Transcription ICANN Singapore
Board - GNSO EWG Process
Saturday 07 February 2015
Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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.
On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#feb
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Jonathan Robinson: Just to let you know the upcoming session is the GNSO EWG process and this is the mechanism by which we'll undertake the work that's being done on how we integrate the work of the EWG with the GNSO policy development process.

Susan, I think you're going to be giving the presentation. I'm sorry we're running a little bit behind schedule. I do hope we'll catch up. I'm not sure if you'll need the full 45 minutes anyway. We'll see how we go. So are we ready to start the next session? Great. So I'll hand straight over to Susan to give us this update. I think you've been chairing the group so you're in a good position to do so.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes. So next slide. And how about the next one? There we go. So this group was formed at the LA meeting. And, yes, I did sort of step forward and take the lead on this but, you know, we've got quite a - you see from the list of people very knowledgeable members and Board members and GNSO members.

And we were tasked with thinking about how we move forward with the EWG's final report. As you all know, this came out of a Board initiated PDP from a Whois review team Board resolution in November of 2012 so this has been in the works for quite a while.

And so we've had - we've worked via phone calls mainly though we did meet at the LA meeting. And we've also - all of this has been transparent, people could listen in to the calls and see the transcripts and emails. So next slide, please.

So this where we are in the PDP process right now, this is the standard process. Because this is the first Board-initiated PDP it's a little bit different than the standard process but we're working through those challenges.

And so right now we're about to - staff is about to draft and then issue the preliminary issue report. As you all know the EWG report was handed over to the Board last June at the London meeting but there's never been an opportunity for the community as a whole to comment on the final EWG report. So this will be included in the preliminary issue report and everyone will get a chance to weigh in at that point.

So next slide. So this was the timeline, sort of gives you some review. Right now we're in the blue section, the October through February. And we will move forward soon into the next steps with the preliminary issue report.

One of the things that we've tried to keep in mind - the Board GNSO Working Group is that we also have some other extremely important work going on in the community with the IANA transition. So even though in some ways we've been working on this since November 2012 this actually being delivered and maybe going to a PDP working group not until fall of 2015 may be a better timeline for the community and the overload of work.

So - and next slide. So we gave this a lot of thought. And there are so many variables to a new - or something to replace the Whois system. And so we thought, you know, if this was broken up into multiple PDPs that didn't all collaborate and coincide then we may have an issue with a disjointed work flow and the result not being something cohesive that could actually be implemented.

So we're recommending - this working group is recommending that there's three phases to a single PDP. This is going to be a massive undertaking and require a lot of time commitment from the community but it will fall into - we are recommending that it fall into three separate phases.

And so in all of the work on the Whois going way back, you know, there's always been the question of the policies that will guide a new system or the current system. And so the first phase is the policy requirements and defining all the needs and the policies that would be required to implement or improve the Whois record.

So there are, you know - we will have Phase 2 is a functional design and then implementation guidance and then it would go to a implementation review team. So the other things that we need to work on are the new issue report, the final issue report, hand it over to the GNSO Council, PDP working group formation. There's a lot of work to do.

So next slide, see if I can speed this up a little bit. So this is what we came up with. And so there's definitely a lot of preliminary steps. We've broke these into the same categories of the EWG report, how we worked on the different categories needed to work toward a new system.

And the very first things that we think needs to happen in a PDP is that the policy requirements in each and every one of these main categories. We also gave it a lot of thought of what is missing? What information do we feel like the PDP would need at some point through these three phases to do the work needed?

And privacy is a, you know, is just, as an example, there's several things going on in the community right now that, you know, would be - would be instrumental in having the information which is like the PPSAI Working Group and the Whois abuse study. And then maybe initial legal analysis.

But the privacy Phase 1 would probably look at privacy proxy needs, at risk registration needs and data protection laws. So they would look at all those policy requirements, develop information for the next phase and maybe in the next phase - and this is all, you know, these are all things that we've thought of, could be that we haven't thought of everything but we've tried.

So, you know, in the policy functional design stage with privacy we would need an overarching data protection policy developed. And make sure that the data protection law that we are compliant. And then privacy proxy laws and secured protected credentials.

