
JOHANNESBURG – GAC Public Safety Working Group meeting

Tuesday, June 27, 2017 – 17:00 to 18:30 JNB

ICANN59 | Johannesburg, South Africa

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Good evening, everyone. There's two choices for you now. If you want to hear more from me and the last session wasn't enough, then I invite you to stay in the room because we're going to be chairing the next session now which is the Public Safety Working Group's working session, which is open to everyone, so you're more than invited to stay and listen to the work that's going on in this group. If you have other things to do, I would kindly invite you to now step out of the room so we can get started with the work of the working group.

And everybody who intends to stay, I would just invite you to please come to the front of the room so as to really be part of this conversation.

All right. Good afternoon, everyone. Thanks very much for coming to the session of the GAC Public Safety Working Group. We have four points on the agenda tonight. We, first of all, want to follow-up with the vTLD Consortium, and very grateful that Gg could be here to speak to us. The vTLD Consortium is the Verified Top-Level Domains Consortium, and I'm going to leave it to Gg to present the details but we had a very interesting presentation at ICANN Copenhagen on the work that they do around providing safeguards on the point of registration of a domain which minimizes the potential for abuse. And of course for that reason, it's very interesting for us to learn from.

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.

So I'm going to turn it over to Lauren and Gg to take us through some of the work that has happened as part of the consortium.

Over to you guys.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

And it was unfortunate that during the last presentation by the vTLD it was at the prime-time spot of 7:30 at night or some odd, so we're happy to have this much more civilized hour of 5:00. And the information was very informative and very interesting, so that's why we invited our -- our friends from the vTLD domains consortium to tell us a little more about -- about their initiatives, particularly the effect that the restrictions have had about -- their registration restrictions have had on the level of abuse. And also their business models because, as I'm sure Gg will mention, to effectuate the type of security measures that they are taking does result in some costs so we're interested in hearing about how that is balanced out.

So thanks so much, Gg, for being with us.

Gg LEVINE:

Absolutely. Thank you, Lauren.

Can everyone hear me okay?

As Lauren said, I'm Gg L. I'm with the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy. We're the registry operator for the .PHARMACY top-level domain, and we're also one of the founding members of the Verified Top-Level Domains Consortium.

I had the opportunity to speak with some of you in Copenhagen to introduce the vTLD consortium. Today I would like to take a deeper dive into how the vTLDs operate, and also invite your feedback on what the next steps can be for influencing the public safety on the Internet.

As some of you may recall, the mission of the consortium -- next slide, please. The mission of the consortium is to enhance public trust, online safety, and Internet commerce by raising awareness of verified top-level domains as safe online spaces.

Next slide, please.

All consortium members require four key safeguards. First of all, they all require verification prior to use. So vTLDs will check to ensure this a potential registrant is in compliance with the standards of the registry before permitting use of the domain name.

Next slide, please.

vTLDs also require that registrants adhere to those standards that have been established by the registry. They also require autonomy, or they have the autonomy to take back a domain name if registrants are found to be in violation of those registry standards. And there is also ongoing verification to ensure that compliance is -- is continuing throughout the life of the domain.

Next slide, please.

So let's take a look at how -- how this works on -- on a practical level. There are certainly costs involved. It is a -- a resource-intensive operation to pre-verify and to do ongoing verification of registrants.

Registration numbers in verified TLDs are relatively lower than they are in unrestricted TLDs. And not all registrars want to work with VTLDs. However, let's take a look at the benefits. costs are recouped through higher fees, and because of the value of the product that -- that registrants are getting, we -- we like to think it's worth it.

VTLDs are virtually free of abuses, and they're gaining recognition within their relevant sectors as vanity TLDs, showing an affiliation with a legitimate -- with a legitimate community. And they're also recognized as -- as safe, reliable, and trustworthy.

Okay. Next slide, please.

And looking at the abuse that is absent from vTLDs, we can point to zero incidents of malware, zero incidents of phishing, and zero incidents of spam in vTLDs. And if those incidents should arise, vTLDs have policies in place to take down the offending domain names.

And I won't take the time to go through the specific verification measures of the individual vTLDs, but these slides will be made available, and I'm happy to answer questions after the meeting or at any time. But I would like to take a look at the business values, if we can skip ahead a couple of slides.

Two more. One more. Okay. Thank you.

And specifically that last bullet point. VTLDs enhance a registrant's brand recognition and differentiates them in a competitive marketplace.

Looking at .PHARMACY, for example, there are tens of thousands of domain names out there that are being used to facilitate the illegal sale of prescription drugs online, many of them counterfeit, many of them endangering patient safety.

In contrast, you have online pharmacies and related entities with a domain name ending in .PHARMACY, and those people can rest assured have been verified to be safe and trustworthy.

Next slide, please.

Looking at -- at vTLDs as a viable business model, approximately 6,000 domains have been registered across .BANK and .INSURANCE, both of which are verified TLDs. More than 40% of banks in the U.S. have registered .BANK domain names and hundreds now use it as their primary website. And adoption and use continues to increase. We're not just looking at defensive domain registrations.

Next slide, please.

As for NABP, nearly 40% of pharmacies in the U.S. are serviced by websites verified by NABP. And while registration volume is relatively low, it is by no means stagnant. Registrations in .PHARMACY have increased nearly 70% in the last year.

Next slide, please.

So now that I have given you a little flavor of what vTLDs are and how they operate, I would like to request input and guidance from the Public Safety Working Group and the community about what the next steps can be for verified top-level domains. Possibilities include an intersessional webinar for the GAC and stakeholders, a possible presentation to the GAC at ICANN 60. Possibly a high-interest topic session on domain name system abuse prevention in a -- in a broader fashion at ICANN 60. And another possibility is to look at measures for new gTLDs in highly regulated sectors and in subsequent procedures and how vTLDs might be able to assist in meeting requirements for -- for those types of -- of strings.

And at this time, I would like to open it up to feedback from -- from the community.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Thank you, Gg. That's very, very informative. And just for context, I want to remind folks that the safeguard.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you, Gg. That's very, very informative.

And just for context, I want to remind folks that the safeguard that the GAC had recommended for highly regulated strings was the subject of a lot of debate and input from -- from the community as to what types of safeguards should be put into place for domains in highly regulated industries, like your banks and pharmacies, gambling institutions, et cetera.

So that was really the subject of some debate, and some of the concerns that were raised was it's going to be a very difficult to engage in verification, and validation is going to be very expensive, you know, among other concerns.

So what's very interesting about the vTLDs is this is a real-world example of a group of several highly regulated gTLDs that have voluntarily decided that they are going to go beyond what's required under the contracts and think about what sort of environment they want for their vTLDs in order to promote them as a very safe and secure space. So that's just for context about one of the ways this initiative fits in.

So that said, I did want to open this up to the folks in the room for -- or remotely if we have that availability. I'm not sure we do. But I wanted to open it up for questions.

