ICANN

Transcription ICANN Copenhagen

GNSO Registration Directory Services (RDS) Policy Development Process Working Group

Saturday, 11 March 2017 at 1:45 CET

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The recording and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:

http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Chuck Gomes: So let's go ahead and start the recording. Thank you very much and welcome to everyone. Again if there are any working group members in the audience please come up to the table.

We would appreciate you being up here. At the same time all of you are welcome and you are also welcome to participate. Notice that there is a mike in front of me back by the seats back there. So feel free to go up to the mike if you do want to contribute, ask a question, whatever it may be in that regard.

So this is the registration directory services. Next generation – well I have trouble with that whole long name. Next generation RDS PDP working group. RDS of course used to be called something else. I think it was called, Whois topic that has been going on most of ICANN's history.

And we welcome all of you here to the meeting today. Let's go ahead and put the slides up.

Woman: I am working on it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. The first thing we are going to do here is just ask if any of the working group members have an update to their statement of interest. Rod go ahead.

Rod Rasmussen: Thanks. Rod Rasmussen. So I don't have a change per se yet but as many of you know, at least a few of you know around here. I have officially retired from Infoblox as a full time employee. However I am doing some contract work for them still.

So I just wanted to make clear if somebody heard that I was no longer with Infoblox it was – I am still in a contract basis there. Just in case somebody raised that as an issue I just want to make that clear.

So no change. I want to make sure that there is no misunderstandings there. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Rod. I am somebody in this working group that could raise that as an issue. Just kidding okay.

All right you can go ahead and go to Slide 2. Well excuse me, no I don't want you to go to – go to the – there we go that is what I wanted. You were back one there. The introduction slide. Back it up a little bit.

Okay there we go that is what I wanted. So let me start of by introducing myself. My name is Chuck Gomes. I am the Chair of this working group. And we have fortunately in this working group three Vice Chairs.

And I would like them to introduce themselves. Starting with (Michael) on my right and then we will move to the left.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. (Michaely Nalem), Registrar. Is that all you want me to say Chuck? Do I need to give anything else? Okay.

Chuck Gomes: We are going to keep introductions quite brief. You can look us up and Google us and whatever you want to find out more about us or ask us on a break. Okay? Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: Susan Kawaguchi, I am with Facebook and a GNSO Counselor for the BC.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Susan. David?

David Cake: David Cake, Electronic Frontiers Australia. No longer a GNSO Counselor for the NCSG. Now just on the NCO Executive Committee.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you and we are very, very fortunate to have a great team of three staff members. Well actually more than that when you consider the logistical stuff that is done by staff. But three that help us in all of our policy work and let me start with Lisa on my left.

Lisa Phifer: Hello I am Lisa Phifer on behalf of ICANN staff.

Woman: (Unintelligible) ICANN staff.

Chuck Gomes: Is Amr Elsadr not with us today?

Amr Elsadr: Yes I am here. Amr Elsadr, ICANN staff.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thank you. Now throughout the meeting just one logistical point. Whenever you speak certainly use the mike and make sure the mike is

turned on and identify yourself before you speak. Keep in mind this meeting will be transcribed and recorded.

So those that may listen or read the transcript won't be able to tell who you are unless you identify yourself. So we appreciate your cooperation in that regard.

The next thing we are going to do is we are going to ask the working group members starting with Holly on my right over here to introduce yourself. And all I want you to give us just your name. And if you are representing a group you can cite the group but nothing more than that please because we don't want to spend a lot of time on introductions.

At the same time some of you may not have met in person some people who are here. So it is kind of helpful to put a face with a name from our many teleconference meetings. Holly would you start please?

Holly Raiche: Thank you Chuck. Holly Raiche ALAC.

Sarah Bockey: Sarah Bockey, Go Daddy.

Chuck Gomes: Make sure you get fairly close to the mike. It looks like you have to be fairly close for everybody to hear.

Sarah Bockey: Sarah Bockey, Go Daddy.

Mark Svancarek: Mark Svancarek, Microsoft.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Chris Pelling: Chris Pelling, NetApp one.

(Karen):   (Karen) (unintelligible) Monitor.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba (unintelligible).

Ayden Ferdeline: Hi Ayden Ferdeline NCUC.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin, NCUC and GNSO Council.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Rod Rasmussen;   Rod Rasmussen Infoblox, member of (unintelligible).

Timothy Chen: Timothy Chen, (unintelligible), member of BC.

Jen Taylor Hodges: Jen Taylor Hodges, ISPCP.

Mark Anderson: Mark Anderson Verisign.

Andrew Harris: Andrew Harris, Amazon.

Vicky Sheckler: Vicky Sheckler, IPC.

Greg Shatan: Greg Shatan, IPC.

