**ICANN**
**Transcription ICANN Hyderabad**
**GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group**
**Friday, 04 November 2016 at 10:00 IST**
Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

.

Chuck Gomes:     Thank you. I'm Chuck Gomes and I'm the chair of this PDP working group. And I just have one request, I'd like to request that Michele can't disagree with anything I say before we start.

James Bladel:     Done.

Chuck Gomes:     Done? Thank you.

Michele Neylon:   You're not the boss of me, James.

Chuck Gomes:    In spite of the challenging task that we have in this PDP working group, we do have some fun, and it's a great group of people not only on the leadership team but in the working group itself. And I've been rewarding to see.

So we have some slides up there. The first one, as you can see talks about what we've done so far. I'm not going to go through those item by item, but you can take a look at those and if you have questions about any of those certainly do that.

You can see on the left there we do have an approved work plan, not the whole PDP because that PDP is broken into two phases. We have a very detailed work plan for the - for a significant portion of Phase 1. Phase 2 and Phase 3 will be dependent on what happens in Phase 1.

One of the big tasks that we have done over the last several months is to develop an initial possible requirements list. Now our charter has 11 work plan tasks that are shown on this slide here. And we're through most of those. We've completed most of those. You'll see though that the initial possible requirements list it in progress. There's still some work being done on that. In fact that will probably be open on an ongoing basis so that we could always add a new requirement as we discover that along the way.

We have just about finished a problem statement, you can see towards the bottom of that slide, for the - oh excuse me, we did complete a problem statement for the PDP working group, and we're just about through with a statement of purpose for RDS for registration data services system. So that's kind of where we're at right now.

Let's go to the next slide, which brings us up to date. So we're now, in fact yesterday in our face to face meeting yesterday, we started deliberation on that

long list of possible requirements for an RDS. The - so it was the first yesterday and we got through several possible requirements. Just to give you an idea of the task in front of us, we have just for the first five questions out of 11 that are in our charter, we have over 700 possible requirements that have been pulled from dozens of source documents that have been produced over the years.

And the working group, it was a nice team ever to develop those, so it's a significant task and we started that task yesterday, which is in our work plan, a part of Task 12 in our work plan.

For those that don't recall, ultimately after Phase 1 we submit a final report to the Council with the recommendations that we put forward. And that's a ways off still. I can talk to that if you want. But we have to deliberate on the possible requirements list that have been developed. And we started that process yesterday.

We do meet, with the exception of next week, we followed the tradition of not having a working group meeting after the ICANN meeting, but we typically meet once a week for 90 minutes. And we will continue to do that.

In the questions that are in our charter to answer, there are three of them that the working group decided to focus on first. The question about users and purposes, who should have access to gTLD registration data and why. We covered some possible requirements are not yesterday. The next one which is blocked out there little bit is data elements, what data should be collected, stored and disclosed. And privacy, what steps are needed to protect data and privacy?

We will be working through those three areas in the next few weeks and months ahead dealing with possible requirements related to each of those. And we will be doing it iteratively, we will be rotating those areas so that we don't favor any one over another. And that's where we're at right now. Next slide please.

Cell here you can see the first five questions there, users and purposes, registration data elements, privacy, data access and registration data accuracy. And I won't read the questions for each one, many of you have seen those before and you can hopefully read them on the screen.

But ultimately after we deliberate on possible requirements for those five areas we have to answer the question which we call a foundational question, is a new policy framework and the next-generation system needed to address these requirements? We have a lot of work to do before we can answer that question but that the first goal, the first big goal in Phase 1 after we deliberate on the over 700 requirements on those first five questions. There are six additional questions that we will have to deliberate depending on the results of the answer to that question. Next slide please.

So how can the GNSO Council and the ICANN community assist? Well let me go through these. Certainly we strongly request participation from everybody in the community that's interested in this topic following the deliberations. We also invite you to check our progress on our wiki, the URL is given for that.

We have reached out already in a couple different ways for feedback from stakeholders and stakeholder groups and constituencies in the community. We will be doing that in the future. Responses, input not only to formal and informal outreach that we initiate but also through your representatives in the

working group. Early on in the process we did an analysis of how well represented the working group was across the community and they came out pretty well.

But we will be watching that on an ongoing basis. And I encourage all of you through your representatives in the working group to stay attuned to what's going on and provide your feedback through your representatives.