So each of the categories here we've given some thought, which we won't go into each and every one today, of what might be needed and would recommend that the GNSO ask for the resources for ICANN to provide that information.

And next slide, please. So we also believe that the oversight of the GNSO Council at each phase is extremely important. After Phase 1 is completed then we think that this should - the PDP should come back to the GNSO Council for input and agreement before anything proceeds to the Phase 2.

And so we've come up with the idea of a GNSO PDP working group coordination team and that could be set up in a variety of ways but I'm just - we were imagining something as a small group of the GNSO councilors that would evaluate each step, each recommendation and the policies developed in that first working group.

So we also think that, you know, we should have a strict timeline for this. We've all been waiting as a community for many years for some sort of changes or decisions made on the Whois record. And if we're moving forward to another - a new process then we should have defined targets and timelines.

That said, we all know that the community is really busy right now so we will have to see how this all interacts with the IANA transition. And we also recommend that even though Phase 1 should be completed, signed off by the GNSO, then when we go to Phase 2 and 3 some of those that don't have interdependencies we may be able to move quickly through a few of the Phase 2 issues into the Phase 3 so we're not stalled and maybe we could work the second and third phase a little faster than the first phase.

But at all times that we would want to make sure that we are coordinating all of the work flow so that something that's decided for users and purposes actually works in the privacy category also.

So - and then it was recommended or thought that maybe we should have some face to face meetings because we do get more work done when a team or when a group is face to face and can (unintelligible). I'm not sure how that would work but maybe coordinate that along with existing ICANN meeting timelines.

And next slide. So we will have All Things Whois. Margie is leading that on Monday so the community can provide input (unintelligible) at that point. We're hoping to have the new preliminary issue report done by March or the staff is. We will have nothing to do with that, staff will do that.

And then a decent comment period because, as I noted earlier, the community has not been able to provide comment on the EWG report. This will be - this preliminary report will include that along with a lot of other things and that community input is extremely valuable. And then there will be a final issue report some time in July and then we will move forward with this all being delivered to the GNSO Council.

So if - and next slide, oh Marika.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just one thing to clarify, we'd start the issue report in March and publish by April May.

Susan Kawaguchi: Oh okay.

((Crosstalk))

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. Sorry about that. Got confused. So next page. Okay so on the - these are mini links if you want more information about the work of this group the Board GNSO group, you can find that here. And that's about it.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Susan. Potentially - well I guess there's been a lot of work gone into this already and it's setting the scene for potentially substantial and impactful piece of work. So any questions or comments at this stage? Go ahead, Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, does that mean that the budget for this has to be figured out this month? It seems a little difficult especially if we're looking for funding for face to face meetings for a number of PDPs; right?

Susan Kawaguchi: I'll leave that to staff to answer.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, I was just wondering if the budget - and it's Stephanie Perrin for the record, sorry, if the budget for this had to be in in February now, in other words, before these comment periods and before the issues report is tabled.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. This is not a special community request. We're planning this as part of our normal budget cycle so the next budget would start fiscal year first of July. So we're requesting, indeed, additional funds to, you know, both accommodate face to face meeting, additional support we may need, additional research that may need to be carried out. So we are planning for that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Marika. I've got Chuck and Holly and then Bret I think at this stage so, Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Susan and thanks for the working group that developed this. But I'm not sure I follow it at all. So let me ask you some questions to try and get some clarity.

                 If I understand correctly the group is recommending one PDP, not multiple PDPs.

Susan Kawaguchi: Correct.

Chuck Gomes: But that PDP could be broken down - once you get to Phase 2 and 3 it's possible that sub groups could be developed to do some work in parallel, did I get that part right?

Susan Kawaguchi: Correct.

Chuck Gomes: Okay now with regard to Phase 1, there are a lot of things on your list for Phase 1. Is - does that happen as part of the PDP? Or happen before the PDP starts?

