from Steve Crocker to All Participants: Hello, everyone.

from Ozan Sahin to All Participants: Welcome to the Accreditation and Access Model for Non-Public WHOIS Data call!

from Ozan Sahin to All Participants: Please remember to mute your microphones or telephones.

from Benny Samuelsen to All Participants: could someone run a sound txt

from Michael Palage to All Participants: How do you mute microphone

from Benny Samuelsen to All Participants: no sound..

from Michael Palage to All Participants: Under Participant Tab

from Frederick Felman to All Participants: Hi Nathalie - will I be able to display materials for the call?

from Frederick Felman to All Participants: I'd like to be able to share my screen with materials for the presenters

from Steve Crocker to All Participants: I gather this tools does not support private chats between participants, right?

from Frederick Felman to All Participants: it does steve, was my mistake, thanks for joining

from Marilyn Cade to All Participants: Webex usually does.

from Benny Samuelsen to All Participants: finally some sound..

from Kevin Murphy to All Participants: Is this going to be one of those calls where every third comment is somebody asking somebody to mute their line?

from Michael Palage to All Participants: WebEx learning curve :-)

from Frank Michlick to All Participants: To mute, in the light client download, you need to click on participants, find yourself and click on the microphone on your right.

from Kevin Murphy to All Participants: For avoidance of doubt, if the mute icon is not red, you're not muted

from Nathalie Peregrine to All Participants: thank you, Kevin, that is correct

from Andrea Glandon to All Participants: To mute your line, please click on the microphone to the right of your name. If the Mic is red, then you are muted.

from Stephanie Duchesneau to All Participants: there doesn't seem to be a way to mute from the web version (not that i can find) and it's the only one that will for me

from Jonathan Zuck to All Participants: Show the participants screen, find your name, and hit the microphone icon

from Stephanie Duchesneau to All Participants: doh, thanks maxim

from Lisa Phifer to All Participants: @Stephanie, menu across top, click Participants, you'll find Mute option

from Michael Palage to All Participants: Or place curser in chat window, hit Control A - Copy and then past into a word doc

from Steve DelBianco to All Participants: to all, you can get into the Queue by clicking the Raise Hand icon on right side of screen

from Mary Wong to All Participants: If you are an attendee, you can scroll the page being displayed (but not the whole document).

from Frank Corday to All Participants: Or zoom out

from Kevin Murphy to All Participants: Is this document available to download anywhere? Anyone have a link?

from Jeff Neuman to All Participants: <Comment> If we want the community to sign on to this document, we should eliminate some of the advocacy language like stating that the "ICANN model over complies"

from Jeff Neuman to All Participants: I will make those

from Jeff Neuman to All Participants: thanks

from Ozan Sahin to All Participants: Hi Kevin, the document has already been shared with the mailing list.

from Mary Wong to All Participants: @Fabricio - there was an earlier question from Maxim Alzoba, thus: "Question to 3rd comment: is there any info in support of assumption that lack of access to info , as , for example in .uk led to mass consumer fraud ?"

from Andrea Glandon to All Participants: If you have a comment or question for all to see, please send to all participants so that the speaker can see it as well.

from Kevin Murphy to All Participants: Doh! Cheers Mary.

from Belaid NOUAR to All Participants: why "journalist"is added to the list of Eligible Entities defined above? this kind of entity gas any relationship with security, investation or any other subject related to the public safty or security?

from Mary Wong to All Participants: @Maxim, all - please send your questions and comments to All Participants (not All Attendees), otherwise the speaker CANNOT see it.

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants: <comment> to page 4, the document might be better perceived by the community if Examples of entities not to be limited to Commonwealth

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants: ok

from Greg Shatan to All Participants: (Comment) Jeff, I think the facts can still be stated but in more neutral language. For example, The interim model applies privacy protections to entities not covered by GDPR. (Comment)

from Zak Muscovitch to All Participants: Sure

from Belaid NOUAR to All Participants: page 3: why "journalist"is added to the list of Eligible Entities defined above in the page 3? this kind of entity gas any relationship with security, investation or any other subject related to the public safty or security

from Jeff Neuman to All Participants: <QUESTION> Should there be a prohibition on all categories of accredited users/entities from providing any information it gets to any other party? In other words, the data can be accessed for their own internal purposes but cannot be disclosed further to any non-accredited entity.

