
ICANN67 | Virtual Community Forum – GNSO - EPDP Phase 2 Meeting (2 of 2)
Thursday, March 12, 2020 – 10:45 to 12:45 CUN

TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening and welcome to the ICANN 67 GNSO EPDP phase two team call taking place on the 12th of March 2020.

In the interest of time, there'll be no roll call. If you're only on the telephone, could you please identify yourselves now?

Hearing no one, we have no listed apologies.

All members and alternates will be promoted to panelists for today's meeting. Members and alternates, when using chat, please select all panelists and attendees in order for everyone to see the chat. Attendees will not have chat access, only view chat access.

Alternates not replacing a member are required to rename their line by adding three Zs to the beginning of their names, and at the end, in parentheses, your affiliation, dash, alternate, which means you're automatically pushed to the end of the queue. To rename in Zoom, hover over your name and click Rename.

Alternates are not allowed to engage in the chat apart from private chat or use any other Zoom room functionality such as raising hands, agreeing or disagreeing. As a reminder, the alternate assignment form

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.

must be formalized by the way of the Google link. The link is available in all meeting invites towards the bottom.

Statements of interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. Seeing or hearing no one, if you do need assistance, please e-mail the GNSO secretariat. All documentation and information can be found on the EPDP Wiki space.

Today’s call is being recorded. Recording will be posted on the public Wiki space shortly after the end of the call. With this, I’ll turn it back over to our chair, Janis Karklins. Please begin.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Thank you, Terri. Hello everyone, welcome to the 47th meeting of the EPDP team phase two. So today, as usual, we will start by adopting agenda of the meeting, but for the moment, for the sake of those who do not follow the work of EPDP team on a daily basis, I would like to say that we have submitted the initial report on priority one issues for public comment, and public comment period expires on 24th of March.

While waiting comments from the community, we are working now on priority two issues which are sort of leftovers from phase one that had been assigned to discuss during phase two. So with this explanation, I would like to propose the following agenda that is now displayed on the screen, and see whether team members would be willing to follow this agenda.

I see no reaction. I take that this agenda is approved. So we will start with the housekeeping issues, and one on my mind is a conversation we had last call on purpose two. At that time, board liaisons indicated that board will be discussing the issue, and seems to me that there has been this discussion on the board. And if I may ask our board liaisons, Chris or Becky, maybe to update us on what was said, what is the outcome of that conversation, that would inform our preparation for our conversation during the next meeting.

BECKY BURR:

Thank you, Janis. You are correct, the board has been following the EPDP's conversation about purpose two, and as you can see, our chairman Maarten Botterman wrote to the GNSO chair as the board's nonacceptance of the phase one purpose two is an issue that is technically before the GNSO but also on the EPDP phase two work schedule.

I will summarize our conversation, and I'm sure we will have a discussion about it following that. The board feels quite strongly that ICANN has an important, legitimate purpose for accessing nonpublic WHOIS data, that access to that data by ICANN is fundamental to fulfilling its mission of stability, security and resiliency of the DNS and that it must be able to access that data as a controller and use that data for stability, security and resiliency purposes.

The board feels very strongly that this purpose needs to be articulated as part of the policy. Now, of course, the policy in terms of how access is given and all of that remains an important decision by the EPDP as

in all things, but the board feels strongly that in order to fulfill our mission, we must have this articulated.

And we are also concerned that the current formulations that have been provided as in the discussions which revert back to the purpose two recommendation in phase one don't address the concern that the commission raised that the purpose two in phase one was conflating access by others for their own legitimate purposes with ICANN's purpose. And therefore, we are uncomfortable with the formulations that have been proposed. We do feel comfortable with the formulation that has been proposed in fact by the European Commission who after all wrote the regulation, and that is a legitimate interest in accessing nonpublic WHOIS data for stability, security to comply with its—to fulfill its security, stability and resiliency mission.

Chris, do you have anything you'd like to add on that?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Not at this stage, but obviously both of us are happy to engage in discussion and answer any questions if we can.

JANIS KARKLINS: Okay. Thank you, Becky, for this. I understand that there's nothing to read between the lines in the letter of chair of the board to chair of GNSO council. So I see Volker's hand up. Maybe let's agree that for the time being, we only ask questions or clarification to the board liaisons, and on substance of the matter, we'll be talking during the next call. Volker, with that understanding, please go ahead.

VOLKER GRIEMANN: Yes. Thank you. With that understanding, I just wanted to say that even though I still think it lacks specificity and some data subjects will be puzzled by what that actually means, I think if that's the position of ICANN, if that's what ICANN Org thinks is the right way to go forward, I'm perfectly happy to go forward with that. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS: Okay, thank you. Any other hands? Alan Woods, please.

ALAN WOODS: Thank you. Yeah, I agree with what Volker just said there. I think we draw a line under it and move on. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS: Okay. Thank you. So in absence of further requests, thank you, Becky, for briefing us on the board's conversation, and what I would suggest, listening to what Volker and Alan just said, I will ask maybe staff to prepare the recommendation or draft recommendation for initial report that we could discuss during the next call. In the meantime, I have Georgios whose hand is up. Georgios, please go ahead.

GEORGIOS TSELENTIS: The position that we had in the initial letter was that we were finding a possible conflation. We did not—and I'm speaking now not as a GAC but as European Commission—have a problem with ICANN having

purpose for this. We saw the formulation in the previous call that was suggested by the IPC. There I had some observations. I remain that maybe we could discuss this with Brian regarding the controllership.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Okay. Thank you. As I suggested, please feel free to discuss and I would maintain my request to staff in consultation with interested team members to prepare the draft recommendation for the initial report that we could discuss during our next call on Tuesday. So thank you, and with this, we could move to item four, accuracy and WHOIS ARS.

Here, I understand that there has been some discussions at the GNSO council, and if I may ask Rafik, the liaison of GNSO council, maybe to inform the team where we are and what is the suggestion.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Janis. [So I opened a] request to check with GNSO council about if the accuracy topic is within the scope or not. I shared that request with the GNSO council, and the topic was put for the GNSO public meeting that was held yesterday.

So we had a brief discussion [in] the council, and I think it's possible to state here that the general sense is that the topic is out of scope, but the council anyway will have a further discussion in the list, and we might expect a formal response by the end of this week as requested. So this is what I can share for now and that's the sense from the discussion that was held yesterday.