Susan Kawaguchi: Phase 1 would be part of the PDP.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Susan Kawaguchi: So this is one single PDP. And we would only work on Phase 1 policy requirements until all of those were finished for each category. Go back to the GNSO Council, get approval that, yes, this is all on the right track and then move forward with Phase 2.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Could you - could the slides be moved back to the slide that showed the phases and all of the elements there?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that one, that's the one okay.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yeah, I agree, this is - there's a lot...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah and that's why I'm probing because this is a really critical issue I think and one that we certainly want to make progress on as quickly as possible so I certainly agree with that.

So did I understand you correctly that in Phase 1 of the PDP the first thing would be - worked on would be users and purposes and then that would go back to the GNSO before going on to gated access? Did I misunderstand you there?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yeah, no, and I'm sorry if I've confused it. But, no, all of the - the PDP - the working group would be tasked with reviewing all of those categories and all of the policies needed for each of those categories. Once all of the categories are reviewed and the work completed then we could start on Phase 2.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. So what does it mean to review all of those?

Susan Kawaguchi: Well, we did break down some of those things, some of the criteria. You know, for users and purposes we looked at permissible users. We'd take another look at the even though the EWG looked at that in depth; we may have missed something.

Permissible users, permissible purposes and guiding principles so we would develop some guiding principles about, you know, what is a permissible user and what is a permissible use - or purpose.

So in some ways some of this work would be reevaluating what the EWG did, sort of thinking it through again with the whole community or the community wants to be involved in this PDP. But there are, you know, definitely different criteria that we think should be looked at and then polices decided on. So could I give you exactly what happened in those? No, because who knows?

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Susan Kawaguchi: Things change.

Chuck Gomes: That's okay. I'm going to keep probing if that's okay?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: So what would be the output of Phase 1 from the PDP working group?

Susan Kawaguchi: It may be - it's all the policy requirements, all the things that should be included in the policies for each of those categories.

Chuck Gomes: And by policy requirements do you mean recommendations for policy or just here's a requirement that you need to address in the PDP working group.

Susan Kawaguchi: Marika, can you help with that?

Marika Konings: I would think it's just the policy recommendations, that's my understanding.

Chuck Gomes: So in other words...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...out of Phase 1 will come the recommendations for policy.

Susan Kawaguchi: Right.

Chuck Gomes: So Phase 1 is a huge effort.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And it's probably impossible to estimate how long that might take especially for that many categories. But so that's really the bulk of the policy development work in Phase 1 and then you move on. Well what does policy functional design mean?

Susan Kawaguchi: Well, you know, the way we imagined this for the privacy category at least was actually developing an overarching data protection policy for ICANN. That's something that, you know, as the Whois review team we struggled with - where's the policy for this? Where, you know, yes this has been implemented and has been working this way but where is the policy that guides this?

And so I think an overarching policy has been sorely needed for a long time and then so in the policy functional design category phase - Phase 2 - that would actually be (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: I still don't understand what functional design means. Sorry, I'm slow.

Susan Kawaguchi: So in developing how this system works you definitely have to design the system and all the criteria needed to make it work. And I think that, you know, looking in the privacy realm at least, looking at, you know, what we're recommending with, you know, changing the Whois or how, you know, creating a new system, you know, would that comply with law? We need all of those analysis done and policies created. Do you have more, Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I think as it was broken down on the other side like the policy requirements definition is really like why, you know, why are we doing it? What problem are we trying to solve? Like the 2 is - the Phase 2 is the

design like, you know, what are we actually doing? And then the 3 is how are we going to be doing it? I think that's how it's kind of envisioned.

And I think as well on the Phase 1 we said it's a lot of work but I think at the same time we need to recognize as well that a lot of work has already been done. So I think I see that these as well building on what EWG has done or at least evaluating what they have done, what may just be taken on as saying look, yes, that was research in depth, they didn't miss anything, let's move forward with that.

And there may be other elements where they say well no, actually, we need to investigate that more and there are other aspects that we need to consider. So I think there's a - at least I would understand where we would be as starting point looking at what is the information available and identify from those what are indeed the policy requirements that we derive from those and how could then the system be designed and, you know, the implementation guidance on how that would work and practice.