For the community, we're all going to have to be ready to compromise to find consensus. And we're at that phase now where we're going to really need to do that seriously. That doesn't mean we compromised on fundamental beliefs by finding ways that most of the community will support is going to be an important challenge for us.

And then a specific request for the Council here is to continue to ensure that all impacted stakeholder groups and constituencies and advisory committees in the community are actively participating in the working group. We will certainly be watching that, but make sure each of you on the Council represents particular constituencies and stakeholder groups and you also have At Large representatives continue to watch that and make sure your group is well represented so it provides that channel of communication with the working group. We will appreciate that very much.

So last of all, we have the sessions here. I mentioned that yesterday we had our face-to-face meeting, and here you can see there are other somewhat related sessions, not for the working group itself, there is one on Saturday, as you can see there. And then you can also see links to our charter, the work plan and the Phase 1 outputs on the screen there.

So with that, James, I will stop and see if there are any questions. Or I certainly welcome Michele, as long as he doesn't agree - disagree with me as a vice chair to talk, add anything I missed. Marika is at the table. I don't know if Susan Kawaguchi, another one of our vice chairs is here. Lisa is in the - oh there you are. I was sitting in a spot - I was looking around for you, I didn't see you. Thanks, Susan. So please feel free to add. And then David Cake is over here, okay.

One of the things we did at the very beginning in designing the leadership structure was to make sure we had one member on the leadership team from each of the four stakeholder groups in the GNSO. I as chair, have greatly appreciated that because they represent different points of view in this very hotly debated topic over the last 15 years, and that has helped very much so I certainly welcome them to add anything to this. And I will be glad to respond to any questions you have.

James Bladel:     Thank you, Chuck. We do have a queue forming so first up is Heather. Old hand. Okay then first up is Donna. Go ahead, Donna.

Donna Austin:     Thanks, Chuck. Donna Austin for the record. I just want to pick up on a request that you made to the Council in terms of making sure that our respective SGs, Cs, continue to be president or have representation on the working group. And I just wonder whether that was triggered by the fact that your group has been operating for nine months now, have you seen any drop off in participation over that time, oranges trying to get to the reason for the question, the request.

Chuck Gomes:     No, Donna, I don't think that statement was not motivated by any particular drop off we've seen. But because this working group will last a long time, it's important that all of us watch that. And so that was the thing. But I don't think

there have, now Lisa and Marika have watched the membership, our vice chair - each of the vice chairs represent a different stakeholder group so if they have different comments on that or additional comments on that they would be welcomed to make them.

James Bladel:     David.

David Cake:       And, yes, and I just want to add the nature of this group is - it's not just that it's going to go for a long time but it's going to change the nature of what it's doing over that time. In a sense we need to be recruiting for this group all the time because we'll need a - you know, the nature of what we will do, particularly once we leave Phase 1 and going to Phase 2, we'll change significantly and we will need to attract new people with new skills into that group and let them know.

So this is a different group. We worked from the start, we said this is not going to be a group - a single group of people that always - that will carry this through to the end. Right from the start we said this group will have to keep bringing new people on as it goes.

James Bladel:     Thanks, David. Michele.

Michele Neylon:  Thanks, James. Michele for the record. Agreeing with Chuck, no, but this is -- this group is - it's contentious, it's something where we are already seeing quite high emotions. We're going to see more, I expect to see tears, possibly mine, definitely Chuck's. And I think, you know, the thing around the volunteers is really, really important because it's not a sprint, it's something like a quadruple marathon or a relay race or something like that. It's going to take a long time.

And it's not reasonable to expect the same set of people to try to actually follow this all the way through. As I think others hinted at, I mean, you're going to need people with different skill sets, and, you know, getting engagement on an ongoing basis. I mean, most of us have day jobs as well so, you know, putting that kind of commitment in. And Chuck deserves a lot of respect because the man has been our first leader, full of energy and he runs rings around the rest of us. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Michele. Stephanie, you're next.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I just wanted to raise two point. We have been, in response to Donna's question, I think there is some strategic by standing going on at the moment, which you could hardly blame anyone. You know, I'd like to miss a few calls myself but I can't.

So it might become an issue if people sort of show what a year and a half from now and put an all-out blitz on something some of us toiled away at and lonely isolation over the next few months. I'm sure Michele will agree with me on that one, right?

Michele Neylon: Yes, dear.