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you, Rafik, for this update. Any comments, any questions to Rafik? Laureen, please go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'm just curious, Rafik, if you could share a little more explanation as to the reasoning of the GNSO in making this determination.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Basically, there was some support regarding stating that it's within the scope, but most of the reaction and the comments from the council was that it should not be within the scope. So I might try to summarize later what was shared as argument. I don't have that handy now currently. But I think the main argument is that it was not in the charter and so on. So that's kind of the reasoning.

But for accuracy, I would prefer maybe to check the transcripts and I can somehow summarize. But I expect that the formal response from the council will include the rationale behind such position.

JANIS KARKLINS: Okay. Thank you. Brian, your hand is up.

BRIAN KING: Thanks, Janis. I was on the council call yesterday and it was somewhat clear that the question had not been read by many in the GNSO council. So I think they were wise to defer making a decision until the

councilors have had an opportunity and time to review it and consider the matter. I think the kneejerk reaction is that accuracy might not have been in scope, but it's clearly within scope of the temp spec and that's how we had been addressing it in phase one and rolled into phase two based on its inclusion in the temp spec. And the conversation around the accuracy issue was very broad, really evidences the fact that they hadn't read the question that we'd proposed, because it is very narrow and specific. So I think council is wise to defer it to e-mail. And just for clarity, it did not make a decision yesterday. Thanks.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Okay. Thank you, Brian. Marc Anderson.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Janis. On this topic, I think we need to be a little pragmatic about where we are with the schedule. It's the 12th now, we have a target to publish the addendum to the initial report on the 20th. And I think we're all aware that within this working group, we have very divergent views on accuracy, whether it be whether it's in scope or not, or if it is in scope, what the mandate would be around accuracy.

So I'd like to suggest we be realistic on this one and realize within the time frames that we currently have it does not seem realistic that we're going to be able to come to agreement on policy recommendations around this topic. I think we have plenty of other work in front of us where I think we do have a realistic shot of coming

to agreement and producing solid policy recommendations. So I think we need to be honest with ourselves and [inaudible].

I was also on the GNSO council call, and while the GNSO council call did defer making a decision, there's also a lot of people that voiced support for the topic of accuracy and considering it for future policy work. So I think the council does recognize the importance of accuracy and isn't saying it shouldn't be discussed, but I think we need to be realistic about where we are within this working group.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Thank you, Marc. Margie, followed by Alan G. and then Rafik.

MARGIE MILAM:

Hi. I was listening in to the GNSO council call, and I know from the BC perspective we disagree with the idea that this is out of scope. In fact, the entire EPDP was put together to address the temp spec, and the temp spec has numerous provisions that relate to accuracy.

So while I know we're getting short on time, there's no magic deadline to concluding our work, and this has been a very important topic not just for the BC but also for the GAC. Georgios has brought it up numerous times, and I think that using time as a reason not to proceed is really a problem.

We've been waiting patiently to talk about it. It was actually in our phase one report, so to say that it's out of scope means that we

shouldn't have even talked about it in phase one, which hi think at this point is a moot point because there is a recommendation related to it.

So from my perspective, I think we need to continue to talk about it. If we need a small team like we've done for example on automation, that's what I would propose and see whether we can make some progress on this. But I think punting it out of the EPDP is a big mistake.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Okay. Thank you, Margie. Alan G.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I certainly agree with that. Accuracy has been an important subject for us too. It was deferred until phase two, so declaring now, three quarters of the way through this PDP, that it's suddenly out of scope I think would be quite unfortunate if the GNSO were to take that action.

Moreover, at this point we seem to be saying that we're going to have some unfinished business that we will not do that is in scope and we will send it back to the GNSO and they may take future policy action should they choose.

That basically assures that it will either never be address or it will take years given the workload that's on the GNSO right now. And to put one back onto the list I think essentially dooms it to be forgotten. And I could accept perhaps that we say we can't do the work but the GNSO must continue the work in some other form by extending this PDP in

one form or another. But to simply toss it back and say it goes on to the pile for future policy development work I would consider completely inappropriate. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS: Okay. Thank you. Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Janis, and thanks [inaudible]. I wanted to add that the question also was if the EPDP team is the appropriate vehicle to discuss the topic, and also, of course, the point was made about the time. I want to remind people that the GNSO council is the manager of the process. it's that manager which sets the scope of the PDP, taking of course into account all inputs and feedback. But we—here speaking for the council—are managing the process taking into account several factors.

And I think several of the arguments I'm hearing, it's already made at the GNSO council level. I also want to respond to Brian that it's not the first time we discussed the topic. It was discussed when we had the correspondence from the ICANN Org. So I think several of those arguments were made. we're having that discussion at the GNSO council and we are taking time to be sure to respond appropriately to the EPDP team and giving guidance here.

The GNSO council was asked for guidance and is going to give it. So I think that the EPDP team has to live with that. I understand that there

is frustration and so on, but here we are trying to manage, to ensure that this process delivers what is expected from it.

JANIS KARKLINS: Okay. Thank you, Rafik. Georgios?

GEORGIOS TSELENTIS: Yes. I don't want to repeat the whole discussion so far, I just want to raise something that we should be aware, that it is an issue—not a procedural issue I see it. I see it as an issue of essence and I see it as an issue of compliance. And for this reason, I would have been much more happy if we were advancing also the clarification questions to the legal advisor that we were trying, I don't know for how many months now.

So I think this discussion of putting it out of scope or something that we cannot complete within our mandate, for me, misses the essence which is, as I said, compliance and also whether we want to have a functionable system that is disclosing actually data that are meaningful. Thanks.

JANIS KARKLINS: Okay. Thank you. I do not have new hands up, so what I conclude from this? I see here a little bit issue of chicken and egg, who comes first. And of course, it is GNSO council who sets parameters of our work because we're a subsidiary to the council, and we need to follow instructions.

That said, I understand that there is divergence of opinion, but also, we are here to try to bridge those divergence of opinion, and I would say that we would clearly appreciate any further or definite guidance from the council. But in the meantime, if we will have—or as much time as we could allocate to conversation on accuracy issues, I'm happy to allocate until 24th of March when we need to produce and publish initial report.

And if we're swiftly proceeding with the outstanding issues like purpose two or [inaudible] purpose, that may be—so then we will have enough time to devote to conversation of accuracy. So, would this approach be the one we could follow? I see no objections, so then we will do so. Thank you.