Chuck Gomes: So I'll stop with this question. So if I understand it correctly out of Phase 1 will be the policy recommendations for all those categories. Phase 2 will be, okay, how are we going to - well it looks like Phase 2 and Phase 3 might blend together a lot between the design of - are we talking operational design, technical design, and so forth. And then Phase 3 would be any additional guidance with regard to how that's going to be done. So it sounds like Phase 2 and Phase 3 are kind of - closely interrelated, is that right?

Marika Konings: I would agree with that.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thanks. Sorry for all the questions.

Susan Kawaguchi: No, they're good questions.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Chuck. Margie, did you want to come in with further information?

Margie Milam: Yeah, I just wanted to clarify a little bit...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: But just note on the diagram, I mean, for what it's worth just one point is in terms of the interrelated, Chuck, I mean, there's this whirling wheel around appearing that they sort of somehow interconnected Phase 2 and 3.

Margie Milam: Sure, this is Margie Milam. I just wanted to maybe give an example. So if you think of users - the Phase 1 is a high level policy so there should be access, for example, for intellectual property to Whois data, that's the high level; right?

                  Then you go to the next level, well how do you determine, you know, who's an intellectual property practitioner? What's the (unintelligible) how to define that? So it's a little more in depth and so that's the, you know, you have to get to the high level first. Do you agree that there should be, you know, certain users and certain purposes at a high level.

                  And then once that all is accepted and agreed on, then you go dig deeper on how do you actually do that and that's policy functional design, if you will. But you don't get there until you've actually answered kind of set the high level policy framework for it based on the, you know, the categories that have been identified. Does that make sense?

((Crosstalk))

Margie Milam: Okay, thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Margie. Holly, you're next.

Holly Raiche: I'm asking - Holly Raiche. I'm asking a much higher level question and that is your first kind of we're actually all tied up in the IANA transition so we might put this aside. To me this is actually critical because if we're moving from the Affirmation of Commitments which is all about Whois and we must preserve Whois, if we go to EWG, Whois is a kind of a we will publish unless, unless, unless. And then we've got enough working groups working on what those unless, unless, unless is. And I'm sitting on some of them.

For the EWG you have a very different set of presumptions; not all personal information should be public. And then you're asking what information should or should not be public under what circumstances might it be revealed, whatever, whatever.

So it's a really different conceptual thing. And I'm wondering how the - the NTIA and the Department of Commerce is going to say, well, up until now we've always talked about the preservation of Whois. This is a different kettle of fish. Are we happy? I mean, we're happy. Are they going to be happy? And have we even asked?

Susan Kawaguchi: I am not aware that we've asked. I know that - and that will come in the preliminary report. You know, the GAC would be one of the communities that would weigh in and provide comments. But have - unless staff knows differently, I don't think we've taken the EWG report and said to the NTIA, "Would this work for you?"

Holly Raiche: Okay.

Susan Kawaguchi: Good question though.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Holly. Got Bret next.

Bret Fausett: Thank you, Susan. That was a very helpful presentation and I commend you and the team for what I think is a very thoughtful approach that you've put forward here.

I am looking at Slide 7 which is also the one here on the screen, and in awe of the amount of work that is ahead of us. And I wondered whether you and the team had given some thought - and I know it would be a - just a very rough estimate - to the time for each of these phases.

When do you think we would get output from Phase 1? When do you think we get to on the far slide, next steps, GNSO Council approval? I mean, I sort of put my finger in the air and I'm thinking 2019. But I wondered if you have some different timelines in mind?

Susan Kawaguchi: So we did sort of discuss timelines just very vaguely because with what's going on in the community right now we have to be aware of that and the continued, you know, burdensome amount of work that the ICANN community has taken on recently.

So - but this is an extremely important bit of work and the PDP would be amazing if we - when we move forward with it. You know, I mean, we sort of threw out would it take three months for the first phase or would it take six? And actually until we get through the preliminary report and see some of those comments I don't think you could make that - really give an estimate.

My hope is - and this is a personal, you know, this is not the team - and others can chime in. But, you know, my hope is that this would be - the working group would definitely be going by next - say January 2016 and the we'd get through Phase 1 in three to four months. That's pretty, you know, that's a lot of work to get done so. I don't know do any of the team members have an input on that?

