyone from this team.

We are very conscious of the how serious -- how difficult it is to put in coexistence a different element like privacy, accuracy, data protection, ease of use. This is also put in separate into a square. But we are still very, very much confident that we can bring elements to this one.

A lot of things are attention to detail. That's why we have also mandated four domains -- four domains for research, and they are listed unto this one and how we can leverage also and what has been done on other groups, like ccTLD. That's one. We are also sure that we cannot issue the final report without having the full understanding, or at least a minimum set of understanding for risk and impact on what we are going to propose. Proxy practices is also very difficult so we want to go into more detail.

And last but not least, we are also conscious, this is -- but the cost is difficult elements.

By the way, no one has a cost for WHOIS today, so I think nobody can blame us today if we are willing to bring some understanding to this element.

So by the way, tomorrow there will be very important communication on this -- public, not specific communication. But I think we are all invited to attend at 8:30 this public session. At 4:30 p.m. we'll have a workshop, working on different elements.

So Italy was asking what is the next step and how we go there. So by early next year, we'll have another face-to-face meeting within the EWG. And we believe that by Singapore, ICANN 49, we'll be able to issue the final report to the CEO and the Board for further guidance on what we do with our recommendation.

With that, we would like to, on behalf of all the EWG members, thank you very much for your attention, for your recommendation, and for your discussion.

You can be sure that all your input are very, very valid and are incorporated into our thinking process. But we have to understand that we have to aggregate all the different angles for reflection and thinking in such a way it's going to serve the entire community of Internet. This is our expectation.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you.

If the Expert Working Group has a couple more minutes, I've seen two more requests from the GAC, which if you have a moment.

U.S., Iran, and then we will finish up.

So U.S.

Thank you.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And I wanted to just express very, very quickly our appreciation for the enormous amount of work that the Expert Working Group has conducted. It's truly very, very well focused. You have really devoted a lot of time and given a lot of thought to all of the feedback that you had received to date.

I will have to note, quite candidly, that we have not completed in the United States our review of this current version. But there is a great deal of interest, and it is under review. But I didn't want to miss this opportunity to thank you again for your efforts. Really appreciate it.

JEAN-FRANCOIS BARIL: Really appreciate this comment. This is a lot of also support for the -- bringing the energy, extra energy which is needed to tackle these different issues. So thank you very much, Suzanne.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you, U.S. Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Chairman.   The appreciation expressed on the U.S. distinguished colleague on behalf of the entire GAC, everybody appreciated all this effort.

Asking the floor for the second.   When we talk about impact risk analysis, we have to add and risk mitigation.   This is important issue.

You analyze, you identify, then you have to have mitigations of that.   Thank you.

JEAN-FRANCOIS BARIL: I strongly believe this is part of also the analysis that we are going to have.   Thank you for the comment.

AUSTRALIA: Okay. Well, thank you to the Expert Working Group.   I'm sure the GAC will be discussing this further.   And we look forward to our next interaction.

JEAN-FRANCOIS BARIL: Thank you, Peter.

CHAIR DRYDEN: For the GAC, 2:15 in this room, please, to reconvene.

Iran.

IRAN:	Excuse me, Chairman. The previous part of the discussions about the high-level, I wanted to attract your attention. I didn't succeed, Chairman.
	We need to put in the record, in order to attract or encourage the high-level personalities such as minister and deputy minister to attend the high-level meeting in London, we need at the least or the latest in Singapore we have a broad agenda of that meeting. That is very important.
CHAIR DRYDEN:	Thank you.

[LUNCH BREAK]