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: How do you manage subsequent use of data in the journalist cases?

from Zak Muscovitch to All Participants: @Jeff - thats a good question; perhaps there should be a "deemed undertaking" to not disclose

from Zak Muscovitch to All Participants: @Stephanie, yes that is a good question as well, and complicates things

from Frederick Felman to All Participants: Regarding law enforcement use of whois data to comat cyber crime, here's an example of the UK metro police usage the metropolitan police is an extensive user of whois data for the investigation of crime, for example http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/8392600.stm

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: Requires accreditaton standards that pass on requirements of DP law.

from Frederick Felman to All Participants: *combat

from Marc Trachtenberg to All Participants: For "victims of online abuse" - is this intended to cover individuals that have been defrauded online? If so, that weems like a broad category that would be hard to confirm / accredit efficiently

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: Subsequent use will depend on purpose of access.

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants: <comment> Those topics are regulated locally, and Health Care Regulator of Country A has no authority over Country B. The same for the Public Safety agencies.

from Frederick Felman to All Participants: and http://www.worldtrademarkreview.com/Blog/detail.aspx?g=bd1a428f-053b-4a15-b978-994b6d7aaa2a

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants: about Public Safety and health orgs (page 5, 6)

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: A blanket "journalistic purposes" will not suffice.

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants: @Frederic, that case was possible due to .uk and UK police are in the same legal space ,

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: I would suggest that accreditation standards would not differ significantly from the kind of research ethics protocols that academics use, although I realize that folks may find that to be a burden after years of free access

from Sajda Ouachtouki to All Participants: Was this document sent out? I checked the calendar invited and couldn't find it attached

from Mary Wong to All Participants: To access the documents that the BC and IPC are referencing today, they were circulated to all who asked to join the call as of yesterday. You can find them here: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accred-model/2018-April/000004.html

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: That was with respect to subsequent use of accessed data, Fab

from Marc Trachtenberg to All Participants: For all categories, who is it contemplated will draft the terms of service that must be agreed to?

from Zak Muscovitch to All Participants: Yes, thats great

from Dean Marks to All Participants: I raised my hand, but now don't know how to lower it. Apologies. If anyone has suggestions about credentials for health and safety organizations, I would be happy to work together. The idea was that the accredited parties would be organizations, rather than individuals. Thanks all.

from Jeff Neuman to All Participants: <QUESTION> Is it the intent of this group to make the list of Eligible Entities be public so that data subjects know who could have access to their data?>

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants: <comment> ownership history is not provided now via WHOIS, so it is a new item

from Susan Payne to All Participants: QUESTION - what about DRS Providers - WIPO for UDRP for example. Rules require the provider top serve on the contact as set out in WHOIS

from Zak Muscovitch to All Participants: Excelllent, point Steve. Perhaps a specific reference to examining chain of title via Whois histories etc. can be helpful

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: DPAs have released a paper about the requirements for accreditation standards, see Art 29 working party documents for this February. Should be on the list of RDS working group documents

from Steve DelBianco to All Participants: Note the GAC advice fmor San Juan: 6. 6. Ensure confidentiality of WHOIS queries by law enforcement

agencies

from Jeff Neuman to All Participants: A Whois service for Eligible Entities :)

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: Do not expect DPAs to opine on every single potential release of data, across multiple jurisdictions, for every potential purpose. (friendly hint, I just don't think they have so much time to devote to ICANN)

from Zak Muscovitch to All Participants: I think what Susan may be referencing, is a specific reference to how UDRP etc. providers require access to serve complaints, etc.

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants: <comment> formally ICANN can access all fields of data without WHOIS - via escrow, and having a direct contact with ICANN for the interested third parties might eliminate need for pubilc WHOIS

from Susan Payne to All Participants: thanks Zak - yes

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: ICANN would of course, in the proposal Maxim just made, have a very clear role as data controller.

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants: yes, like in the current CZDS, where all third parties, can access zone files freely

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: This may not be the liability profile they prefer, but I would submit that this reduces the risk to registrants that costs are going to go through the ceiling for tiered access

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: However, the accountability and transparency mechanisms are simply not there with ICANN at the moment.

from Philip Corwin to All Participants: Ther issue of UDRP and URS provder access to WHOIS data in the performance of their functions has been raised in the RPM Review WG and the co-chairs will be proposing raising that issue with Council and ICANN management so it doesn't get overlooked. It's very important for keeping those non-judicial alternatives viable.