Let us move to next agenda item, which is feasibility of unique contacts to have a uniform anonymized e-mail address. So here, we had already initial conversation. As a result, we have preliminary recommendation, and no comments have been submitted to this. Let me maybe read this preliminary recommendation that EPDP team received legal guidance noting that the publication of uniform masked e-mail address results in the publication of personal data. Therefore, wide publication of masked e-mail address is not currently feasible under GDPR as disclosure would in certain instances require meaningful human review, that means balancing test under GDPR Article 6.1(f).

So may I take that this is recommendation that team would like to propose in the initial report of priority two issues? So no requests for

the floor. I take that this is the wish of the group. It is, so it will find the entry in the initial report. Thank you.

So let me go to next agenda item, and that is city field redaction. Here is the same, we had already a conversation and as a result of conversation, the conclusion was that no changes are recommended to the EPDP phase one recommendation that redaction must be applied to the city field. No comments have been received so far, and my question is whether team can agree that this recommendation will find entry in initial report n priority two issues. I see no hands up, so I take that this is our consensual decision. Thank you.

At this speed, we'll have plenty of time to discuss accuracy issues even during today's call. Next agenda item, financial consideration. Maybe I will ask Berry to give us a little bit of history for the purpose of those who are not following the discussion [inaudible] members of the team very briefly and where we are now. Berry.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Janis. As Marc had sent out to the list, I guess about ten days ago, asking about the status of this, these questions were originally sent by Org late last year. And just before our face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles, they were presented to this group, but in terms of getting to conclusion on the initial report, we didn't have the time to focus directly on these particular questions. As it had happened in parallel to Marc's inquiry about the status of it, I was working on trying to prepare an initial response to the questions that were provided.

The original request, of course, back in late last year, was at the time we had three possible models that the group was considering, and when Janis had originally asked, it was to be costed out for those particular three. And if that wasn't possible, that perhaps the costing could be performed against the UAM model that was produced by the TSG.

At any rate, it's always helpful to try to have a draft of something for the group to respond to, so as I mentioned in parallel to Marc's inquiry, I had just about finished creating some of these initial responses that you have reviewed here. I won't go through them in detail, or we can maybe do that as a next step. The only things that I'll—just kind of the general disclaimer, it was really pretty much me that has put down these preliminary responses. They're really thumb in the wind guesses, and I have no pride of ownership, so please provide feedback as you deem necessary. But again, I don't think we need to strive for perfection or full accuracy here, but we are trying to just establish a general baseline that will help inform Org as they continue to move forward in trying to cost out this particular model. So, happy to answer any questions on some of the responses. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Thank you, Berry, for giving this background and also that this is the best estimate one could make. Before opening the floor, I would also like to say that probably, we're facing here Mission Impossible because we do not know how many individuals or entities will use

SSAD ultimately and therefore in every case, at this point we can make only best guess. Sometimes educated, sometimes not really. But it is not that we need to really wordsmith, but rather speak about ranges that we think might be accurate.

With this introduction, I would like to open the floor for any comments, and the first on the list is Marc Anderson. Please, Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thank you, Janis. First, Berry, hats off to you. Thanks for taking a first stab at this. There's a lot of questions there, and that's quite the daunting task. So I appreciate your work on this.

A couple thoughts though. First is, Berry, as you mentioned, this is a little dated at this point. Some of the questions have been overcome by events and evolved a little bit. And you've tried to point that out as much as you can. But here, I think it would be worth asking staff to take a look, and maybe our ICANN Org liaisons, if you could take a look and see, based on the current state, based on our initial draft that went out for public comment, are there new questions that you need added, or what questions are sort of, as I said, overcome by events? I think that would help a little bit.

The other thing I wanted to say is really, going back to something Brian King suggested when this topic was first brought up, is maybe have a small group discussion [inaudible]. Janis, I think you made a great point, we have no hope of being 100% accurate on this one. But I

think maybe if we brought representatives from the different groups together, we could have a chance to establish reasonable ranges for some of these questions. And I think that would really benefit from a small group discussion on this, so I'd very much like to see that happen before we finish these answers off and send it back to ICANN Org. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Thank you, Marc. James, your hand is up next.

JAMES BLADEL:

Thanks, Janis. I just want to echo Marc's praise and gratitude to Berry for taking something that was really truly unknown and trying to put some boundaries around what we're dealing with here. As I noted on the list, I think the concern is just that we have to spend a little bit more time with some of these variables. And I think Berry acknowledges here that these could be underestimating a couple of key factors that would dramatically increase the number of accredited users, the number of transactions, and therefore the costs.

My concern is that I don't know that there's a really good answer of how to gauge the level of interest in becoming accredited as an SSAD user, and I'm kind of reminded a little bit about just how ICANN didn't know in the last round of new gTLD applications, are they going to get ten, 100, 20,000? There was just this complete mystery.

So I don't know if there's any lessons learned from that experience where we could potentially get some sense of demand initially to

understand how many users we think will apply for accreditation at certain pricing levels. That might help a lot, and maybe that's something that the intended or anticipated requestors, like the BC or IPC, could maybe poll their constituency and get an idea of what their usage patterns might look like. Because otherwise, I think we run the real risk of either sitting around and building something that is overbuilt and takes forever and costs a mint, or we have something that's clogged from day one and accreditations take weeks or months to process and get folks active in the system. I think that's one of the first variables we should try to attack. Thanks. But thanks again to Berry.

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you, James. Mark SV.

MARK SVANCAREK: Thank you. Yeah, I would like to also mention thanks to Berry for putting this together. I think for the most part, these are the right questions that we should be answering even though it may be a little bit old at this point. I also want to plus one the idea of a small group discussion. I think that getting a sense of the numbers and how things are going to work is best discussed in a small group so that we can all agree on how we want to represent these things.

I think that there are good assumptions here. for instance, the assumption that there might be 10,000 people being accredited over some period of time. And I don't think that the absolute numbers

matter so much as just a general sense, because I don't think that the marginal costs of adding one or two or even 100 accredited users is going to significantly complicate or increase even the operational cost of the thing, let alone building the thing.