Stephanie Perrin: My second point is we've been discussing this as an example I think or the examples we have of these big reviews that come back to, and I'm sorry that Phil has stepped out because he expressed that much better than I did. You know, these are - a lot of them Whois stuff has just accreted over the years. It is not necessarily in a good formal policy. In fact we had plenty of input saying you need a policy, you need a definition, we need a purpose, you know, not just from the data commissioners but from people like that SSAC.

So, we do have to do a certain amount of reinventing so people should not be surprised when they show what two years from now and read something and say well they've gone in and changed everything, well I certainly hope that is the case. Anyway that was, as I say I think Phil made that point a lot better than I did.

In order to review implementation mechanisms you have to have a policy that created the implementation mechanisms, and kind of going back to the work of the Policy and Implementation Review Committee. Since we don't have a proper policy it makes reviewing the efficacy of the mechanism somewhat problematic. Thanks.

James Bladel:     Thanks, Stephanie. I put myself in the queue because I have question for Chuck and for some of the other vice chairs on this working group, and the leadership of the PDP. I have a concern about this PDP, I think from the Council's perspective in that the issues arising from Whois popping up all the time and the interdependencies with other work streams are causally being identified.

And the fact that we have this ongoing, and she mentioned very lengthy and comprehensive PDP, it makes it a very nice target to become a bucket for those issues that we refer, you know, when we find something new and some other in the course of some other PDP that we reference back and send that over to the RDS.

I mean, do you feel that that's happening or do you have any guidance for us on when that, you know, when that would overload that? And I'm thinking specifically, I'm on some cold medicine so I'm having some trouble thinking of a specific, but we have encountered for example I think the Whois Review Team coming up and looking at the scope of what the upcoming Whois

Review Team would be knowing that it would probably collide to some extent with the work that's ongoing in this PDP.

We talked about things like translation and transliteration implementation. We talked about things like the IRD and the conflict with national law. So these things keep popping up, and I think the question at the Council level is when do we appropriately refer these to the RDS PDP? Or when do we maybe show a little restraint and say no, you have to kind of work on this on your own as a discrete work stream and stay out of RDS's way?

Chuck Gomes:     Thanks, James. Chuck speaking. First of all, our charter does a really good job, and you guys approve the charter, does a really good job of noting the interdependencies of other work going on and other work that has been done. And that long - that list of dozens of resource documents in the cases where there have been Whois related efforts, the reports from those are part of the information that we are pulling possible requirements from.

Also for those activities that are going on now, we will incorporate those as they have reports and so forth. So that's built into our tasks. And again, that's an area where we invite everybody. If you discover something and you want to make sure that that PP working group for RDS is including that, please check with your reps or check with me or any of the leadership team or Lisa or Marika, and we will be glad to follow up on that. But it's a great point because there are things going on, there are things that happened and we are trying to include all of those things in our work.

James Bladel:     And Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: I just want to follow on with that. I think, you know, we see all of the other issues with Whois but some of those we can look at with an eye towards, you

know, this will be a new system or maybe a new system if the PDP working group decides on that. We haven't made that real decision yet. And so some of the other existing Whois issues that are being worked on, like the conflict with national law, we definitely take that into account.

But it could be that this new RDS could design a system that we wouldn't need that policy anymore because it addresses it, you know, and does not cause that problem for the registrars. So, you know, I'm not guaranteeing anything. But so I think all of our work moving forward we have to keep looking at the other issues. But those other issues still need to be worked on in the community because there is no guarantee if or when this could be rolled out. And so we need something to keep the existing system working and improving at all times too.

James Bladel:    Thank you, Susan. Okay the queue is clear and we are right up against our time. So are there any further questions for Chuck from the table or the floor? Michele?

Michele Neylon:  This is Michele again for the record. It's not a question, it's just a comment. In common with all PDPs we're still open to new blood, new members, etcetera, etcetera, so if anybody is interested in joining and joining the party please come and join, I don't know, how many participants do we have now, 150+ or something?

Chuck Gomes:     I don't know what the latest membership number is. We have members and observers, there are a large number of observers as well. It's certainly well over 130 members. Now like all working groups, there is a percentage of bat that released a very consistently active but it's been a pretty diverse group that is staying active. And in spite of the disagreements I've been very pleased

with the co-op or to the spirit of everybody willing to listen to others - other viewpoints than their own so.

James Bladel:     Any final questions or thoughts? Okay, let's conclude the session.


END