Yes, Denise.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you. Denise Michel with Facebook. Thank you for this presentation, and to the questions that you ended your presentation with, personally I would say yes. I think they're all viable and interesting paths to explore, to socialize and have a broader ICANN conversation about this. And I also have a question. So the -- there is a -- so the registrars and staff have apparently been struggling for over four years to comply with cross field validation requirement in the 2013 RAA. I'm just curious as to whether any individuals, entities

involved in that effort, has reached out to you for, you know, possible relevancy in terms of what you are clearly successfully doing. Although it might not be fully applicable, it's certainly, I think, likely raises some very interesting and validated approaches to this. Thank you.

Gg LEVINE:

To answer your question, not specifically. They have not reached out to us specifically to address overall questions regarding the 2013 RAA. We do work with a small group of registrars that are willing to work with us on our -- to accommodate our restrictions and verification process, as do the other members of the vTLD. But no, we have not worked on it on a general level on a higher scale.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Yes.

WENDY SELTZER:

Hi, Wendy Seltzer here. Thank you for sharing this. I find it quite interesting as a voluntary measure chosen by some registries to operate something that they feel brings value to users, both purchasers of domain names and users of the DNS. I think it's interesting as an example of competition in the domain name marketplace. I would find it troubling to see it mandated anywhere. I think that would conflict with various other uses and particularly free expression interests that we also see in the Domain Name System. And given the wide range of jurisdictions engaged in regulation and

the wide range of regulations that might be placed on industries in different places, I think ICANN should stay firmly away from the verified program as anything that it mandates in contracts.

Gg LEVINE:

Thank you, Wendy. I want to emphasize that the -- that these programs are voluntary and something that a select group of registry operators have opted to do because we saw value in operating in this fashion. As far as mandating, I don't think that that was the -- that's certainly not the intention of the group. If it serves as a way to satisfy GAC safeguards, for instance, that may be one possibility, but they -- they remain strictly voluntary.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Hi, Kathy Kleiman, noncommercial users constituency. Some vTLDs have many advantages, and thank you for laying them out. But some have been accused of being discriminatory. Largely limited to one country and the credentials of one country. So I was wondering what the process is for the community to help you respond so some of these allocations of some of the vTLDs and make sure that they're opened up fairly for the global audience that, you know, gTLDs are intended for. Thank you.

Gg LEVINE:

I can speak on behalf of .PHARMACY, which is a global endeavor. Currently the majority of our registrants are U.S.-based, although we do have provisions in place to accept and process applications from

multiple other countries. The caveat is that registrants must be compliant with the laws of the jurisdictions in which they're based as well as where they do business. So that may be where -- where the idea might come from that -- that it's discriminatory. It's -- it is -- it's -- it discriminates based on legal compliance within -- within the jurisdiction where it's based and where it does business. So only in that sense would it -- would it be restricted in that sense. Does that answer your question?

LAUREEN KAPIN:

The gentleman in the navy jacket, and then I see this gentleman in the brown jacket. So yes, you.

ROBERT GUERRA:

Great. My name is Robert Guerra. I'm speaking on capacity of Privaterra. I'm also Canadian. And I know that there's -- I just want to echo both Kathy and Wendy's comments earlier in regard from the person speaking from .PHARMACY, I would say that there's perhaps a difference of opinion between certain types of pharmacies in the U.S. and in Canada in regards to what constitutes a pharmacy, the trade on the border, and the precedent it might set. There's a huge trade between the two countries in regards to pharmaceuticals, and you may want to call it a gray area or not, but if that doesn't get settled properly, it might prohibit online pharmaceutical sales in other parts of the world. And so if it's an issue of contention, I'm just wondering if ICANN or other bodies can set up an ongoing process to try to figure out whether it's big Pharma that's going to come to the table and

seize .PHARMACY or whether there's going to have a community discussion. For example, around .GAY there's been a very robust conversation because there was some contestation. So I'm just wondering if you're open to the same thing for .PHARMACY. Thank you.

Gg LEVINE: I'm not sure I'm -- I'm gathering that you're -- you're specific question. Are we open to a community dialogue? Can you rephrase the question?

ROBERT GUERRA: I'm happy to follow up. And so in your description, in terms of .PHARMACY, you mentioned it was mostly U.S. pharmacies. There are others that may want to have .PHARMACY that are based in Canada and other countries that have been denied .PHARMACY. So if there's a contestation that's taking place, can that go perhaps to a broader community conversation or whether it's the registry of .PHARMACY that's going to decide who in fact is a pharmacy or not?

Gg LEVINE: Sorry. U.S. federal law and Canadian federal law, for instance, currently prohibit the -- the cross-border transactions of pharmaceutical products. And if that were to change, then that would also be reflected in the policies of .PHARMACY.

ROBERT GUERRA: Sorry. Just a quick follow-up, and I don't want to take the point, is that the Internet is global. And so there seems to be -- you're mentioning here, you know, U.S., Canada. There's some contestation. On a global scale I'm not sure if there's going to be contestation or not, which body is going to decide, and that would be a good thing for this community to decide and not the registry of .PHARMACY.

Gg LEVINE: Well, as I mentioned, we do require compliance with the laws in the jurisdiction where the registrant is based and where they're doing business. So if they're doing business in the United States, they would need to be in compliance with the pharmacy laws in the United States. Likewise, if they're doing business in Canada, they would need to be in compliance with the laws of Canada. If they're in Canada and doing business in the United States, that may introduce a violation of -- of law.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Ron, Go ahead.

RON ANDRUFF: Thank you very much, Chair. Madam Levine, I'm -- I think you're -- I'm confused. I believe that -- I'm sorry, I'm over here. Sorry, I apologize.

LAUREEN KAPIN: May you identify yourself?

RON ANDRUFF:

Yes. Ron Andruff, a long-standing member of the ICANN community. I believe that you made a statement a moment ago that's not quite true. You said it's illegal for Americans to buy Canadian medications, maintenance medications, when, in fact, it's a long-known story about the bus trips. Many people would get on buses, come up and get their 90-day supply, and go back, and that's been recognized as a non-issue for decades. But the bigger issue here is, if I understand your policy correctly, what you're saying is that if there happens to be an individual who lives in Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia, and that person has high blood pressure and they find they can get their blood pressure medication at a very low price through a Canadian pharmacy, that, in fact, that Canadian pharmacy would have to be licensed in Mongolia. Likewise in China, in India, New Zealand, in Kentucky, in Texas, and in Connecticut and in Hawaii and in Indonesia and in -- I could go on and on. And so what you're saying is, you're basically putting a hurdle that is impossible for anyone to overcome. So what it sounds more like to me is that you are creating a situation that is perfect for any pharmacy in the United States. Can you please help me with that?

Gg LEVINE:

Sure. You are correct that a pharmacy would need to be in compliance with the laws of the jurisdictions where they're doing business.

RON ANDRUFF: But this isn't a compliance -- I'm doing business via the Internet. And so therefore, I'm using the Internet as a marketing tool and I'm doing mail order, which has been a long-accepted practice. So when you're using terms, being in compliance with the law. Of course, everybody has to be in compliance with the law but what you're saying effectively is, you're setting the bar so high that virtually only United States pharmacies can meet that criteria.