Jonathan Robinson: So, did you want to come back real quickly and respond to that and then Stephanie is next.

Marika Konings: Yeah and this is Marika. And of course it all depends as well on how much effort the working group is able or willing to put into it. I mean, we've seen a lot of efforts, if you meet, you know, twice a week for two hours of course things go a lot faster than if you meet once a week for one hour.

As said, we're looking here at, you know, face to face time that could, you know, really help as well as condense the overall timeframe. But to just give you an idea because we have, you know, tried to keep track as well and if you would maybe see Phase 1 similar to an initial report on more traditional PDPs, you know, meeting once a week for one hour it takes an average a year to get to your initial report even on, you know, more complex ones.

So that is if you do it really the traditional way. But again, here if there is a willingness and desire and as well direction from the Council that this is a priority you can look at ways of moving things faster than you may have done on the more standard or traditional PDPs.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin for the record. This is a very impressive slide and congratulations for all your work. I'm assuming that all of these in the left hand column are simultaneous that there is no particular stated order here.

And I guess I've got a question and a comment, one of the things that worries me about this whole process is - and as you know having served on the EWG with me, I maintain we need a very thorough risk analysis first because some of the underlying assumptions have been risk managed for many years, privacy compliance, compliance and due process with constitutional requirements.

In my view those have been - well we used to say in government - risk managed. That meant we'll bend them until somebody catches us. Possibly I shouldn't say that on the record.

But so I think ICANN is well over the cliff in terms of having pushed things including the 16 permissible purposes that we started with the EWG. So if we don't reexamine and get public comment on that at the very outset in an exhaustive process there's a risk that some of the foundation blocks that we're building on halfway through these PDPs are going to be pulled out from under us.

And that's not even allowing for the passage of time and things being sorted such as, for instance, the European Court of Justice and the right to be forgotten such as the throwing out of the escrow - data escrow requirements, all of which are not specifically - well that one's not specifically Whois. But it definitely has an impact on this huge beast. So what's the plan for dealing with that?

Susan Kawaguchi: We did give that a lot of discussion. And if you notice too on the slide, you know, the last category is risk assessment but the one above it was benefit analysis. And so is there a benefit to moving away from the current Whois to a new system? That needs to be looked at too.

So but we still think that those would be looked at in Phase 1. And let me see if I have some other information here. But - and basically come up with a criteria in Phase 1 for a risk assessment requirement and then do that risk assessment.

I get your point that it should be done prior to any of the work being done but what are we assessing if we haven't decided on some of those policies yet? It's sort of the, you know, chicken and the egg. You have to know what you're - what the system sort of may look like or may intend to look like before you can actually make an assessment of that.

Stephanie Perrin: Well, I would suggest that it's probably a multiphase risk assessment that you can definitely do a risk assessment on your assumptions as you go in. And that, I would recommend to the GNSO, is an absolute sine qua non. If we don't do a risk assessment on the assumptions that we're starting with before we as a Council agree to something then we haven't done our jobs properly, I would suggest.

So that - that's easier than doing a risk assessment on, say, the entire built new RDS with regional variance or whatever, you know...

Susan Kawaguchi: Yeah.

Stephanie Perrin: ...just as an example.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: So just to check, practically when you do you envisage that happening, Stephanie? At the point of the - of the Council reviewing the issue report?

Stephanie Perrin: I would say it has to be. We have to do the risk assessment on what's in the issue report because if there's anything faulty - and I don't mean faulty in that the issue report could be just a stupendous issue report but it pulls together what we're working with, and if there's anything faulty in what we're working with that's the time to find out and reexamine and get legal analysis and all the rest of it.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, thanks. Got James next and then Volker and then I think we'll probably wrap it up at that point.

James Bladel: Thanks. James speaking for the record and also a member of this GNSO Board group that's working on these issues. Just to Stephanie's point I agree that, you know, the - I agree that it's a concern. I'm not sure that you can

correctly - have any hope of comprehensively correctly predicting all of the risks at the outset so that's why I think the frequent reviews as you go along so you're more iterative in your assessment of risk.