Time will tell as we design it. I don't think that it's going to be a mint to create or to operate. I think that we'll set the SLAs in our policy and then everyone has to accommodate those SLAs in the rates that they make requests, and that will keep the system from failing. And people who don't abide by that will reap the consequences.

Some of the other assumptions I think are not correct assumptions, and those would be best discussed in a small group. Thanks.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Okay, thank you. I understand that you three, namely Mark SV, Marc Anderson and—oh, yeah, we have already, and we can add Stephanie to this because she also volunteered to work on that. But maybe what would make sense prior to the first meeting of the group would be to create a kind of matrix where each group of EPDP team could give their best guess on different numbers that are required. And once that matrix would be filled by all groups—and I would say that should be done by maybe next Monday latest—then the smaller group could meet on Tuesday and we could take a final decision next Thursday. Because again, we need to send responses to ICANN Org if we're serious in getting back any real estimates by the time of finalization of our final report where this should be reflected.

So, can we agree to proceed in that way? Marc Anderson.

MARC ANDERSON:

Yes, I think that's a great idea, and happy to volunteer for that small team. But just to echo your suggestion for getting input from other groups, I think that would be extremely helpful, both for the small team's work in finalizing these questions, particularly if we can get a swag at number of security researchers and looking over at the GAC, if you could help with law enforcement and other government type requests. I think it would be extremely helpful if we get some estimates on sort of the number of accreditations and requests that you think would be fielded through that, realizing of course that this is not an exact science.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Okay. Thank you, Marc. So then Berry will take an Excel sheet and will put those numbers that need to be filled. I would ask all groups on the team—those who want, of course—to think about numbers responding to the questions, and then put those numbers in this Excel sheet, and that should be done by next Monday. And then on Tuesday, we would organize small team meeting on this issue, would review all inputs that have been provided, and hopefully would agree on proposal for the team consideration next Thursday, aiming at signing off and sending responses to ICANN Org by next Thursday. Berry, your hand is up and you're typing something.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Janis. Instead of a spreadsheet, I'd really just prefer if the small team members could just use sidebar comments, that instead of 5000 requests and 10,000 domain queries, that it's 7000 and 20,000, or something more specific than "This number should be orders of magnitude higher." I'd like to try to be very specific and keep it all within this document, because this is pretty much the deliverable that's going to be returned back to Org. and then that way, it's in one place and we can all track the group's edits. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Okay. If you say so. The point is to be specific on which numbers you want to have estimate by different groups. So that's the point. Maybe what you can do, you can mark in the document, let's say those numbers in certain color and that everyone knows they need to look specifically and then provide input to those colored questions.

Okay, so then we're good with that. Thank you very much. Next on our agenda is automation. So here, with automation, we have two cases that we have not explored yet, case number eight and nine. Nine actually is already in the initial report, but if I can get case number eight. We need to review this one, and since case number nine is already mentioned in the report—but again, we will have a brief exchange on that if needed.

But with eight—Mark SV, would you introduce case number eight?

MARK SVANCAREK:

Sure. Thanks. I think there's a word I would change in 8(b), but I'll get to that. so in this use case, the subjects have consented to make their registration data public, and I would just point you to policy recommendation number six. I know there's still some debate about some aspects of this, such as things related to technical contact, but setting that aside, whatever portions they have consented to make public, those portions should be automatable.

I think that—sorry, Alan, I'm going to say “I think” again. Well, it says here the complexity [is going to be] compliance tracking. It should really be the complexities of consent tracking. So this is the sort of automation that it makes sense for the CP to flag locally because they know who has consented to what. And the gateway wouldn't easily know that unless the CP was keeping them up to date. And we've already determined that that would be onerous and possibly even error prone.

So this sort of automation would be implemented at the CP without much interaction with the gateway, although I suppose they should be in the justification that they send back, the teaching information that they give back to the gateway's machine learning, they should probably call that out and say, “I am disclosing this because this registrant consented to have their data published.”

JANIS KARKLINS:

Okay, so thank you, Mark, for introduction. I have a few hands up, starting Alan G and Marc Anderson.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm somewhat confused. I thought that under the phase one recommendations, if a data subject had consented to make their data public, that it was in the public WHOIS. So why do we need this?

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you, Alan, for question. Mark SV, would you like to answer that immediately?

MARK SVANCAREK: I think Alan G is right. I think we should actually remove number eight, assuming that it's implemented correctly in phase one recommendation number six. So I think we should withdraw this one, and I apologize for the ambiguity.

JANIS KARKLINS: Okay, so if that is withdrawn, then probably we need not to discuss it further, unless there is further hands up. Brian, your hand is still up.

MARK SVANCAREK: Well, there is one consideration since not everyone is going to—I think there's some complexity about whether the contracted party offers that functionality or not, but I may be misremembering this. So there may be some comments in the list explaining to me why I'm wrong. Thanks.

JANIS KARKLINS: Okay. Brian, your hand is up.

BRIAN KING: Thanks, Janis. I think there remains a use for this even when the data is public. If a requestor for example has a list of domain names that they're investigating that are all part of some botnet or suspected to be part of a botnet and they'd like to request the data for all those domain names. It makes sense that if they go to the SSAD with all of them, that the data for registrants who would like the data to be public, if they could make that public and available upon request in the SSAD, we should be able to automate that. so that's a pretty good use case, I think, for automation that's really a no brainer. If the registrant wants their data to be available upon request, certainly that scenario would be not mandatory and would be at the registrant's discretion, but it's certainly a viable use case. Thanks.

JANIS KARKLINS: Okay. Margie.

MARGIE MILAM: Yeah, I wanted to echo what Brian is saying, is that I understand the phase one recommendation is not always public, so I think we still need to keep this one in because of the possibility that even if the data sets are test consented, that it's not going to appear unredacted.

JANIS KARKLINS: Okay. Marc Anderson.

MARC ANDERSON: I originally raised my hand to ask the same question as Alan G. I'm struggling to understand where this is really helpful. If a data subject has consented to publish their data in the public RDS, then that should be the first place that data requestors are going to get the data. Why they wouldn't get the data from there first and why that wouldn't be sufficient is a little confusing to me. If it's not, do we get rid of the public RDS and send everything through SSAD? I don't think that's what we want, but this seems like we're doing extra work to disclose data that's already been disclosed in the public RDS. So I think this is extra work for limited value and we'd be better off just deleting this one.

