David: And the next item is Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation issues PDP working group

And Don Blumenthal is here to speak to us about that so if you can start that item start recording. Thank you. And over to you Don.

Don Blumenthal: Appreciate it. Just had to get that cleared out there.

We've got slides up here. I'm normally not a big slide person, but I got here about eleven o'clock this morning so I figured a needed a fallback just in case.

Now that I see Marika and a lot of committee members here, I probably could have just skipped it and let them take over. But I didn't know that ahead of time.

At any rate, this is the Privacy and Proxy Accreditation Services Issues PDP Working Group. And just (another point), I remember what PPSIA stands for.

We've been - it worked for a few months now, but the beginning was probably one of organizational figuring out how we were going to proceed. We finally got that and then we had the holiday break. So we really got started I think on substance, it's fair to say, in January.

We've got a very large group and it still seems to be growing. People have kept signing up well after the group got started.

And I just thought I'd lay out how we've gone about our work and what's next. To begin with, we took the GNSO questions and groups them, and that was party for our benefit but also for the step of reaching out to the AC's and the SGs and SOs and CEs to get their input.

There are some of us on the group who have been involved in Whois issues and even Privacy/Proxy for, in my case, 16 years. There are others on the committee and around ICANN who are much newer. So we wanted to organize and make it as easy as possible for people to look at the issues and examine them – excuse me.

Our discussions are ongoing on our calls which are weekly and our email list. And everything is posted on the Wiki for people who want to follow thing.

We did make one initial decision early on – and I probably shouldn't mention this first. We discussed breaking into working groups, sub teams, as we did for example in the Thick Whois Group. Some here at the table should remember what the Thick Whois process was.

But we decided that, and we're finding this is true, as we get deeper into the issues, a lot of these issues are inter-related, so breaking into sub teams really wasn't – we thought then wasn't feasibility and then we found out we were right.

We're looking at a couple of issues now where we realize we can lay out some initial thoughts but we can't conclude until way down the road because they circle back on each other. So that's our working model is weekly calls, continuing during the week with email lists; nothing new about this. But keeping a committee as a whole rather than breaking into sub teams.

We did send out letters to the different constituency groups, ACs, whichever. We only at this point received responses from the BC, the IPC and the NCSG, which to be honest, to a large extent reflects the most active groups

within the committee. These are the groups that drive the discussion, not necessarily the – they drive it but individuals from those groups are the most active. We understand we may get a couple more, and we certainly would like to hear from more than just three groups out of all the ones we wrote too.

We also sampled terms of Proxy/Privacy Services that currently exist to get some ideas on how we should proceed. And we've heard presentation from ICANN Staff who work on Privacy/Proxy issues on registrar issues from members of the, say, registrar community.

Again, there's a large difference in understanding of how the system works, and the more we can educate everybody in the group, I think the better our work product will be.

Yes. The initial plan from here on out – we even met last week; somebody was surprised that we're that driven and dedicated, whatever work you want to use – I don't know. We did last week and we'll take a break, but the main work plan is to continue to slug backward – continue moving through the questions.

Our discussions and preliminary decisions are being logged as we go on a template. We did try for a short time my mapping software. That kind of dropped out at one point, may be more; suitable for some projects and others. I mention that for Mikey's benefit.

Our next steps I think, outside the norm of looking at the questions, is to discuss the input we did get to the GNSO questions from the three groups that responded. The EWG's Privacy/Proxy Survey results were just published I think while I was flying or just before, so we haven't had a chance to look at those but we will.

We're reaching out to the ccTLD community to get a feel for their experience with Privacy/Proxy. And we're going to meet with any group that want to meet with us. I'll give you an example.

I've been requested to sit down with the GAC Tuesday morning along with the person who's leading the EWG effort. I apologize for blanking on the name right now.

That's our work plan, that's how we started, that's how we're going forward. We are hoping for a preliminary report in early 2015. I'd like to think we could do it sooner but it's good to be realistic and then get happy surprises if we could and move through quicker.

I'd be happy to take questions.

David: Do we have any questions for Don? Wow, I mean I think you're suffering Don from the fact that all the people that are really interested in this topic here are already on the working group.

Don Blumenthal: Yes, I was thinking we could have a mini face-to-face meeting during the break and probably get a lot accomplished.

We will have an RO open meeting Thursday morning at nine o'clock.

David: Do we have any questions yet?

Steve DelBianco: Steve DelBianco with the BC. Hey Don, thanks for your good work on that.

The BC submitted just a handful or requests but then some questions. And I realize that the working group, we're stretched thin enough that we didn't have significant participation and I apologize for that. But those questions are things that you could address with me and I'll circulate to the BC or in writing, whatever your preference is, okay.

Don Blumenthal: Okay, appreciate it. I skimmed all of these when they came in; I read them in depth on the plane. Twenty-six hours gives you a lot of reading time.

But yes, we'll discuss with how to follow-up with the comments we did get. Thanks.

David: Do we have any more questions? Since I don't hear any more questions, we might thank Don for his report and move on to the next item which would almost see us back on schedule.

Don Blumenthal: I try to help where I can.

David: Yes, I thank Don for his report and we'll clear that item.