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants: though CZDS has impostors (people pretending to be from some particular company e.t.c.)

from Griffin Barnett to All Participants: Please advance slide to next page thank you

from Steve DelBianco to All Participants: regarding restricted or throttled access, see GAC's San Juan Advice, item 5.   Ensure that limitations in terms of query

volume envisaged under an accreditation program balance realistic investigatory cross referencing needs

from Cole Quinn to All Participants: Yes

from Susan Payne to All Participants: @Phil - yes I was looking at ICANN Cookbook and they state that DRS Providers should be accredited. Of course, that would mean accreditation for them needs to be in place on 25 May

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants: <comment> most probably parties representing interests of the particular TMs need access only to the records relevant to those TMs

from Steve DelBianco to All Participants: @Maxim -- but if I am investigating counterfeit goods, I may need to query domain names that bear no resemplace to my trademark, if those domains are selling counterfeit items

from Griffin Barnett to All Participants: Precisely Steve. The connection between the domain name itself and possible infringement may not be obvious just by looking at the domain name itself.

from Marc Trachtenberg to All Participants: Yes - sometimes you have no idea where the investigationwill take you. You are following breadcrumbs

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants: @Steve, there might be a way to describe that , due to the relevancy , but on the hosting level (content is not regulated by registries on new gTLD and Registrars)

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: Who did you get that feedback from, Fab? and does it comply with fundamental rights?

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: This kind of access is, generally speaking, not proportional.

from Fabricio Vayra to All Participants: @Stephanie - Feedback received during CPH session

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants: <comment> it might not be possible without contracting at least ICANN

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants: * about collection of historical data

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: Since the liability for subsequent disclosures of data rest with registrars and registries, I cannot imagine why they would be motivated to take on this risk.

from Gg Levine to All Participants: Do we know what entity would determine eligibility for accreditation?

from Ayden Ferdeline to All Participants: Will all comments submitted to that email address be published somewhere in their original, unanalysed format?

from Vanda Scartezini to All Participants: sorry in the road, just arrive in the office

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants: <comment> accreditation of unlimited number of parties (without any degry of control of is going on later) to full access of all WHOIS data is not far from full public access

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: Excellent question, Ayden. Possibly all parties should copy the GDPR email so they appear on the ICANN feedback page

from avri doria to All Participants: i thnk Reg's concerns go for many people. Some of whom may have stayed away for fear of presence seeming like agreement.

from avri doria to All Participants: i am just hear as a listener, for example.

from avri doria to All Participants: i mean ... here ...

from Griffin Barnett to All Participants: @Ayden - I believe ICANN is or has set up a publicly-archived listserv specifically for accreditation model discussions (accred-model@icann.org) and that comments to 3amcomments@gmail.com could potentially be posted there as well

from Griffin Barnett to All Participants: But I think comments to the gdpr@icann.org email address would also be appropriately channeled

from Philip Corwin to All Participants: @Susan--Thanks for pointing that out. I'll take a look at the cookbook. But I don't think it could hurt to raise the profile of the issue, as I have heard little to no discussion on that aspect of potential GDPR impact.

from Griffin Barnett to All Participants: That's just my personal understanding, but would defer to ICANN staff and the accreditation model drafting group etc.

from Mary Wong to All Participants: Thanks Ayden and Griffin. Yes, the accred-model@icann.org email is for a publicly-archived mailing list. Also, comments to ICANN can continue to be provided to gdpr@icann.org. ICANN Org does not run or have access to the Gmail address.

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: Who is the accreditation model drafting group, and was there a call for volunteers, and a charter?

from Susan Kawaguchi to All Participants: @ Stephanie, this is not an official GNSO driven inititiative

from Susan Payne to All Participants: @Phil - yes indeed, I completely agree that it needs to be highlighted and addressed as a matter of urgency

from Susan Kawaguchi to All Participants: as you stated in San Juan you were drating an accreditation model too.

from Susan Kawaguchi to All Participants: we are all brainstorming and trying to provide guidelines for an accreditation model

from Steve DelBianco to All Participants: will comments emailed to accred-model@icann.org ALSO be considered by drafters? (I assume so)

from Arnaud Wittersheim to All Participants: I may not have followed all the updates. I was wondering if there is a known timeline to implement the accreditation model? Will there be alternative proposals and a vote for to elect the model? will it be priorly sent to ADP?