JANIS KARKLINS: Yeah, my understanding is that the SSAD will be part of whatever is next WHOIS system. Brian, your hand is up again. Or Alan G, is this an old hand or a new hand? Brian.

BRIAN KING: Thanks, Janis. I appreciate Marc Anderson's comments, and I think it depends how you look at it about whether it'll be double work. I think if the SSAD can become the place where you'd go to get as much nonpublic data or as much data as you have a legal justification for, I think what it'll do is decrease the number of times that a requestor's going to have to go outside the SSAD and ask the contracted party to do some manual review directly. So I think it does have that

opportunity, and I see Alan’s comment which I’ll friendly characterize as a bit sassy about the average upstanding botnet owner.

The case I'm actually thinking about is [inaudible] MarkMonitor clients who would want to be clear about who owns the domain names so that if someone is investigating a domain that they own as part of something, it’s clear that they're not such an entity or not such a registrant. So it does have utility there that if the data is public and if the SSAD is going to be used as the place where one would go, which I think is how a lot of us are envisioning this, to get the data to which you have a valid legal basis, if the registrants consent to the data to be published, there's no need to introduce a manual element there. it absolutely should be automated. Thanks.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Okay, Brian, thanks. James followed by Marc Anderson.

JAMES BLADEL:

Hi. Thanks. I just want to put a note of caution, and maybe just outright disagree with Brian. If there's two sets of data, let’s say, public and nonpublic, the volume of requests for public data could be several orders of magnitude higher. And we’re talking like—maybe Verisign folks and some other folks aren't here, but we could be talking about hundreds of millions or billions of requests a month for nonpublic data or for use cases that don’t need redacted data, that can get by with just what's either consented to be published or technical or status indicators or expiry type information.

I really strongly feel that we should try to keep that out of SSAD, because all it's going to do is clog up the plumbing for those requests that do need nonpublic data and need to be evaluated. It's going to, I think, introduce unacceptable to users like the BC and IPC are going to be very dissatisfied with the response times, and the SLAs are going to be just unachievable aspirations. I just want to make sure that we're focused on the meaningful small set of requests that need nonpublic data and have a different channel for the significant volume but low value requests for public data.

So I just want to make sure we're thinking at scale. Thanks.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Thank you, James. Marc Anderson.

MARC ANDERSON:

Great points from James, and echoing what he said, we set off to develop an SSAD system for the purpose of developing a system to provide access to nonpublic gTLD registration data. The SSAD is there to provide a mechanism for those people with a legitimate reason and purpose for accessing that data to have a better, more consistent, more streamlined way of getting at that data. And muddying that to be also a system for accessing public data as well I think is not doing any of us any favors. Can we please just focus on this being a system for access to nonpublic registration data?

JANIS KARKLINS: Okay. Thank you for your plea. Brian, and then Mark SV.

BRIAN KING: Thanks, Janis. I can respond to that. I think that if we're going to require users to go through the process of becoming accredited and paying for the queries, we already have some disincentives to clogging this thing up with requests that don't need to be there. Maybe if I can make a political plea to my colleagues here, I'm going to have to turn around in short order and sell this thing to the IPC and explain why this is a good thing for us to sign on to.

And if I'm going back and saying that we can't get automation for trademarks with an exact match of the trademark, and we can't get automation where the registrant has consented that their data can be published, this doesn't look good, guys. So help me help all of us. Thanks.

JANIS KARKLINS: Okay. Mark SV, please.

MARK SVANCAREK: Thank you. I just want to make sure that we're not talking past ourselves a little bit. I think we did agree that if you make a request for nonpublic data, that the public data will be served with that same response. That's not the same as saying that every time I want public data, I should go through the SSAD.

So I think that there's some elements of truth in things that a lot of people are saying, but if you just look at them by themselves, you might not get the overall picture of what we're talking about. I think we already did agree that if all you want is public data, you should use the public interface, and if you want nonpublic data, you should expect the public data be delivered with it to avoid race conditions. So hopefully that clarifies where we're at already. Thanks.

JANIS KARKLINS:

That is my recollection as well, that's why I said that the SSAD will be kind of subset or side door of RDAP to get the nonpublic data, but also with nonpublic data as we suggested in our initial report on SSAD public data also would be provided.

Look, maybe it makes sense to reflect a little bit as a result of this conversation. And if I may ask Mark SV who is penholder on this to see if this eight could be somehow rephrased to fine tune our understanding of the system and accommodate concerns of both sides, Brian and contracted parties.

MARK SVANCAREK:

I am very happy to do that. Thank you very much.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Thank you. So now we could move to the last request data from UDRP and USR provider. I think that this case is already in the initial report, and my question is, is there any need to discuss it further?

MARK SVANCAREK:

It was included for completeness, that's why it's the last one. It's not clear to me that we need to discuss it here. If anybody feels like it needs to be discussed and volunteers to discuss it, please put up your hand. Otherwise, we can move on. Okay, no hands up, so thank you, Mark. So you'll then think about number eight, which for the moment is deleted on the screen, and maybe we could think about it further.

Now my question is how we proceed with this, where we are now. We in initial report put two examples of the automation that could be done from day one and decided that we would review other real-life cases and they would be, if consensually agreed, presented as a part of the final report.

So in discussions of all the cases mentioned here, we clearly see that there isn't consensus on most of them. Some are maybe closer to consensus than others, and in one of the conversations, we came up— at least I sense that the solution may lie with the magic words of “must” or “may.” And in that spirit, I suggested that maybe we could seek advice of groups in the team how they see, which of the cases may go as must be automated from day one, which cases would go with may be automated with a view of gradually moving to must, and the third category, which cases will remain always maybe automated at the discretion or decision of the contracted parties.

So for the moment, we have only one input from—no, we have two inputs, and maybe I can ask SSAC and registrars to speak on their inputs. Ben, please go ahead.

BEN BUTLER:

Thanks. And apologies, we weren't really clear on the best way to characterize what we were trying to say. So really, all we're saying is in looking at all the use cases, although eight and nine now are suspect, we just generally feel that all of these are fine as a "may" from day one and we should just be looking towards moving towards "must" as DPIAs are completed and more legal assurances and more data becomes available. Just kind of echoing the overall mentality of this hybrid model of moving to more automation when we become more legally sure.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Thank you, Ben. I can repeat what I was thinking, that maybe the way forward was to characterize which of nine presented use cases may be put as a must from day one. And I think that candidates for that category would be case number one and nine. So then another category would be may be with a view to going to must as we progress with the operation and training of system.

