from Ozan Sahin to All Participants: Welcome to the proposed Accreditation and Access Model for Non-Public WHOIS Data Call on 24 April 2018 at 15:00 UTC

from Ozan Sahin to All Participants: Please remember to mute your line when not speaking by clicking on the mic icon right to your name – it should turn red to indicate you are muted.

from Frederick Felman to All Participants: Is it possible for a leader to say something to test audio?

from Frederick Felman to All Participants: Thank you

from Ozan Sahin to All Participants: You are welcome Frederick.

from Mary Wong to All Participants: Please remember to MUTE your mic if you are not speaking. For those using WebEx audio, this means your mic icon should be in RED (not grey) with a strikeout across.

from Stephanie Perrin to All Participants: There are two microphone pictures. One says it is muted and one says it is not muted. Can you tell me if you hear me?

from Mary Wong to All Participants: @Stephanie your audio is live.

from Mary Wong to All Participants: (now muted, thanks Stephanie)

from Stephanie Perrin to All Participants: well I don't seem to be able to turn it off, perhaps you have to. Thanks.

from mark svancarek to All Participants: I am not able to mute microphone neither from the lower right icon nor the Communicate tab.

from Stephanie Perrin to All Participants: hands up everybody who misses Adobe (oh wait, can I actually put my hand up.....)

from Van Scartezini to All Participants: hi all , thanks to Andrea I could enter..

from Keith Drazek to All Participants: Thanks to the BC/IPC group who have taken the lead on this important effort.

from Frederick Felman to All Participants: please mute your lines

from Sara Bockey (Observer only) to All Participants: I'm hearing the word community used a lot. Since this is coming from a narrow segment of the community it is not appropriate to call it that. You have come horribly close to calling this a cross-community model.

from Mary Wong to All Participants: Hi again, all, if you have a
QUESTION or COMMENT for Fabricio and any of the presenters via chat, please make sure you address it to All Participants (NOT All Attendees). You may also raise your hand (grey icon, bottom right) to speak via audio.

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants: is it possible to switch pages with the discussion?

from Kathy Kleiman to All Participants: I share Sara's concerns.

from Mary Wong to All Participants: @Maxim, there is no scrolling ability in this WebEx configuration, unfortunately. We have been asking presenters to note what page/section they are on, and to let staff know when they wish us to advance pages.

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants: I think it is important to add which particular communities are working on it (not all)

from Griffin Barnett to All Participants: In case anyone is looking for it, V 1.4 of the draft model is available here: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gdpr-aaml-ipbc-whois-access-accreditation-process-1-4-20apr18-en.pdf

from Rubens Kuhl to All Participants: Sara, Kathy: while this is an effort that indeed is not balanced, the output still has to pass DPAs screening, and that usually looks at the substance instead of authorship. So I'm less concerned with that than I would be in a normal ICANN-only process.

from Mary Wong to All Participants: @Maxim, I believe Brian Winterfeldt listed the comments/commentators who submitted suggestions that were incorporated into this draft version 1.4 at the beginning of the call.

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants: @Mary, I noted that I do not represent RySG

from Jeff Neuman to All Participants: 31 days?

from Jeff Neuman to All Participants: Its April 24th, and we have until May 25th

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants: implementation in software is not possible in such small amount of time

from Kevin Kreuser to All Participants: 30 days, 8 hours 30 something minutes

from Kevin Kreuser to All Participants: https://iapp.org/resources/topics/eu-gdpr/
from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants:I participated as an individual expressing my own concerns, and noted that I did not represent even RySG (not talking about CPH)

from bradley silver to All Participants:I have my hand up

from Kathy Kleiman to All Participants:My hand is up.

from Rubens Kuhl to All Participants:Same for. Do not represent CPH, RySG, or even all divisions of my employer, only domain registration services one.

from Fabricio Vayra to All Participants:I see hands now. Thanks.

from Frederick Felman to All Participants:please mute your lines

from Rubens Kuhl to All Participants:Hearing echo

from Stephanie Perrin to All Participants:I think most of us are having trouble muting our lines. Need help from staff.

from Mary Wong to All Participants:If it helps to clarify, this group/list is not a formally-chartered cross-community group or other Working Group. ICANN Org is providing some secretariat support for this group/list, for a proposal first circulated by the BC & IPC, and which effort they are continuing to shepherd via this effort to engage the rest of the community more fully.

from Jeff Neuman to All Participants:Thats why I called in separately and muted my line with *6

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants:adding these requirements to RA/RAA will not help without window for implementation (having all Registries and Registrars non compliant with both GDPR and RA, RAA is not good)

from Rubens Kuhl to All Participants:We need to be real about incentives, though. Developing a layered model won't change the blackout in May 25th. It will be able to solve it for the next calendar year, perhaps.

from Steve DelBianco to All Participants:Kathy's referring to the 10 purposes on pages 14-15 of v1.4

from Rubens Kuhl to All Participants:Have to drop now. Will try following up later.

from Kathy Kleiman to All Participants:Annex A

from Griffin Barnett to All Participants:i suspect comments on purpose statement are being synthesized along with recent guidance from WP29
so perhaps it is merely a timing issue in terms of addressing in next version of model

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants: have to drop the call. will try to follow

from Griffin Barnett to All Participants: (i should say, recent guidance from WP29 and further community comments and developments following that guidance)

from Keith Drazek to All Participants: I think that's a good point, Griffin.

from Steve DelBianco to All Participants: Kathy -- but how would those amendments to the Purposes affect the proposed Accred & Access model?