Gg LEVINE: We do, in fact, have registrants in Canada doing business in Canada as well as in the U.K. doing business in the U.K. So I'm not -- I'm not seeing -- I guess I'm not seeing it from the same lens.

RON ANDRUFF: Well, your statement was, you have to be licensed in your own jurisdiction, obviously, and that's correct. You're also saying I would have to be licensed in every possible place a customer may come from anywhere in the world.

Gg LEVINE: In order to sell medications to that customer, the pharmacy would have to be appropriately licensed in that jurisdiction where that patient resides.

RON ANDRUFF: Because NABP says so.

Gg LEVINE: Because that is how the registry operation is run.

RON ANDRUFF: Right. So the registry operator has created a policy --

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Sorry, Ron. I'm very sorry.

RON ANDRUFF: I'm sorry, I beg your pardon. I beg your pardon. Thank you very much.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: This is Cathrin, for the record. I'm sorry, I am going to have to step in because I recognize there may be significant competition issues here. But this is the Public Safety Working Group, and I'm afraid I'm going to have to ask both of you to continue this conversation outside the remit of this group because we're really trying to focus on one specific issue here. And I realize that there may be drawbacks for some participants of the community that derive from this specific model of the vTLDs but we cannot go into the details here in the framework of this session. I'm very sorry, but I'm going to have to cut that debate here. I know we had one more remote question, and then we're probably going -- and there's one more gentleman at the back. And after that, I'm afraid we're going to have to close this part and move on.

HARU AL-HASSAN: Thanks for the presentation. My name is Haru Al-Hassan from Nigerian Communication Commissions. My question is that, how do you know that the registrants comply with the local law in their jurisdiction? How do you confirm that they completely, I mean, comply with their local laws?

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Sorry, this is Cathrin again, for the record. I was probably not very clear, but I think this discussion we will have to take elsewhere.

HARU AL-HASSAN: Thank you.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Sorry about that. We'll just take the remote question.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So we had one question from (saying name). Can ccTLD follow policy for vTLD and be a part of consortium.

Gg LEVINE: Could you repeat the question, please?

LAUREEN KAPIN: So I think the question I assume is from a ccTLD and they are asking if they can adopt the policies of the vTLD consortium and they can

become part of it, which I assume would be an offline discussion, but I don't want to put words in your mouth.

Gg LEVINE: Agree. I think that that is a discussion that we could definitely have offline.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Thank you, Gg. We have one more remote question from Maxim which also relates to the market issue so I'm going to have to also refer Maxim to the private discussion. It sounds like there's another session in the making for the vTLD consortium potentially.

So I think we're going to close the questions here. So I'll turn it over to Laureen and Gg.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So thank you for the questions and for providing your perspectives and concerns. Thanks to Gg for giving us more information about this model, particularly how it has had a very robust impact on diminishing abuse and providing a real world example of how these procedures can work. And I would invite the audience members who -- who want to have further discussions to contact Gg or members of the consortium because I'm sure they would like to share their perspectives with you, even if you end up agreeing to disagree. You still may come to some areas where you agree upon also. So thanks very much.

Gg LEVINE: I just wanted to point out that the last slide contains contact information.

But I can be available after the meeting to -- if anyone wants to continue the conversation. Thank you.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: So Fabien is putting up the last slide so everybody has Gg's contact information, also from our side.

Thank you very much, Gg and Laureen, for this very informative session.

We are now going to turn to another important issue for the GAC Public Safety Working Group which is the implementation of the privacy and proxy accreditation agreement. And the topic lead on that has been Nick Shorey for the Public Safety Working Group. So I will turn the mic over to him now.

NICK SHOREY: Thank you, Cathrin. Good afternoon, everybody.

So we've been working on a disclosure framework as part of the IRT, the Implementation Review Team, for the policy on privacy and proxy services for the last several months. Members of the Public Safety Working Group developed this framework as instructed by the IRT to try and resolve some of the outstanding concerns that the GAC had

expressed in the Helsinki communique, I believe it was, regarding the -
- their final policy recommendations on this.

The disclosure framework was circulated, as you'll remember, amongst the PSWG and endorsed, and then subsequently endorsed by the GAC on the 2nd of June, and was then transmitted to the IRT. I presented the document to them and also provided a bit of a context to some of our proposals.

The IRT have reviewed and discussed the document and a small number of edits have been proposed.

In the spirit of collaboration, this was shared with the PSWG last week, and PSWG members held a pretty positive session with the IRT today to discuss some of the -- the edits and talk around those points.

The proposed edits pertained to the types of data listed within the framework, the categorization of high-priority threats, the publication of contact information, and the time frame for the review of requests. So not a huge amount. And we had some discussion today around that. I think from a personal perspective, it did feel as though some middle ground was found on data types and categorization of high-priority threats. We did run out of time during that meeting, so I'm working with the IRT administrators, the ICANN team, to see if we can find some additional time again this week to pick up on the final points that we weren't able to talk over. So I'll keep people sighted on the mailing list if we can arrange a time to get together.

As one of the GAC representatives on the IRT, I certainly welcome further feedback from members of the PSWG that I can take into the IRT. And the IRT have asked the PSWG if they've got any additional thoughts and inputs, if they can share them by the end of this week and that will help as we continue our weekly calls to develop the final policy.

The IRT is going to continue to finalize the framework over the coming weeks, and this will inform part of the final policy document which will be issued for public comment hopefully in advance of ICANN 60. Possibly around September time. And so there will be a public comment period then where at which point the GAC can provide some final input during that as well.

That's pretty much the state of play at the moment. I don't know if you want to take questions or talk, Cathrin. Back to you.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

Sure. Thank you very much, Nick. This is Cathrin. And thank you also very much for your excellent work in getting the straw man proposal out there which was not an easy effort and it's very much appreciated. And I think we see from the level of comments that we received from the IRT that you pitched it just about right. So I would think that there is not a lot of these comments that we need to be significantly concerned about at this point, but I would invite you all to review very carefully the document that Nick has shared with the list to see whether there are areas of concern where you think that the -- that the intent or the aims of the GAC in making sure that the privacy and proxy

services accreditation respect the necessary requirements also from a public-policy perspective, whether those are really fulfilled. And of course this will also be circulated to the full GAC list for review after the update tomorrow for information.

There is one issue that maybe is worthy of just spending another two minutes on, which is the question of how -- how law enforcement can contact the privacy and proxy services to receive access to the information that is required for law enforcement investigation. And we had a discussion on this now in the IRT team which took issue with the suggestion that there could be a contact information, an email posted on the website of the privacy and proxy services provider because that is liable to give rise to significant amounts of abuse. And they proposed that there could either be a list or database that's maintained by ICANN itself or, alternatively, some way in which each privacy/proxy service could accredit law enforcement. And those are, of course, questions that have significant implications for law enforcement agencies in terms of being able to access the information. So I would invite all of you to also reflect on these issues and what's the position of the PSWG and recommendation to the GAC at large on these issues should be in terms of how we move forward.

But at this point, maybe I'll just stop and see if there are any questions for Nick.