And then the third category would remain "may" no matter what, and that would be at the discretion of contracted parties or entity making disclosure suggesting that they may decide that it may be automated but that it's fully at their responsibility and their own risk.

So these are three categories that are outlined here on this table. I have now four hands up, maybe even more. Stephanie first, Alan G, Brian, and Alan Woods, In that order. Stephanie, please go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thank you very much. I just wanted to officially say that NCSG is begging for more time to fill this out. We have, as Milton has made the point many times, a lot of problems with the whole concept of automation. We believe most of these cases will involve a balancing test which we don't believe can be automated, and that would even include the law enforcement example which we have been pondering at some length. So we have grave concerns here.

I would also like to raise another issue that arises in this context, and that is that we have on the EPDP a number of contracted parties who have lawyered up who are well aware of their obligations and their liability. Once this is admitted as a policy from ICANN, ICANN has to accept the responsibility in my view as a controller for controlling that policy. And if we allow permissive disclosures, so the IRT is currently working on the requirement to force registrars and contracted parties to permit voluntary disclosure of information, and we put a whole pile of musts into this template here, we are basically permitting the contracted parties who have not done their homework—we're not just permitting them, we are forcing them to just go along with the flow and replicate the WHOIS situation. That's the easiest, cheapest response for them.

So that puts ICANN in the position as a data controller having produced the policy that forces that requirement and then acts on it and enforces it through GDD—I just want to draw your attention to that and say that I don't think this is viable. We can depend on the

folks that are around this table now to make correct judgment calls on this and know their risk. We cannot depend on the ones who are not here. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you, Stephanie. Alan G.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. With regard to that last statement, my understanding is the contracted parties around this table are here to represent all of them, not just their own interests. So hopefully they will take that into consideration.

I put my hand up because I'd like to make a comment in general. It's one I made at a joint ALAC-GAC meeting the other day. I have real concern, given how hard it is to make these decisions, that we're going to be able to put a process in place on an ongoing basis to make further decisions, and especially further decisions that might have a "must" in it. I just don't see the viable way that we can do that, and if that is indeed the case, then I'm concerned that our whole model falls apart.

Now, I understand it's in everyone—the contracted parties' interest to automate things if they feel secure because it lowers their workload, but nevertheless, the difficulty of making these decisions and finding a process where we can come to closure on them, I just don't see how that's going to work. So I think going forward within our limited time, we're going to have to strongly consider that process, the committee

or whatever it is that's going to do this, because I think we may be building a house of cards that will collapse. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Thank you, Alan. Just to recall why we're doing this, because when we finalized the initial report, IPC insisted that we need to put more than just two cases on alternation in an initial report. But because of lack of time, we couldn't. As a result, we agreed that while waiting public comments, we would continue and review cases that volunteers—and that was Mark SV— would put forward as based on daily practice.

So that does not mean that these are only cases that contracted parties may think about in real life when SSAD will be in operation. This is just to see whether there are any other sort of cases that we could put in the final report, which would fit this aspiration of automation from day one. So it seems to me it is rather difficult. But nevertheless, the initial report suggests that system would evolve and we put proposal that there would be a mechanism which would review the operation of the system and would try to, based on experience, move from manual to automated and from decentralized to maybe more centralized as we go. So here we're just examining whether any of use cases make final entry in the final report as proposal for automation. Alan Woods, Volker.

ALAN WOODS:

Okay, so very quickly, I just wanted to kind of point out that I'm not necessarily on board with this whole “may” and then at some time in

the future could change once we figure it out versus “may” forever. I think, to be honest, it’s kind of an unfair choice, it’s almost [inaudible]. I think we’re making a policy for now, and if it’s a “may,” it is a “may.” But that doesn’t necessarily mean either that it was a “may” with an open gate or a “may” forever. It’s, at the time we created this policy, it was a “may,” but then at some point in the future, we could be able to then advise that change to the policy.

I just feel that it’s absolutely too binary to say, “may with a possible” and “may forever.” I think it’s just a “may” for now, and let’s not add anything to the end of that. I still want to presuppose that the point in time is these are “mays” because we don’t have the ability to say it now. But that does not mean that in future it won’t be changed, and that’s not the same as the first one. So my brain is having a little bit of trouble fitting into either one of those particular ways of putting it.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Thank you, Alan. Volker followed by Margie.

VOLKER GRIEMANN:

Thank you. Ultimately, this is still something that’s new to us. Once the SSAD gets into operation, then all registrars will have different experiences and will be able to make decisions on their own. I’m a fan of “may” because ultimately I like options, I like the ability to do stuff that I feel is right even if I’m not forced to do that. If we forbid that automated processing, that would be something that I would rather regret, because as time goes on, I may feel that even without policy

advice, I have the confidence that I can automate certain things that other registrars might not feel confident in automating at that stage.

So having a “may” is something that gives us a certain level of permissibility, a certain level of leeway that we can use to implement what we feel is the best implementation of automation choices for us. So I'm a very big fan of “may” as opposed to forbidding it. Must is something that we probably need more experience for and something that there's still some pushback against in the registrar community simply because they feel that this doesn't protect them against potential legal claims down the road. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Okay, thank you, Volker. Margie followed by Matthew.

MARGIE MILAM:

Yeah. Hi. I think from the BC perspective, we feel it's important to have most of these be “musts.” And really, if they're all “mays,” and you kind of take a step back from a high level, you've built this system and essentially it's just a glorified ticketing system. It's not what the proposal was meant to be, which was as hybrid. And a hybrid from the way we understood it was that some things would be automated and some things wouldn't.

And I feel that this whole discussion of “may” and not even allowing for it to adjust over time really moves away from the understanding when we first agreed to this hybrid approach. So I would very much oppose, for example, what Alan Woods said about making it a “may”

as is and not subject to further review, because I feel that that potentially could mean you need a PDP to fix it, and that's simply not going to be sufficient for making this system evolve in the way that it needs to evolve to be serving the needs of all stakeholders.