from Griffin Barnett to All Participants: balance is already partially taken into account by the mere fact that much of the WHOIS data is becoming non-public in the first place

from Dean Marks to All Participants: A request to Kathy and NCSG, it would be helpful to post the comments to the accred email so all of us can see them. Thanks.

from Anne Aikman-Scalese to All Participants: COMMENT: I used to think ICANN could distinguish between pure speech and sites where goods and services are sold and donations collected (public safety and consumer protection issues). Then when it was discovered that Russian operators used "free speech" on Facebook to try to throw a U.S. election -- so now I am back to thinking that the balance between private free speech and the public's right to know who is speaking has to be considered. A far as I know, the history of the free speech right is not actually anonymous free speech. People hearing the speech need to "consider the source". Otherwise, why is Mark Zuckerberg apologizing in Congress and facing regulation?

from Kathy Kleiman to All Participants: This is not a Catch-22, the right to the privacy of data subjects and the right to those who want to use their data can be understood and balanced -- consistent with the GDPR -- and knowing that "unfettered access" is, we know, is not legal, even for law enforcement.

from Steve DelBianco to All Participants: NCSG posted their comment to Accred-Model on 14-Apr. https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accred-model/2018-April/000034.html

from Griffin Barnett to All Participants: not sure access is intended to be "unfettered" -- i think it's always been envisaged that there would be code of conduct / terms and conditions governing access and use of data obtained via accreditation program
from Michael Karanicolas to All Participants: Developing an accreditation model that facilitates access to journalists would necessitate a definition of who constitutes a journalist.

from Kathy Kleiman to All Participants: @Bradley, the right of privacy is not a choice of ICANN, it is the fundamental rationale of the GDPR -- it's built into our formula here -- and against which third party access is weighed and measured.

from mark svancarek to All Participants: great ring tone ;-)

from mark svancarek to All Participants: voice is too soft

from Chantelle Doerksen to All Attendees: Hi all, working on muting. There is only one host who can make changes. We're working on it, thank you!

from Keith Drazek to All Participants: As Goran noted in his latest blog, following this week's feedback from Art29, there will need to be an accreditation system for tiered access to non-public Whois data. Let's use that as the basis for today's discussion and move to a substantive discussion of the latest draft of the model proposed by BC/IPC.

from Mary Wong to All Participants: Apologies for slight delay in staff response; Ozan was kicked out of WebEx and we are restoring Host rights for him (you need to be a Host to mute/unmute participants).

from Fabricio Vayra to All Participants: Thanks, Mary and Ozan.

from Kathy Kleiman to All Participants: Glad to hear that "unfettered access" is not the term that will be used going forward. Excellent.

from Griffin Barnett to All Participants: to be clear that term is not used anywhere in the draft as it stands

from Griffin Barnett to All Participants: not that i can find at least

from Kathy Kleiman to All Participants: "getting it right" is key :-)!

from Griffin Barnett to All Participants: tiered access is already fettered compared to what currently exists

from Griffin Barnett to All Participants: +1 Alan

from Anne Aikman-Scalese to All Participants: We in fact need an Expedited PDP.

from Belaid Nouar to All Participants: in fact interim model is
developing through ICANN.org initiative to comply with the GDPR and isn’t a PDP basis result. So after May 25th, 2018, what’s the next step?

from Mark Svancarek to All Participants: Hand up

from Mark Svancarek to All Participants: I can’t find the Hand Up UI—please put me in the queue and unmute me thx

from Dean Marks to All Participants: @Keith and Kathy and Stephanie: the issue that Keith raised as to who should be the accrediting body is one of the most difficult issues in my view. In some ways, I think it would be better for there to be a centralized entity that evaluates on as an objective basis as possible. And on the other hand, maybe it would be better for there to be "expert" bodies for different interests who can sort the "wheat from the chaff."

from Anne Aikman-Scalese to All Participants: sorry I cannot get my hand to go down but it seems that TMCH clearing house agents could be accredited in relation to marks that are validated in the TMCH.

from Bradley Silver to All Participants: @Stephanie, what’s the criteria for independance? By nature, the parties bets positioned to accredit, are going to be affiliated with the category they're accrediting.

from Belaid Nouar to All Participants: can anybody response to my question. Is ccTLDs are also concerned by the interim model and accredited access?

from Fabricio Vayra to All Participants: Thanks, Ozan

from Mark Svancarek to All Participants: Please unbmute me

from Mark Svancarek to All Participants: now mute me :)

from Fabricio Vayra to All Participants: Thanks for being so patientnMark S

from Kathy Kleiman to All Participants: @Fab; drop-down menus with a selection of pre-written rationales for gathering data is probably not the "appropriate balancing of interests" that the law envisions.

from Fabricio Vayra to All Participants: @Kathy. Thanks. Would be interested to explore further with you.

from Chris Pelling to All Participants: I would say to Rod that the purpose has to be provided at time of request

from Chantelle Doerksen to All Attendees: Email address, as mentioned by Steve DelBianco: accred-model@icann.org
from Scott Hollenbeck to All Participants: This technical specification is available right now: https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-hollenbeck-regext-rdap-openid/

from Scott Hollenbeck to All Participants: Focused on RDAP, though.

from Griffin Barnett to All Participants: 31 days Fab

from Anne Aikman-Scalese to All Participants: To the IP folks, time is very short. We need to be working on how TMCH Agents can be accredited by Deloitte.

from Griffin Barnett to All Participants: Thanks for the good discussion

from avri doria to All Participants: bye, thanks

from nigel hickson to All Participants: thanks