I've expressed on the calls I think multiple times my concerns that some of these phases build upon each other and that if something goes wrong at one of these phases it can kind of have, you know, a domino effect on subsequent phases.

And what happens to - does it just stop? You know, what happens with the GNSO - these little blue triangles here. It says GNSO approval, that presumes that everything is Okay. And we're going to approve the outcome of these various phases. But, you know, I think more appropriately would be, you know, the GNSO reviews these outputs, determines whether or not they're still in keeping with the overarching goals and desires of the system and goes forward.

You know, and then what happens if one of these, you know, line items doesn't pass the test? What does that do to the whole - to the whole product? So, you know, I think this is - I think we, you know, this is where we start. You know, this is not a roadmap to the finished product, at least I don't - I don't consider - I think it's a good starting point. I think it gets us to the next checkpoint where we can check in and revisit these things again.

I think one of the questions that I've had that I don't know who to ask this question of, if it's the Council or the Board or staff is, what happens to the group that's working on this after Phase 1 is launched? Do we just kind of fold into the PDP or we go away or do they have some role to play in, you know, predigesting all of this before it's brought to Council? I don't know the answer to that question either. I think we're really off the page on some of this stuff.

Jonathan Robinson: So, Marika, you want to respond to that?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. No definite answer to that but I know it has been discussed and I think it also goes partly to Stephanie's point, you know, whether this group should maybe reconvene, you know, after the public comment on the preliminary issue report towards the phase of the final issue report that says are we still all on the same page?

Is this, you know, what we've laid out is it still what we believe needs to happen based on input received either as public - part of the public comment forum, you know, does indeed additional analysis or research need to be done up front? So I think that it's something that probably is a conversation to have for the GNSO Council with the Board as this is a, you know, Board-initiated PDP to work out what is the best way or method to make sure that, you know, you're in tandem.

Like you've done with this process group because I think it's, you know, it's a innovative approach of how to make sure that it's not, you know, the Board is telling GNSO this is what you should be doing or, you know, as well the other way around but a way of how can we work together on this.

And indeed, I think it's a conversation to have what is the most productive or effective way to keep that level of coordination. Should that be the same group that is there now? Should there be, for example, an official Board liaison to the PDP working group that provides a vehicle back and forth? Is it just a standing topic, you know, for every meeting that we have at the Board during ICANN meetings?

I think there are different ways you can do it but I think at least there's probably a recognition from both sides that there's some kind of ongoing coordination that would be helpful and kind of, you know, moments where you can just reflect are we still, you know, behind this model or do we need to course correct on some of these items to address what we've learned in the meantime.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, thanks. It looks like the last word will go to you, Volker.

Volker Greimann: Yes, Volker Greimann speaking. Two brief points. Stephanie raises a very
interesting question with regard to the certain building blocks building upon
each other. And I think from what I understood from the presentation that
whatever is marked as A here is supposed to be taking place concurrently.

I think we should look at some of those points that there might be a
subsequent requirement to have them occurring subsequently especially
when you look at risk assessment and privacy requirements as a lot of what
comes out of this or goes into these requirements may only be determined by
what comes out of the others.

So the results of the risk assessment and the privacy requirements will be
determined by the results of the previous or the other elements because you
will not be able to define the privacy requirements in a specific way - needed
way without knowing what comes out of the other requirements working
groups.

The second point I would like to raise is that we also look at how to best
integrate the GAC and - in this work by reaching out a very early stage asking
the GAC members to get their data privacy officials involved in this work, get
various governmental institutions involved in this work at a very early stage
and have them participate in an active manner if possible or comment on the
outcome. Looking again at the privacy requirements I think government
involvement in these is an absolute must.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks, Volker. Well I'm keen to bring this to an end, I know,
Stephanie, you want to say something, David and then let's wrap it up.