And in that light, I think that if we're willing to accept that the "mays" could become "musts" at some point, we need information about the way that the system's working in the period that they are "mays." So what I would propose is that we have tracking of the disclosure rates for each of those use cases and have that be something that's collected and reported on as part of the system so that when we get to the discussion in whatever mechanism we're going to do to adjust the automated disclosures, we've got real hard data as to how many requests there are, how many are being disclosed and how many aren't.

So that would be my proposal, is that for these use cases, we have specific reporting on each one.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Okay. Thank you, Margie. Matthew followed by Brian.

MATTHEW CROSSMAN:

Hi. I'd just like to make a suggestion here that I think might help with this conversation, and it's that now that we have these use cases fleshed out in detail, that we submit these to Bird & Bird to get some more specific advice on the automation of these specific requests.

I think that especially where some of these are going to be “mays” where a contracted party is going to need to make a decision about whether to automate, I think it would be really helpful to have a better understanding of the legal risks involved in each of these examples. I don’t think we’ve really addressed that as part of this very helpful but more sort of functional discussion about these use cases.

I think it’s a good use of our legal resources because we do have these specific use cases rather than some of the bigger conceptual questions that we’ve been tossing to Bird & Bird, so I think it could be really helpful as we assess these and even as we make some of these decisions about “may” and “must.” So that’d be my suggestion to kind of help further this discussion. I welcome any thoughts on that. Thanks.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Okay. Thank you, Matthew. If team members could also reflect on Matthew’s proposal to submit the list for evaluation by Bird & Bird from legal perspective and provide kind of yay, any on each of them from automation permissibility from legal perspective. Brian followed by Alan G.

BRIAN KING:

Thanks, Janis. I’d like to agree with Matt and support that suggestion to send these to Bird & Bird. I think that we seem to have some—this is an opportunity for them to help us, I think. It seems clear that some of

us think there's more solid legal foundation for automation [inaudible] so it might be helpful to have a referee or objective perspective here.

I'd also like to reiterate one thing that I mentioned previously, is that the trademark use case is going to be very important for the IPC. So I'd like to ask our colleagues who are not yet comfortable automating that scenario that we spell that out, understanding this is not all trademark requests but specific safeguards that we spelled out to help me understand what risk I'm missing there, because I think we'd like to continue to collaborate toward any safeguards that might make that more palatable.

I frankly don't see a risk, and so I'm missing something. So if I can ask my friends for help, I genuinely would appreciate that. And I will note that unfortunately today is the first day that I'm seeing this, so the IPC will fill this out. I think that's all I have for now. Thanks.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Okay. Thank you. Alan G followed by Chris Lewis-Evans.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Two comments. In the chat, Matt Serlin said that his notion of the hybrid model was to do with requests going into a central gateway, the decision's made by the appropriate contracted party. That was the original hybrid model, but that was proposed by the contracted parties but not the one I thought we agreed to. So there seems to be a misunderstanding.

The reason I've put my hand up though was when Alan Woods was talking, he was talking about—implying that “may” and “must” is part of the policy. And if that’s the case, then it’s going to take a PDP to change a “may” to a “must” or to add a new use case which has a “may” on it. And if that’s the case, then I think all bets are off. We were talking about some non-PDP process that could add use cases that were eligible for automation.

So I think we’re wandering in a direction that’s very different from what some of us thought we agreed to, in both directions apparently. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Thank you, Alan. I don’t think so, because we are simply in a search of cases that may be put in the final report as proposal that these specific issues could be automated from day one, and that is because some of the groups on the team feel very strongly that there should be very clear language on automation and what could be automated or not.

But the system is built in a way through this mechanism that is proposed in initial report that there would be a mechanism to evaluate and see how operational the system could be made more efficient, including through moving either decisions from the contracted parties to the central gateway when contracted parties voluntarily agree to that move or that some decisions could be automated because contracted parties feel very comfortable that automation would increase efficiency.

And that should be described already as a policy that these moves will be taking place as system evolves. Chris Lewis-Evans followed by Mark SV.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS:

Thank you, Janis. Just listening to Volker’s input, and to go to that, I think maybe misquote Marc Anderson here, we have a “may” and a “must,” and as Volker said, some of the contracted parties will need some sort of movement depending on individual circumstances; where they're based and that sort of thing.

So, do we need to look at adding another column in here with a “should?” Because I feel that—I think Marc Anderson said that if it’s a “may” in IRT, it generally gets thrown away. So if we had a “should” in there, then it’s up to the contracted parties to say why they're not doing it. I think some of these cases for me would probably fall into a “should” rather than a “must” or a “may.” So I just wonder whether that’s worth us considering adding to this document. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Okay. Thank you, Chris. Mark SV followed by James.

MARK SVANCAREK:

Thanks. The conversation has moved on since I first put up my hand, but I think the point I would still like to make is that if we’re discussing “must” and “may” and policy or not policy, we really need to have some sort of understanding on how updates are going to be made. If

this is based in policy and we must create a new PDP, then that's probably not going to work very well, and if we're going to create some sort of an advisory council that's going to manage this, we need to figure out pretty fast how that's going to work and what they can do that's binding and what they can do that's merely advisory. So that feels like a pretty gaping hole to me in this whole evolution concept. I don't know where we go from there, but that would be my concern. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Thank you. James.

JAMES BLADEL:

Hi, Janis. I'm trying to take all of this in, and I thought I knew where we were headed until Alan Greenberg's last intervention when he said that essentially, what we're talking about is not what he thought we had agreed to in terms of a hybrid model. And I just want to take a step back here for a second. And maybe this is really just boiling down the "must" or the "may debate," is if the SSAD is going to make disclosure decisions, then one of two things has to happen. Either the SSAD has to be in possession of the data, or the SSAD has to have a way of compelling a contracted party to produce the data over the objection of the contracted party's legal risk assessment.

Right? One of those two things. Either it has it and it gives it the data or it doesn't have it but it can compel someone else to give up the data. And I don't think that either of those were ever part of our many

discussions about the hybrid model, so everything is ultimately a “may,” because I don't know how a “must” works in practical terms. Does ICANN show up at my door with a gun and say, “Give us this data or else?” Of course not. That’s ridiculous.

So I want to make sure we’re clear here that when we’re talking about hybrid, we’re talking about automating the accreditation, automating the requests, automating the distribution of those requests, and putting the contracted party on the clock to respond to the request. But the content of the response still has to be in that “may” realm and always, in my opinion—unless we get some blank check from the regulators who put us in this mess, it’s always going to be the case that that “may” will—even a “Must” would have an asterisk attached to it.