Everybody is happy, so make sure to review the documents so that we can be sure that we're all in line and can provide a coherent position also to Nick to take forward. And then I guess the next steps would be

for us to inform the GAC tomorrow that the work is on track and that as of now, we don't see any significant issues that would require any GAC intervention at this point. But also to flag, of course, that there will be a public consultation period that is can still oncoming where there is opportunity for all parts of the community to weigh in again.

NICK SHOREY:

Thank you, Cathrin. Nick again. So that's correct. There are I believe around about three members of the GAC on the IRT, of which I am one of them, and we'll continue to work on finalizing this overall policy document. And then hopefully there will be a public comment period around about September.

So the PSWG needs to be sort of cognizant of this and build it into its program going forward ahead of ICANN 60 -- ICANN 60, gosh. And, yeah. So you'll need to continue to consider that kind of thing.

And to sort of jump back on the -- the contact point issue. So in the document, we proposed that the contact point for law enforcement disclosure requests would be published on the -- on the website of the provider, and so that's where that concern around sort of spamming and everything comes into it. But I think -- did seems to me, the couple of years that I've been here, this is a -- this issue of sort of contact points and validation -- sorry, verification of law enforcement agencies is a broader issue this cuts across not just this but other policy tracks in a variety of areas. So the PSWG might want to consider our approach to this. Maybe we might want to sort of set up a separate thing. I don't want to sort of start new tracks of work. But

certainly it's a broader issue, and we're seeking to address it within -- in this context, but it will come back in other -- other policy issues as well.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Thank you, Nick. Indeed, it is a very important point, and in a sense we're maybe even playing out in miniature what would play out for a tiered access system to WHOIS. So it might be worthy of horizontal consideration.

Thank you again, Nick, and the colleagues working on this for all of your hard work on this.

If there are no further comments on this point -- yes, Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Not any comment. First of all, I would just like to thank all the people on the podium. I would like to express our appreciation or my appreciation to you, Cathrin, for your devotion into yes-isms, dynamisms, energy and so much, so forth, that you have expended during previous GAC meeting, this meeting on all of the issues. And I congratulate you. I don't know where all this energy comes from.

Thank you.

[Applause]

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Thank you very much, Kavouss. That's very kind. This is Cathrin for the record.

And now we're going to turn to the third topic, the outcome of the RDS and GDPR sessions. And for this, I guess I'll start with Greg as the topic lead on RDS to give us an update on where we stand on the policy development process. Over to you, Greg.

GREGORY MOUNIER: Thank you, Cathrin. I'm not going to give you an update on what happened also because yesterday we had a very extensive two hours cross-community sessions, and the -- the leadership of the PDP RDS gave a very good update of the situation and I think most of the people here attended.

I think from the Public Safety Working Group perspective, this has been a long process for the whole community. And we are pleased as well to see the ICANN community is also starting to look into the GDPR questions seriously. And this will have a strong impact on, I think, the future of the NG RDS.

Yeah, nothing really to comment on that. I'm really looking forward for the new development. I'm looking forward for the session tomorrow to start to elaborate a firm position on some of the key aspect of the -- the RDS PDP. In particular, for instance, on the gated access to the WHOIS. So it's getting really interesting to see all these different initiatives starting to -- to come together, and we're still looking forward for the outcome of this process.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Thank you very much, Greg, also for your work on this which I understand from yesterday's session hasn't always been the most enjoyable part of the work in this community. Some challenging discussions there.

And I think one thing that emerged very clearly yesterday is that it is -- will be very difficult to expect anything to come out of this process by May 2018, which as most of us now know is the deadline for implementation of the European General Data Protection Regulation on which we just had a session. So just to -- There's not much to debrief on -- from that session. I mean, it was pretty much just an awareness and knowledge-raising session that aimed at facilitating the understanding within the community of what the GDPR actually means and does and what it is not. Because I think it is probably safe to say that at least for some parts of the community, this was not at all clear yet. I'm really hoping that there was some progress made in the previous session. But there is no -- no policy or anything that has come out of that.

I think one very important element, though, that emerged is that ICANN is now specifically looking at developing a process to not design new policy but to look at how the current policy and the current contracts can be implemented in such a way as to try and respect the requirements of the general data protection regulation. And I think that this is certainly a development that is worthwhile flagging to the GAC at large, and probably one that I think that we

should look to support. Because just leaving everything at the status quo and heading blindly for May 2018 may not be the best option also from a public safety perspective.

So I was just wondering whether there is any feedback from the group, the observers, the people in the room on whether this should be supported by the Public Safety Working Group and whether we should possibly ask the GAC whether they would also consider supporting this effort.

So I'll just open it to the floor here.

Sorry; Iranga, please.

IRANGA KAHANGAMA:

Thanks, Cathrin, especially on the GDPR. I really appreciated your presentation. I guess one maybe clarifying question that you could provide to us is that it was interesting to hear about the -- the internal working group that ICANN is creating, the task force I think is what they called it. Could you speak about -- and said it was contracted parties and ccNSO and what, if any, relationship the PSWG and/or the GAC would have with that group. And if we need to talk about what your role should be or what actions we'll have with that or if it's not applicable to us. Thanks.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

Sure. This is Cathrin again. So I know as much as you do because this was presented to me alongside with you. But I did ask Theresa as she

was leaving whether the GAC was also part of the communities that would be involved, and she said that yes, she has been in contact with the GAC chair. So there is work ongoing to loop the GAC into this group. I understand the GAC has not yet been a part of these conversations, but it has been clearly recognized that it needs to be presented. And I guess that also something where we could offer our support as the Public Safety Working Group, and then, of course, it is for the GAC leadership to take a decision on who should participate in that process. I mean, this would definitely be a good next step, if everybody agrees that this would be an issue that the Public Safety Working Group should take forward. So I'll just again throw it to the room and see whether there are any opinions on this. Denise, please.

DENISE MICHEL:

This is Denise Michel for Facebook. I think it would be very useful, from a very practical level, to have a specific representative from the Public Safety Working Group. Particularly as some of the discussions we heard from ICANN staff indicated that they have a fairly steep learning curve in terms of the actual operational and specific elements of the WHOIS record and how it's used. And since the PSWG trends much more towards hands-on knowledge in this area, I think it would be very useful if the PSWG specifically was involved. Thanks.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

Thank you, Denise. Thomas, did you? No. Thomas was just moving and I thought he raised his hand. Anybody else on this? Guys, this is your working session, so do express opinions, if you have them. Don't

hold back. This is not supposed to -- this is the classroom setting, but we're a working group. The setting is a bit unfortunate. So I'll take this opportunity to remind everybody to please contribute as a group. Although, I guess in this case, I might take your silence as a sense to the idea that we might take this forward. So if there's anybody who thinks that this would not be a good idea, or if there's anybody who would be against flagging this to the GAC and then offering the services of the Public Safety Working Group going forward if the GAC so desires, please raise your hand now. Okay. So we will flag that to the GAC, and then see what decision is taken at GAC leadership level.