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: I am proposing a standards working group to develop ISO standards, which is quite different from this exercise. However, some of the documentation and proposals will be useful to that exercise, and interested parties may wish to join workshops to discuss that work.

from Susan Kawaguchi to All Participants: Goran has repeatedly asked the community to provide an accreditation model just like he called for GDPR compliant RDS models

from Susan Kawaguchi to All Participants: @ Stephanie can you share your draft accreditation model?

from Steve DelBianco to All Participants: with Calzone model, however, ICANN Org made the unilateral decision on teh Interim model. It was not a bottom up policy development

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: As soon as the privacy commissioner of Canada announces the awarding of their research funding, I certainly can share that proposal. The proposal is to do the work to prepare materials and stakeholders who are interested in developing ISO standards. I have to find more $$ because the funding proposal was slashed but I am about to start that endeavour. I think it would be appropriate for ICANN to provide some inkind support (had to slash french translation of final report, for instance). However, this is a well known problem, not unique to ICANN, so I am optimistic that there will be support.

from Mary Wong to All Participants: @Stephanie, @Susan, all - as noted, it's important to have full community engagement on the evolution of a final interim compliance model, including accreditation. Following various discussions at ICANN61, the BC and IPC requested some support to facilitate community discussion on this accreditation model. We are providing support for this call and the publicly-archived mailing list to enable the full community to continue to discuss this topic. We're also encouraging the community to work together as well as share information on their efforts, including notification to gdpr@icann.org.

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: Great, we need a workshop time slot in Barcelona Mary, with remote participation. May I formally ask for that via this chat:-)

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: Coffee would be nice too, my hospitality budget had to be cut.

from Fabricio Vayra to All Participants: @Claudio - I can't find your question.

from Mary Wong to All Participants: @Fabricio, I think @Claudio may not have addressed his question to All Participants; I believe this was it: "has the group considered how EU institutions are approaching GDPR compliance, such as the EU IPO (trademark office)? e.g. see: https://edps.europa.eu/node/3112#regulation_ec_45-2001 "

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: Please remind people to identify themselves

from Susan Payne to All Participants: in response to Claudio, I don't think the same issue applies. European TM law provides for there to be the public register.

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: Was that Michael Karanicolas

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: thanks

from Jonathan Zuck to All Participants: I think that's just an assumption that GDPR is about a decrease in Whois. It's very possible that ALL of the uses of the whois fall within GDPR. It's possible they don't but equally possible they do. IT's not like whois motivated the passage of GDPR.

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants: disclaimer: I do not represent other Registries than .moscow and .xn--80adxhks, and can not speak for them or RySG

from Marilyn Cade to All Participants: I wonder if it might be better to have a space during ICANN62, not just ICANN63. This might be tough to arrange but having a time at ICANN62, with full remote participation, etc. will need to be asked for asap. It might need to be late afternoon, Day Zero.

from Nathalie Peregrine to All Participants: @ALL: PLEASE REMEMBER TO STATE YOUR NAME FOR TRANSCRIPTION PURPOSES

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: I agree Marilyn, sadly I could not till I had funding

from Marc Trachtenberg to All Participants: Even if this accredidation model were agreed upon today and accepted by ICANN, it is unlikely that it could be implemented by May 25 which means that Whos will go dark from a practical perspective for use in connection with investigation of illegal activity, infringement, consumer protection and other legitimate interests. I would like to get the view of people on the call for ICANN maintiing public accessibility for the minimum amount of WhoIs data elements which are reasonably necessary for effectively conducting consumer protection and other public interest research, investigation, and enforcement efforts online until the accreditation model is agreed upon and implemented. In my view this would be

Registrant name, Registrant organization, registrant email, regustrant city, registrant country

from Frank Michlick to All Participants: Public today unless there's whois privacy on the domains.

from Marc Trachtenberg to All Participants: @Frank - yes, agreed

from Bradley Silver to All Participants: what paragraph is this in the Hamilton memo?

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants: @Frank, also attorneys who represent interests of clients might be used without being a subject to P&P policy (where not only domain registration involved)

from Marilyn Cade to All Participants: Prevent child abuse, or investigate.. not "protect" child abuse. Just to correct the record on what was the intent of the statment, I suspect.

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: trying to unmute, it is not working

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: please unmute me?

from David Taylor to All Participants: Hamilton's analysis also disregards the differentiating view of the Article 29 Working Party on the concept of personal data under the Data Protection Directive. In its Working Paper 136, the Article 29 Working Party identifies "relating to" as one of the crucial elements of the definition of personal data (the definition of personal data in the Directive 95/46 will remain the same under the GDPR).