So I want to make sure that we’re all still talking about the same thing, because I'm just getting more and more confused as the conversation goes on.

JANIS KARKLINS:

No, I think it would be worth rereading our own initial report to remember what we’re talking. So the question that contracted parties would remain 100% the disclosures was not accepted by some groups, and that’s why we went slightly further and we were talking about this potential evolutionary model where we create a committee and see how the SSAD functions and what, whether, when and then what disclosure decisions could be either automated or sent for disclosure to the central gateway.

So of course, the initial system would function as you described, James. That would be most, if not 100% disclosure decisions would be made by contracted parties, but once the system works, there would be some kind of evolution. And of course, that evolution would be decided by this mechanism and that would be consensual decision when contracted parties are ready to automate something or allow a central gateway to make decision on their behalf. So that's where we are and that's what is written [in essence] in the initial report. So it's always good to remember what we're suggesting ourselves.

I have Volker's hand up and Alan G.

VOLKER GRIEMANN:

Thank you, Janis. Ultimately, where we were coming from was that we have a certain status quo where nothing is automated. We have two extremes in positions and we were looking at a situation where we were probably not going to come to any form of consensus unless we find a middle way. That was the hybrid model.

The hybrid model allows for an automation, it allows for automation wherever the contracted party feels that the risk is manageable if they allow for a certain type of automation, and even if automation is not possible, you will still have an easier way of requesting the data since there'll be so much streamlining and so much unifying of processes and so much unifying of requests that a lot of what you have today in this uncertain world of everybody doing their own thing is taken away.

I think that is a big gain here. When it comes to “may” not being worth anything in IRT, I must disagree, because it ultimately means that if we say that a contracted party—or let’s name it the registrar because that’s what it’s going to end up with in my view, but still, if we allow a certain thing to be automated, then the system must be built to that to allow that.

If we say that the system must be ready to allow automation of a certain thing, which I think “may” does, then it’ll be built to that spec. if we are not putting that in, then it will be the case that whoever builds the system simply will not allow for that option of automating certain things, the modularity that I’m looking for, because it would save cost not to build it in and it’s not required by the spec.

I think if we have a recommendation that requires that a certain option be provided, then that option will be available and you will see with many registrars—probably not all of them—a very high uptick in automated responses over what you have currently.

Sure, this is not everything you wanted, but we’re not getting everything we wanted either. We still have to implement that thing. It’s going to be a lot of hassle to do that. We’ll have new contractual obligations that we don’t necessarily like. So this is a give and take. We’re meeting in the middle somewhere. So cut us some slack, we’re doing what we can.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Okay. Thank you, Volker. Alan G.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I actually agree pretty much completely with what James said. I believe the reality is the contracted parties have the data, and all the SSAD can do is instruct the contracted party to release the data. They may refuse, and that's the asterisk that I think James was talking about.

It may say "must," but if the contracted party has some overriding reason why this case is special, be it the women's shelter or be it the contracted party knows that this particular requestor is a bad actor and we simply haven't done the paperwork yet to get rid of them, then they could refuse and justify it. And if ICANN Compliance gets involved in that case, they have a hard justification for why they refused in this particular case.

So I believe there is an asterisk there that gives the contracted parties some discretion, but that doesn't alter the fact that in the absence of some special case, they're supposed to release the data. There's no guns involved though, and clearly, the contracted party ultimately has the switch that says yes or no. But the "must" case, that switch should only be used in extreme and very specific cases. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Thank you, Alan. Mark SV.

MARK SVANCAREK:

Thank you. I want to support one of the things that Volker said. This is really important about making sure that the infrastructure is actually built. In the hybrid model, contracted parties are still the deciders, and how you interpret, “Here's a recommendation from the gateway. Do I find this to be extremely persuasive or not?” And how that affects the way you use your automation, that’s an interesting conversation and I think that does evolve over time. But if we’re not obliged to build the infrastructure, then it is just so hard to make any progress on this even if we learn more information over time and come to a different consensus over time.

So I liked what Volker said in that regard and I support that. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Okay. Thank you. I don’t have any further requests for the moment. Let me suggest the following. Seems that Matt proposed interesting idea that was not turned down, and I was told since I was not able to follow up fully the chat room, there was some good proposals in the chat.

So what I would suggest then, maybe that legal committee next Wednesday when they meet, look at the issue. And if maybe Matt as the author of the idea could summarize or put some few bullets in front of the legal committee from this conversation, what Bird & Bird could do, that would be helpful. So that’s the one conclusion.

The second one is I would like also to ask staff to make analysis of this conversation including all the plus ones in the chat room, and for the next meeting that we have next Tuesday, maybe staff could propose some text of a way forward based on this conversation that we have.

My sort of take from this is that we're not yet on the same page, and of course, I don't know whether IPC and BC would take a hard stand as that was said in the drafting initial report that that may be a deal breaker or not, but this automation, we need to get some text that we could work on on automation for the final report without, of course, prejudice what comments we will receive from the community.

We would then, based on this analysis and staff proposal, resume this conversation next Tuesday. Would that be an acceptable way forward? Okay, I see no requests. And of course, I understand that Mark SV, based on the inputs received, will fine tune the use cases as that was agreed already at the beginning of this exercise.

Good. If that's acceptable, then we can move on, and we have the last agenda item, and that is the next meeting. So we're meeting next time on Tuesday, 17th March. I received request from board liaisons to move purpose two decision on Thursday. So therefore, I think we have pretty good consensus building on that around the board proposal, and we can take a risk and move it to call on Thursday.

For the next Tuesday meeting, I would suggest that we would split meeting in two. At the beginning, we would discuss potential [inaudible] purpose, we would continue discussing automation cases, and we would see if there's anything else apart from purpose two that

we could put on the agenda. And after that, we would move to the small group mode and would continue our conversation on financials.

So that is proposal. Of course, we will have a leadership call and would maybe rethink the agenda. And of course, agenda would be published no later than Monday.

So with this, I am looking, is there anyone else who would like to take the floor at this stage? I see no requests for the floor, so then that brings us to the end of the meeting. Thank you very much for your active participation, and this meeting stands adjourned.

TERRI AGNEW:

Thank you, everyone. Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines. Alex, our tech, if you could please stop all recordings. Thank you, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]