All right. So that brings us to the fourth point of our agenda, and I'm so glad we finally have time -- we finally have time for this. 45 minutes. Fabien, the controller of all things, tells me. So this is, I think, a topic that we have tried to have on the agenda for the past three sessions, and for lack of time have not been able to dedicate the time it needs to. So we want to use this as a very practical session to discuss with you how we can organize ourselves better internally. And that is not to say we want to formally reshape any bits of this, but just to see how we can better all contribute as members of the Public Safety Working Group to the different topics that we have been asked to work on by the GAC. And how we can better organize our work amongst each other. So I apologize to those of you who were coming here to listen to the interesting policy bits. This will be somewhat drab because we really want to talk about practicalities. Nonetheless, it is very important, and this face-to-face meeting is one of the rare occasions that we have to talk about these issues. And related to that,

we also need to look at our strategy going forward on these different topics and what might need further resources, what might need further attention in terms of developing policy positions and how we want to take that on. But maybe we'll start with the internal organization bit.

Yesterday, we sent around a table to the group that listed the different work streams that we're currently involved in, or have been involved in the past, and the different topic leads for those work streams and other members of the Public Safety Working Group working on them. And one thing that is -- that is shown very clearly is that we have not yet managed to involve all of the Public Safety Working Group in the work that we do. So there's over 100 members on the mailing list of the Public Safety Working Group who have been specifically nominated by their GAC representative to be a part of the group, and we don't yet see 100 people leading on topics, which, of course, is to be expected. But we would still like to expand the work beyond the current core team.

So what we would look to do is really to have you volunteer for specific areas where you want to contribute with your expertise to the work that is currently ongoing or that will be ongoing soon. And we have already published the Google Doc, where I see we already have more people listed for the different aspects. So thanks to all of you who have already volunteered. And for those of you who are interested in getting involved, maybe we'll just take one second or one minute for each of these categories that we have created, and I would ask the topic leads just to briefly present. I think we know where we

stand on the policy, but just what is needed in terms of input from other members of the group who might be able to contribute further. So maybe Iranga, if I may start with you for abuse mitigation, if you could just briefly outline what would be helpful to you in terms of further support. Because as you can see, Iranga is pretty much alone out there right now with abuse mitigation, which is a huge topic. So Iranga, over to you, please.

IRANGA KAHANGAMA:

Thanks. So I think the work has been going okay, but I think a lot of the momentum we've had, particularly in the run up to this meeting, is going to require a lot more input and I think we're at a really strategically important time where we can have the -- like I said, the momentum coming off the annex 1 dialogue question. So, I mean, my name's on top of that whole category, but I would also consider my name next to the annex 1 as I've kind of led the charge on that. But emanating from that, I think rightly so the next one, two -- the next four listed are kind of going to be sub-buckets to that because I guess what the goal is going to be is to use the -- the subject matter and the themes from the annex 1 questions and combine them with indicators, metrics, and other measurement tools emanating from those four items. The domain abuse activity reporting, identifier technology health, DNS marketplace, and CCT review. So I think as those become finalized and developed, we want to drive requirements and reporting mechanisms from those to relate them to the annex 1 and then have them as a general reference point, as I mentioned the other day, yesterday, to have a centralized de-conflicted set of metrics

for evaluating a lot of these DNS abuse issues. So it would be good if we had point people for each of these, and I think as far as the domain abuse activity reporting project, just because I see that that seems to have a lot of momentum, I think I'll inevitably be highly connected in that, too. So can definitely do that, if others are in a place to properly track some of the other efforts. I don't know if anyone else had any comments or suggestions based on that.

VINCENT NGUNDI:

Thank you very much,co-chairs. We possibly would like -- as Kenya, would like to appreciate the work that the PSWG has been doing. It's been a lot of work. We're kind of new to the process, but we'd really like to appreciate the work that has been done by the PSWG because it actually impacts on us very well and we value that contribution. And with that, we would like to -- to volunteer to be part of that work stream. So Iranga, we'll be able to support you in your work and continue to do the great work. Thank you.

IRANGA KAHANGAMA:

Great. Thank you, Vincent. That sounds great.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

Great. We already have one volunteer. Is there anybody else who wants to spontaneously participate in the work? That's very welcomed. Thank you very much, Vincent.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone).

IRANGA KAHANGAMA: Do you have a preference in terms of one of those work streams you wanted to cover.

VINCENT NGUNDI: Yes, specifically the domain abuse activity reporting project.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Perfect. You're signed up. And we're going to send -- we're going to send -- oh, please. Did you want to say something?

STEVE KELLY: Sure, Steve Kelly from the FBI. Cathrin, just a question. Are you proposing that there be a topic lead for the overall buckets to be kind of like a chairman of a committee of sorts or is this just to help us to understand how the work fits in? So I see Iranga is listed as the abuse mitigation lead and then there's a bunch of sub-activities and then, therefore, who would be the topic lead for the overall or activity relating to registration data accuracy, accessibility, and privacy? Would that be Greg? So that's my question. Are we looking for topic leads in addition -- overall topic leads in addition to specific project leads?

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes, thank you for that very relevant question. Would anybody like to volunteer an answer? I think this is something for the group to decide. Of course, it might make sense to have then smaller level coordination at the individual team level, which might be assured by the topic lead. What are you guys' views on this?

IRANGA KAHANGAMA: So I think the answer is both. I think in certain instances you're going to need to have cohesion to kind of eventually bring some of these concepts together at a more macro high level, but then the day-to-day grind of following the outcomes, the outputs, and the progress of each of those smaller ones still probably should have a point person, or maybe every -- you know, maybe you don't need one for every one. Maybe one for every two projects, depending on how many people we have. But I think there should be kind of that two-layer micro and macro management of some of the projects.

STEVE KELLY: So Steve Kelly again. I agree that that would be organizationally useful. Then perhaps you could have a call or a meeting of a work stream and not have to have everyone join that and then outputs from that can flow up. And so perhaps for the leadership, they can get together in sync and understand if things are on track. Otherwise, the calls become unwieldy because everything's in play. But this starts to -- as the group grows, this starts to organize the work into topic areas of relevant work streams.

IRANGA KAHANGAMA: Absolutely. And I know before this Fabien had started a cadence of the PSWG meeting calls which we may have gotten a little too busy for in the last few weeks, but definitely as those pick back up I think that's a smart move and we can have a more streamlined kind of set of calls.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Amy, you wanted to weigh in?

AMY SANSBURY: Yes. Amy Sansbury. I think how I envision the flow of this is that there will be a lead person for each topic, and I think there's, what, four topics. Each subcategory will have their own individual lead that will report back to the person in charge of that group. So, for example, if you go up to where Iranga is, being that he's the lead person for the abuse mitigation, Dirk Balou and Jason Plomp, whenever they have a meeting, one of them will have to take the lead, inform Iranga what that meeting -- what took place in that meeting. Iranga will be the person that will come back and communicate with Cathrin. So I think that is how the flow would be.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Okay. Jason, please.

JASON PLOMP: Yeah. I don't want this to become some sort of bureaucratic nightmare, either, and have, you know, distinct lines of communication and everything else. I think communication within the Public Safety Working Group is quite good as it stands, and not that I disagree with you, Amy, but, you know, kind of free flow of information and open communication lines should prevail.