Stephanie Perrin: Just - Stephanie Perrin for the record. I wanted to agree with what James
said, the fundamental problem being the way we view risk assessment here
at ICANN. It's not an episodic thing that happens once, it seems to me what

is required on a project of this scope and magnitude is a project management team, hopefully reporting in here to the GNSO, or perhaps the GNSO as it figures out in its review, how does it actually do project management across such a big horizontal, picking up Volker's comment about how do we engage the GAC, how do you do that?

And ongoing mature risk assessment is a fundamental part of project management and accountability. So I don't know whether the people who signed up for that joint Board GNSO working group signed up to be accountable for that process for the entire life of this which I think is probably at least five years.

But I think that's the question that needs to be asked. And maybe we need to find some time to think about it as we look at our own structures. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: A quick response to that is, you know, we did propose a collaboration team to oversee how all of these different categories and the work - as the work is developing that there be either - it could be sub teams with sub chairs and, you know, and how those are picked and how that team works we don't know.

But it is - we did think about some sort of a collaboration team to make sure that all the moving pieces were going in the same direction and nothing was a roadblock or maybe if it is a roadblock to really go back and - to square one and re-think this all. So we did think about that and that is in the presentation. I sort of glossed over it a lot very quickly but it is something we thought of.

Jonathan Robinson: David.

David Cake: Yeah, the one thing that really sort of has struck me about this data, I mean, is very, very - there seems to be an assumption that it is just the GNSO. And I really think that this work is so complicated that besides that, as Volker mentioned, involving the GAC and particular data protection agencies and so

on. I think we would also, you know, we should really be reaching out to the SSAC to report on some of this.

And there are parts of the work that look to be complicated enough I would really like to see external experts involved. So I think this phase in terms of how we handle it as a Council or as the GNSO, rather, is really a great start. But I think we still have a - plenty of interesting questions to come across a lot of which are about - will be about collaboration with - or use of external resources external to the GNSO.

So it's only - particularly, I'd have a vote for - let's have - not just the GAC but SSAC involved in discussion of how we deal with this.

Jonathan Robinson: So, Marika, you wanted to respond then on that? Go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just to note that, you know, we haven't of course specifically called it out here because it's standard on every PDP; we always reach out to all the SOs and ACs, ask for their input and participation, the PDP manual foresees, you know, expert participation where needed.

And maybe just to note as well that, you know, the GAC and the GNSO will be discussing preliminary recommendations on early engagement of the GAC in the issue scoping phase so, you know, there's provided there's support for those, you know, at this meeting I would foresee that this may be the first PDP under which that would be implemented as a potential pilot so that would also cover, you know, specifically the GAC engagement.

And of course we have Mason as well to help with that. So I think that's maybe not explicit here but I think that's definitely, you know, planned as with other PDPs.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so, I mean, I think we should thank Susan and the group for that work. It's clear that this sets the scene for something substantial and

essentially unprecedented in scope and size and the unique nature of this work.

Feels to me like there's been a lot of feedback from this session. I'm not sure how we best capture that. The only thing I can think of for the moment, and now Steve there - I think the action really, Steve, is that it would be good - I don't know, Susan, if you're willing to go back over this and try and pull out - has anyone got a suggestion for me how we try and capture some of this feedback that - because this has been a very useful session. There's clearly some quite comprehensive feedback.

And some of it's about the mechanics of how we go forward. So there is a chart, there's a method, there's a proposal but how do we capture this feedback? Marika, you've got a suggestion?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. My understanding is that, you know, the feedback from this session as well as the session that is being run on Monday as the All Things Whois session, will be reevaluated by the process group to determine, you know, based on that feedback should we be making any changes.

So I think this is also a topic that's I think on the Wednesday session for the Council so that would be another opportunity, you know, people having been able to reflect on what was discussed today, maybe discuss more about it in the hallways to provide, you know, maybe formal feedback or even if it's informal views from the Council to that group to factor in as they finalize their proposed approach, at least that's, I think my understanding of it.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, that's helpful. So I just - I was conscious that there's been quite substantial discussion and I didn't want that to be lost. But it feels like there's a way in which that will be woven into the process. So let's put a line under this session now. We'll take a 15 minute break. Just to let you know in terms of scheduling we are a little behind. I'm not unduly worried about it, I think we will probably pick up on it at various points.

END