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: Please unmute me, I must have been muted by central control

from Mary Wong to All Participants: @Stephanie we are trying to figure out what the problem is.

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: Now I know I say unpopular things, but .....

from Nathalie Peregrine to All Participants: @Stephanie: you are unmuted now

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: looks like I can talk now if Fab can recognize me, thanks

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants: <comment> unfortunately even Registrant ID (which might be usefull for identification of bunches of domains registered for the same Registrant) seems to be regarded as a personal info ...

from Marilyn Cade to All Participants: For Staff/there are over 12-15 call in users. Can you be sure to gather names to add to the list of participants in this call?Perhaps they can send you their names.

from Ayden Ferdeline to All Participants: +1 Marilyn - important to know who has/is dialing in

from Mary Wong to All Participants: @Marilyn, we asked for folks who are only on audio/voice to identify themselves in the beginning. There probably are others who called in later, but as the call is already going on we have not interrupted to ask. Perhaps the moderator/leads can ask at the appropriate time? We do have the list of attendee names for all who are on the Webex tool.

from Marilyn Cade to All Participants: To furthe Ayden's comment: so that the list of participants is accurate and transparent.

from Frank Michlick to All Participants: <QUESTION> Who is designing the compliance checks for the use of the data by those who are accredited for access under this proposed model? Thinking of all the rampant whois data abuse currently going on.

from Anne Aikman-Scalese to All Participants: COMMENT - It may be time for companies to start making announcements that there are no legitimate sites for purchasing their goods and services other than a certain specific list. The fast-approaching deadline with no resolution of accreditation will mean that companies - especially pharma, infant formula, and toys, are going to have to start making LOUD public statements about the dangers inherent in Internet purchases. COMMENT

from Benny Samuelsen to All Participants: are there an estimated amount of accreditations which will be applied for?

from Marilyn Cade to All Participants: You did ask for that, and 3of the names were completely non understandable, but not challenged. WE now have many more. This should be a standard requirement for using ICANN resources. If one

does not identify oneself, then not allowed on the call. So, yes, those on the dial in should be told to send you their names.

from Ayden Ferdeline to All Participants: Yes, especially given the audience on this call largely does not believe in privacy...

from Susan Kawaguchi to All Participants: @Ayden that is not a true statement

from Vanda Scartezini to All Participants: remembering also that in developing world people use to connect through a NAT box to allow internet access to several persons under same IP....

from Susan Kawaguchi to All Participants: I personally truly believe in privacy

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants: <comment> Registries and REgistrars (outside of EU) are subjects to local privacy laws, and even finding the ways to stay complinat with GDPR might not resolve full access issues

from Susan Kawaguchi to All Participants: but a balance with consumer protection

from Susan Payne to All Participants: @Marilyn, @Brian given the comments of Reg and others about their concerns that there should be no assumption of agreement by their participation, it's possible some CPH participants don't want to identify themselves. Perhaps we should allow them to identify themselves simply as a contracted party if they do not want to identify them,seloves due to that concern. It's more important that they should feel comfortable to listen in

from Marilyn Cade to All Participants: Ayden, I am not going to agree that I don't believe in privacy, but I do believe in responsible accountabiilty and informed consent, and that some issues do trump individual privacy, IF one signs up to use a particular resource.

from Susan Kawaguchi to All Participants: Your statement would be comparable to me saying Ayden does not believe in consumer protection and I do not think that is true

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: just putting this comment on the record.....although I still want to speak.   Accreditation and purpose limitation for third party data access is a hard problem that ICANN has avoided grappling with by ignoring DP law for 18 years. We are in a rush now.

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: But we still need to do the hard work

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants: bye all, I hope there is a chance for full public comments in the future

from Vanda Scartezini to All Participants: totally with MArilyn concept

from Ayden Ferdeline to All Participants: @Susan Payne - There are people who would like to use the Domain Name System without being identified/harassed/etc too

from Marc Trachtenberg to All Participants: @Ayden - I echo Susan's comment. Its not that we don't believe in privacy - we are all also individuals who would like their privacy protected. But there are limits and this must be balanced against other very legitimate interests like consumer protection.