Now, I added my name under the verified TLD after the last session because I think any comments out of here were from Canadians regarding pharmacies so we need a Canadian on there to keep the DEA in check.

So I volunteered on that one. But I'll have a look at the other ones based on what the Canadian contribution can be.

Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I want to put in a plug for folks to really think about participating on some of the data gathering initiatives that ICANN is involved in. So it seems like we have some interest already for the domain abuse activity reporting project, aka DAR. But there's also ITHI, the Identifier Technology Health Index, and the DNS Marketplace Health Index. Those are both going to be two initiatives that the public safety community should be very interested in.

And I know that the ICANN staff that's involved in these efforts really wants the Public Safety Working Group's participation in these initiatives so that they can take their practical experience, concerns, and expertise into account as they're developing these data-gathering tools.

For example, the health index is seeking to define how do you measure the health of the DNS so folks who are involved in combating pharming, phishing malware or engaged in looking at spam and how that is a vector to abuse in certain instances, your expertise would really be valuable to contribute to these efforts.

So this is my -- this is my plug to really consider looking at the information that's available about these initiatives on the ICANN website. And there is a -- there is specific information available. And consider becoming involved in these projects. And if you want, you can tell us right now that you'd like to -- you'd like to volunteer. But we would still accept you telling us later on. But they're important initiatives.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

Thank you very much. That was Laureen Kapin, just for the record. I'm Cathrin Bauer-Bulst again.

In just a second, what Laureen has said I think this is an extremely important work stream going forward because we have brought this to the Board. We have said this is key to us. We need to understand better what happens in terms of compliance with the contracts, in terms of abuse mitigation. And there's some very interesting results also coming up now in the report for the CCT Review Team on what is happening with abuse, especially in the gTLD domain space. So now this is our chance to learn more about what ICANN is already doing in terms of trying to mitigate abuse and whether there are useful indicators in there that we can build on to understand better what

works and what doesn't work in terms of fighting abuse. So I can only underscore the importance of this exercise.

So -- But just to come back to this organizational issue, I think what I'm getting from the group, if I may summarize, our interim status is that you do think it's useful to have a little bit of sub-organization without, of course, turning it into a big bureaucracy where there is big reporting lines and commitments in terms of what format you submit, which report on which day of the week, which I fully understand and would second.

So maybe the working thing for thousand would be to have sort of a flexible model.

I see there's another comment. Yes, please.

ANDREEA BRAMBILLA:

Thanks very much, Cathrin. Andreea Brambilla, Canadian GAC representative.

I was just wondering, for some of the cross-cutting processes, some of the sort of items identified under there, has -- we may want to give some thought to how that will sort of fit in with -- I believe there are also GAC representatives that are participating in some of those processes, and just maybe giving some thought as to how that will be coordinated.

Thanks.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Thank you. Indeed, that's a very important point. As with anything, of course, the PSWG always reports back to the full GAC and tries to coordinate. And we've had this also, for example, now in the CCT Review Team where there were representatives from the GAC and from the Public Safety Working Group of the GAC where I understand coordination was quite smooth. But, indeed, that is something to reflect.

Nick, please.

NICK SHOREY: Thank you, Cathrin. Nick, for the record.

This is really, really helpful to have this document here that sort of spells out the breadth of the work that we have just within the Public Safety Working Group. And then if you consider that across the entire work and scope of the GAC, it's just phenomenal. Thank you to everyone that's been working on all of these topics and volunteering as well here today.

What strikes me, you look through these lists and there are some really significant priorities, and we -- we all have day jobs, particularly the law enforcement folks, public safety folks who are here who -- for whom most if not all of them this definitely isn't their full-time job and they have a lot of other stuff to do.

I know from my organization we have huge challenges over resourcing and the ability to sort of contribute to this. So we certainly all need to sort of help each other out. If we can get a couple of people on each

topic just to spread the load, share the burden, that would be great. But it might also be worth our while doing some kind of sort of rag assessment on sort of the priorities and also maybe some sort of risk assessment as well. That's one area I know I find difficult when I'm speaking to my bosses back home and saying I need to go to this meeting or I need to, you know, be given time to work on this. To be able to quantify the risk of not doing that is very difficult, particularly because some of these issues, the impact may be a long way down the line.

So maybe it might be worth us collectively also considering some sort of risk analysis of all of these issues, and then that will help us individually go to our home respective departments and be able to apply for more resource so we can then sort of be in a position to offer up more of our time as well. That might be a useful thing, if we can work on it together.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Thank you, Nick. This is Cathrin. That sounds like an excellent idea to me. And I saw some nods around the room, so I think the GAC is in -- the PSWG of the GAC is in line with a that.

Iranga, did you have a comment?

IRANGA KAHANGAMA: Yes, just a follow-up. I think that makes sense and may be even worth considering, within this list, specifically prioritizing tasks.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: And we already have a column. Excellent!

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Now we need to fill it.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Now we need to fill it.

I think -- I'm wondering if it's useful now to go through all the brackets because I think people are understanding the principle, but maybe it's worth scrolling down just to show the rest of the categories. So we have the cross-cutting processes where of course it will be difficult to say there's one topic lead who will coordinate so that is probably left better as it is. Then we have the outreach and communications where we currently don't have a lead, where -- yes, I think we would invite people to consider whether they want to take the lead on this, because it is a very important part of the work that we do, also to clarify what our role is as the working group of the GAC and to make sure that we have one line when we communicate, especially outside the GAC.

And then I see for the management of the Public Safety Working Group activity, Vincent has also volunteered to help. That's very much appreciated.

Yes, and I think at this point, unless there are specific questions about the categories, we might want to use the last 20 minutes for more

general conversation on the overall strategy of the Public Safety Working Group. And I think what Nick suggested is already a very good way to get us started. So there, I think also in terms of allocating resources and making sure that we have the right amount of priority given to the right topic, it might be worthwhile to have a brief reflection on how important certain processes are to us.

Nick, do you have any suggestions as to how we might take that? Do we want to assign some numbers on the scale or -- in terms of the importance or the risk of not contributing?

NICK SHOREY:

Sure. I mean, so over the last year or so, I've just moved back to the National Crime Agency from the Department for Culture, Media and Sport in UK where I was on the GAC team directly and I'm still sort of assisting the GAC representative on the public safety side.

As part of during my time there, I sort of did run a project for a year looking more broadly at some of these issues, and so I've got -- I've got a load of sort of business case documents that sort of do -- sort of detail some kind of -- you know, attach risks to some of these things, so I'd be more than happy to share those with the PSWG so we can start to sort of build up a kind of collective view about sort of the risks.

Starting immediately, I think the top priorities are those issues where there are policy development processes in Cross-Community Working Group activities. So, you know, CCT review, which will then impact the subsequent -- subsequent rounds. The next generation WHOIS is

moving slowly but has to be watched like a hawk, I think, because it's moving very quickly. So those are a couple that strike out to me immediately as sort of top priorities.

And then, yeah, we can sort of do sort of a rag rating against the rest of them. And I'd be happy to share the stuff that I've done for the projects that talk about risk.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

Thank you very much, Nick. I think that would certainly be helpful. And I think you're -- in a sense you've already identified those processes where the GAC has explicitly told us you're a member and we're relying on you to inform the GAC at large, which I think should be the key consideration for us in terms of giving priority to given processes. And I guess the next generation RDS PDP is another one of those that we, according to this criterion, should give high priority. For the RDS review team, of course we're the only ones. So there's only members of the Public Safety Working Group who are participating. So I think that will also be an important one. But how important it is will also depend on how it defines its scope, so for now, maybe we can reserve judgment on this one.

Are there other parts on this or does anybody else have comments in terms of ranking these and what we should invest in, what are key processes from the perspective of the GAC that we need to prioritize above everything else?

IRANGA KAHANGAMA: I think the DAR effort is going to need to be higher priority, too. I think there's lots of opportunity and I think one thing we have opportunity to do is get in when it's early and half baked. So I it's always key to get in when you have a good chance.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: So for those who are not familiar yet with this acronym, the DAR is the Domain Abuse Activity Reporting project. And that is a new name for something that some of you may have heard of as DART, which was the Domain Abuse Reporting Tool. But for some reason, this name was objected to by a private user of that name, so ICANN got a cease and desist, and so now it's called the DAR. So you're up on that story.

And, indeed, I guess this is a key process also because it's -- in a sense it developed in parallel but it might respond very well to the GAC advice that was provided in Hyderabad and Copenhagen in terms of the larger intent of that advice to get more stable and regularly reported metrics on abuse. And this is one of the most promising tools that we see. So that is probably an accurate assignment also from my perspective.

Do others have views on this? Steve, can you --

STEVE KELLY: Steve Kelly. I had a broader comment so maybe I'll pause to see if anybody has anything to say about DAR in particular. If not, if I might offer another suggestion. There's two factors we consider in terms of the important or the priority, I guess, is the term. One is the risk or

opportunity involved in that item, and the other is the timetable involved. So if we have something that's either high risk or it's a high opportunity but it's at really short time scale like the RDS and the GDPR issue, like, that's something that is high risk and there's no time to deal with it. And so that would be blazing red. But there may be other things that are high opportunity but it's a longer term process. And so it's going to simmer. And so maybe considering those two factors will help us arrive at a priority level for each of these.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Very good suggestion.

Thank you for that, Steve.

So we have -- yes, the GDPR impact assessment and the next generation RDS PDP which I guess would fall into that category.

So I guess as we're doing this, we're also establishing criteria. We started out with the GAC priority and the policy development processes. We're also adding risk and the timetable now which makes a lot of sense.

STEVE KELLY: Right. Steve Kelly. So either risk or opportunity, because it could be something we're fighting off, it could be something we're trying to seize opportunity. So risk slash opportunity being a column, and then timetable being another column. And then those things taken into

consideration together would generate your total priority level in some way.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: And I just realized we forgot -- this is Cathrin again, we forgot one work stream which is the new ad hoc work group with the consumer safeguards. Vice president? President? I forget the title but Bryan Schilling, who is the new consumer safeguards director.

Greg, can I just turn the mic to you for a second on the -- on the RDS and our assessment now? Do you have any comments on that? And is there anything that you would need in terms of further input from us and support?

GREGORY MOUNIER: Yes. So the RDS PDP was expected to produce an interim report in January and it's been postponed, I think. I'm looking at -- no, Lisa is gone, but I think it will be coming up very soon, which will mean that the Public Safety Working Group will have to prepare probably a draft input, official input, to that report, which will then be fed into the GAC. And so we need to plan for full time. So if we're taking the timeline into perspective and yet again the next gen RDS and PDP is flashing also, I think. I don't really -- Is there anybody from the PDP who could refresh my memory as to when the first interim report is expected? Since you it was postponed? Nobody -- I'm looking at -- no, they are gone. But it's coming up in the next four, five months.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Okay. And I assume there would be some heavy drafting input that would be expected also from our part of the community. This is Cathrin. Sorry.

GREGORY MOUNIER: Yeah, that's what I meant. We're going to have to draft an input to that interim report.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Okay. So I think as we're going along, we're refining the criteria, this might also be something we need to take back and assess. And if you want to volunteer for that, you're welcome to sign up. We're going to create a special field for you so that we can contribute together to -- to defining the right priorities.

Are there other comments on how -- yes, please, Iranga.

IRANGA KAHANGAMA: I was looking, I don't mean to call out Lili but I think we had a conversation. Are you tracking the WHOIS review? So maybe that's something we should keep on the list just so we can get the updates from you whenever.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes. I think it's on there. We hid it under RDS review, which is a new name. And just so -- I can actually brief you now because nothing has happened yet. We had an informal dinner, and we're going to have an

informal meeting immediately following this session tonight. And the first conversation that we're going to have at the first formal meeting, which is not this informal meeting, will be on the scope of the review whereas you know the GAC has taken a position following the GNSO's proposal to not limit the scope just to a postmortem review of the previous WHOIS review team's report but rather to also look at the efficacy of the WHOIS and the other criteria that are listed in the bylaws for the general WHOIS review. Because the reason for limiting the scope of this one was that there was an expectation that the RDS PDP would deliver something pretty much right with the conclusion of this RDS review, and as of now, that doesn't look altogether likely. So there is a possibility that the current system will still be in place in one form or another. So there is a -- there is a need to have a conversation about the scope of the review. And that's where we stand with the work right now. Sorry for that little excursion. But indeed, that's also, I think, another -- I guess we can label it as a high importance topic, high priority topic because we are -- as the Public Safety Working Group, we're the only GAC representatives on the group because all three of us are actually from the Public Safety Working Group.

IRANGA KAHANAGAMA: Yeah, I didn't -- sorry, I didn't mean to imply any priority. I just literally confused all the WHOIS groups.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: This is Cathrin again. No, not at all, because I had said before that maybe we should hold our judgment on whether this is important.

Are there other general comments on this? Other comments on how we should prioritize other people wishing to volunteer work streams that we're forgetting, categorization that doesn't make sense, color scheme that you don't agree with?

All right. Then maybe I'll just ask, who is willing to take this back and assess a bit together with, I guess I'll volunteer myself and maybe Nick, can I sign you up? To look at this. If there's anybody else who would like to help us look at how we can apply the priorities in a smaller group and then sharing it again with the list and also, of course, later on with the GAC to see whether -- how this responds. And we would also need to map it to the mandate. So that's something we've done while preparing this list, but it's not yet shown in this table because, of course, in our terms of reference our priorities are set out very clearly. And each of these buckets, in fact each of these work streams and activities maps to one of the objectives that the GAC has set for the GAC Public Safety Working Group, and that we will also need to make transparent. So if there's other people who want to contribute to working on this prioritization effort, please make yourselves known to us. And I would invite all of you to please sign up for work because we need your support. Kavouss was saying something about energy. I think there's limited amounts of it for all of us, so we very much appreciate your support. This is a great opportunity to get involved. And we also realize that it hasn't always been transparent to everybody where they could usefully contribute, and we're sorry about that. And we're hoping that this will really create a possibility for all of you to identify which work streams you

can usefully contribute to. This, of course, also goes to those following us remotely because it does not always require participation at the meetings to contribute to the work. A lot of it is drudge work done between sessions. That is writing of documents, commenting on documents, does not require presence here. So if you want to share in the glory, please also contribute from wherever you are. And with this, if there are no other comments. I'm looking at Fabien, the master of all things.