from Susan Kawaguchi to All Participants: I am muted

from Griffin Barnett to All Participants: +1 to Susan K and Marc

from Marc Trachtenberg to All Participants: @Ayden - for the people who would like to use the Domain Name System without being identified/harassed/etc, they can do that NOW, through free proxy services and free email accounts which are readily available

from Marilyn Cade to All Participants: I saw the comment from Susan Payne, but ICANN does not allow anonymous comments in the publid comment process. I understand that someone can say: my name/observer only but faiiling to say who are is failing in the ICANN mode

from Susan Payne to All Participants: @Ayden, then you should think my suggestion is reasonable; @Marilyn - but has anyone weho is non-identified on the phone bridge spoken?

from Greg Shatan to All Participants: I didn't say we had no time for hard work. I said the idea of creating a global national scheme for cybercrime investigators was out of scope and far beyond what's needed here. It's not the right approach now or 10 years ago.

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants: <comment> IP addresses can be substituted, and even Autonomous systems can be haisted (blocks of IP addresses), so it is not very safe

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants: also systems can be compromised (with valid IP addresses)

from Susan Payne to All Participants: My point is there may be some people listening-in and whilst it would be preferable to know who, surely we want them to join the next of these calls rather than refuse if they don't want to identify themselves?

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants: and RADAR is not a good example of a safe system

from Marilyn Cade to All Participants: That is not the point, Susah: everyone who joins an ICANN supported call should be listed in the participant list. And not be afraid of observing.

from Anne Aikman-Scalese to All Participants: For everyone concerned about genuine and authentic goods and services, begin to develop your public press rel.eases and ads re the dangers of an Internet system with no WHOIS access now. Full page ads and banners on authentic websites should be developed now. These will have to go up in early May in order to obtain any consumer protection effect whatsoever. Companies will also have to issue disclaimers of liability related to any counterfeit products or services - advising the public that if the product is counterfeit, the consumer will have no recourse.

from David Taylor to All Participants: Seeking to find a balanced solution based on legal grounds for accessing / public interest does not equate to a non belief in privacy.

from Greg Shatan to All Participants: We should just ignore the ad hominem statements. Thankfully there have been few.

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants: bye all

from Mary Wong to All Participants:

@Greg, @Rod, @Susan, all - reminder that accred-model@icann.org is a publicly-archived mailing list that anyone can join, to continue these community discussions. If additional calls are appropriate, please let staff know and again we'll announce and post recordings etc to the mailing list.

from Lori Schulman to All Participants: <QUESTION> Is there community consensus that RDAP will be implemented as the next gen RDS model?

from Michael Graham to All Participants: Michael Graham

from Kaydian Smith to All Participants: Could you kindly repeat the question

from Hans-Christian Mehrens to All Participants: Hans-Christian Mehrens, Faegre Baker Daniels

from Stephanie perrin to All Participants: in the normal world, we would all have SOIs. Just saying....

from Scott Hollenbeck to All Participants: @Lori: not a direct answer, but there are no other options coming out of the IETF.

from Mary Wong to All Participants: Thank you Brian.

from Chris Lewis-evans to All Participants: Agree with @Rod @Greg. <Comment> Is it mentioned in the document that this is a temporary solution and should not be considered to be a full system?

from Mary Wong to All Participants: @Stephanie, as noted, this isn't a formally chartered GNSO/ICANN group but an open mailing list/group to enable the community to discuss and continue to collaborate.

from Anne Aikman-Scalese to All Participants: IT IS NOW PAST DUE TIME TO EDUCATE THE PUBLIC ON THIS IMPENDING CHANGE AS IT RELATES TO DANGERS TO CONSUMERS.

from Marc Trachtenberg to All Participants: Hopefully this education will be more effective than that for new gTLDs..

from Greg Shatan to All Participants: Stephanie, another failing of ICANN is to organize activities like this far enough in advance to do things more formally.

from Mary Wong to All Participants: To join (if you haven't already): admin-accred-model@icann.org

rom Lori Schulman to All Participants: Please type email address into chat

from Mary Wong to All Participants: To post: send email to accred-model@icann.org

from Vanda Scartezini to All Participants: Agree GRed, could be a huge suggestion - will do the the former baord members lists that all running board reads..thank again for this event - quite constructive. have a nice weekend.

from Hans-Christian Mehrens to All Participants: hanschristian.mehrens@faegrebd.com

from Philip Corwin to All Participants: Apologies but I must now depart to be on an ICANN WG call, Ciao,

from Vanda Scartezini to All Participants: thanks to all nice weekend

from Marilyn Cade to All Participants: And congratulations to a real bottom effort by members of the community.