Okay. Are there any further comments on this? If not, then I'm going to close, not just on time but even -- sorry, Nick, go ahead.

NICK SHOREY:

Yes. I have just a couple of thoughts, more generally not around prioritization. But I think just in terms of the way -- the way we kind of sort of work as PSWG, I kind of feel that we're missing an opportunity to make real productive use of our time intersessionally. So just encouraging everyone to be sort of really vocal on the mailing list, more sort of -- I know everyone struggles to read all their emails but certainly more chat on the mailing list I think would really help us to make progress on these things. And it was pointed out to me earlier, and I think quite rightly, that coordination of positions is something that we can do better on privacy proxy stuff and I take that away, and I think that's something we can think about as PSWG, about how we sort of -- the process that we might want to sort of create to facilitate that, so utilizing our conference calls prior to meetings, so we will all come prepped, those sorts of things. I think outreach as well is

something I know that everyone has been talking about. Obviously, when we go back home, we're sort of parts of sort of other working groups and coordination groups. I know we have plenty within the EU region that we're still a part of, at least for the while. So sort of just promoting PSWG and encouraging our colleagues to get engaged. I think one of the challenges probably that we have in this space is that quite often your GAC representative may not be from the ministry that oversees your law enforcement agency or Consumer Protection Agency. In U.K. we report up to the home office. It's a different department to the people that come here. So making those connections is going to be really, really important. And it might be worth us sharing our thoughts, ideas, on how that's worked, how it hasn't worked, and then we can sort of help out there. So I think maybe a couple of things might also be worth our consideration.

DAVID CONRAD:

Thank you, Nick. That's a very key point. And this is Cathrin again. And I think one thing that's building on this, I want to ask people to do is, Fabien is doing a fabulous job monitoring all activity that might be of relevance to the GAC and specifically public safety concerns and passing that on to our list. And what we're seeing a lot of the time is that he lists it, you know, he says hey, you may want to look at this. Sometimes I have the time, sometimes I'm drowning in other stuff and I don't even look at it myself. But if somebody would just respond and say, I'm going to look at this for the public safety working group, just to see, you know, is this something we need to invest further time in or is it something where we're okay. So just respond to the list and say

hey, I'm going to take it on myself, take a look at this and assess whether this needs further work, whether this needs to be added to our list here or whether this can safely be let go from our perspective and for what reasons. So I would just invite you all to consider doing that as you go through the list. Bless you, Fabien. Greg, please.

GREG MOUNIER:

Thank you. Greg Mounier, for the record. I think it is great to call upon people who are a member of the Public Safety Working Group who have an interest to step in and say yes, please take that responsibility or I decide that I will just look into it on behalf of the Public Safety Working Group. But I think in the emails we receive and we exchange on various topics are great super informative. I think you can't do away with having advised discussions. So I would really encourage you as well to do as the GAC is doing. The GAC leadership is having regular conference call. So we could imagine once a month we set a specific date, could be every first Monday on the month, and we have just one hour where all those who want to be part of -- you know, have time and we go through the list of topics, maybe get a quick update, maybe only focus on one specific point. But for me, at least, it would really help me, at least in my engagements with the next gen IDS PDP to be able to brainstorm a little bit with you guys and, you know, bounce back. Okay, I've heard that on the mailing list. I'm not sure if I were to answer I would say that but maybe you can, you know, do those type of things. And it would probably help us if people who are not so much involved in Public Safety Working Group work to assess

the amount of commitments, you know, they would take to take new tasks. So I think having this regular call would be beneficial.

And another thing, on the outreach, I always hear that we need to involve more law enforcement officials from around Europe and the world into the work of the public safety working group but, of course, the main problem is resources. I mean, speaking for the country I know best, I don't think the French judicial police has the financial means to send somebody, to dedicate somebody to follow all the ICANN meetings and the RIPE meetings and the rest, and it is a real problem. So at Europol, we've been thinking -- it's still in early stage, but we think about some kind of a training and monitoring program. We still need to find some money but basically the concept would be, for every ICANN meeting we would take one or two police officers that are aware of how the DNS work, for instance, would bring them along, introduce you to the Public Safety Working Group and introduce them to some of the key influential members of the GAC and the various communities. And then we -- you know, every ICANN meeting we -- we -- you know, we take others, and then we create this core group of law enforcement officers around the world and around Europe in particular, I mean, from my constituency, I would say, who are aware of the work of ICANN and maybe could help us as well by sending us cases and, you know, just -- I don't know if that's something we could also look -- I'm looking at Fabien. If there is money or a program where, you know, I'm thinking about the newcomers program at ICANN. Maybe we could also just combine this. I don't know.

NICK SHOREY:

Thank you. Nick again. And a further point, to build on that. One of the things I sort of came to think, looking back at the privacy proxy PDP, was that to some extent we were somewhat outgunned during the public comment period. If we think back to that, there was around about 10,000 public comments that were received on the final policy document. The majority of them sort of very short one sentences in support and not that it had a -- well, not that it sort of determined the overall passage of that document, but it certainly -- the comments, you know, sort of had an impact. And so I think we need to -- I think we certainly need to also think a bit smarter about how we engage with those processes at the crucial times.

I'm -- in my sort of day job, I'm part of sort of -- sort of operational trust groups and things, which are comprised of InfoSec, people from sort of private companies. There's a huge group of people who have an interest in this space outside of governments. Obviously this is a -- this is a government working -- it's a subgroup of the GAC, it's a government working group and so the membership and that is all governments. But we have a huge sector there that we can engage and work with collaboratively to bolster our ability to engage and participate on these with shared, you know, common interests.

So I think it might be worth considering how we sort of outreach interface to some of those groups as well. You know, not sort of -- sort of starting to sort of get all of those people involved here. This is a government group. But certainly our outreach into some of those other industry groups and sectors might be really sort of positive and productive and help us certainly on the PDPs.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Thank you, Greg. I think those are really helpful suggestions. Seeing the time I would suggest that we pick up on Greg's idea of the regular call which Fabien launched at some point already and which we have had a couple of, we pick that up again and continue our discussion there, and which we will try in advance of it. In the meantime, on the assessment and the priorities and maybe you can also take this back and reflect notably on where you want to further contribute. And let me just take this time to thank all of you who have volunteered, who are volunteering now, and will volunteer in the future to help us deal with this workload, for your time and efforts. It is really very much appreciated, and I know that a lot of you do this sort of in the evenings and on Sundays. So thank you to all of you for your dedication to this effort. And with this, I will close this working group meeting of the GAC Public Safety Working Group. Thank you very much to all of you for taking the time. And thank you very, very much to ICANN support and the translators for making all of this possible. Have a good evening.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]