Andrew Sullivan: Andrew Sullivan. I work for a company called, DIME which is now owned by
                  Oracle and I am for two more weeks a member of the intranet architecture
                  board.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much. Any working group members in the audience? Okay.
                  Let's go to the next slide please.

                  And I am going to turn it over to (Michaely) Whois going to bring everybody
                  up to date. Now we are not going to spend too much time in this because we

really want to get into moving ahead with our work in this meeting today. And that is where we are going to spend most of our time.

So (Michaely) I am going to turn it over to you and let you drive it from there.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Chuck. (Michaely) for the record. So the bit we are going to look at here now is quick review of our work plan and current progress to date and current status.

By way of interest, those of you who are not sitting at the table how many of you are members of the working group? Those of you sitting in the audience down below? Oh there is one.

How many of you are observers on the working group? No? Okay. There is one back there okay. So for a lot of you are not following – probably not following this thing as closely as those of us at the table. Next slide please.

Do I have power? I don't have the power to change the slides do I? If you could please thank you.

Okay so it is probably quite hard to read that unless your eyes are very good. But this is the current work plan and the highlighted bit is where we are at now. So we are in Section 12 which is deliberate on possible fundamental requirements.

So the kind of questions we are asking. Who should have access to gTLD registration data and why? And talking about the data elements themselves. What data should be collected, stored and disclosed. And then with respect to privacy what steps are needed to protect data and privacy?

Our focus in ICANN's 57 has been primarily around thin data and the collection of the data. For those of you aren't that familiar with all of the inner

workings of Whois. You essentially have two models, you have thin and thick.

Thin data – well the thin data elements would be things like the name servers, the registration whereas the registrant data is normally in the thick bit.

Over the last couple of months we have been trying to get the kind of temperature of the room on certain aspects of what we have been discussing. So we have been using some polls to get very kind of rough consensus on kind of general movement.

So if you bring up the next slide please Lisa.

Okay so these are initial points of rough consensus. This is not anywhere close to being final but this is what has come out of the polls that we have conducted over the last couple of months.

So the questions we have been asking, should detailed registrant thin data elements be accessible for any purpose or only for specific purposes? So we are still deliberating that.

But there is general agreement on the concept that every thin data element should at least have at least one legitimate purpose. And that every – that the already existing elements have at least one legitimate purpose.

Now looking into the specific purposes there is a whole list of them there. I am not going to read out the entire thing. This will all be available online.

There is also a document which you can get from our Wiki which goes through the key concepts which have been a working document. Now all of this has something that has been iterative and has been ongoing for the last few months. So I think maybe we just go onto the next slide please.

So for thin data we do existing gTLD registration directory service policy – oh god I can't read that. Do existing gTLD registration directory services policies sufficiently address compliance with applicable data protection privacy and free speech laws within each jurisdiction? Which is obviously a fairly complex question.

And there is general consensus that they don't. Whenever we are talking about purpose but we still as a working group need to agree on a purpose statement for the overarching ideas.

Sure go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Michaely). He is going to continue in a moment but that list of 19 items there is what we really accomplished so far other than the logistical things for the working group.

And I found this pretty helpful to me because like everyone in the group we get frustrated at the slow progress on this. But these 19 conclusions and they are not totally conclusions in the sense that we may come back to any of them and adjust them or delete them. We may add more as we go.

But the working group despite all of our differences and we have a few has really made pretty good progress in reaching these what I usually refer to as interim conclusions that will be the foundation of even bigger decisions that we make down the road.

So before I turn it back to (Michaely), is there anyone that has a question at this point? Okay go ahead (Michaely).

Michele Neylon: Thanks Chuck. Okay this lady is just going up to the microphone there.

Chuck Gomes: You were a little slow Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I know I am sorry. Must have been the jet lag.

Michele Neylon: Could you please state your name for the record?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes I will state my name for the record thank you. It is Anne Airman Scalese. I work for Lewis Roca Rothgerber Christie and I am a member of the ITC.

I asked the question in my individual capacity. Trying to understand when the group concluded that existing gTLD policies do not sufficiently address compliance with applicable data protection privacy and free speech laws. And understanding that that has to be in relations to the purpose for such data.

There is this very obvious jurisdictional issue where I know particular problems have arisen in the past with non-compliance with let's say the privacy laws of Ireland for example.

And we say, can't do it. Privacy laws of Ireland won't permit it. But has the group been addressing this question from the standpoint that you have to work with the most restrictive privacy laws that exist?

Or that you have to accommodate certain territories and jurisdictions? Or that a registry needs to be subject to the law of the particular jurisdiction from which it operates?

Because obviously it is very difficult to comply with applicable law of all jurisdictions all at once. And you know obviously I do also ask this question as someone who represents trademark holders who may be looking to find either fraudulent or infringing activity.

And in that case, if that ability is restricted, you know, to the extent that the private sectors aren't able to enforce against this type of activity and that burden falls on governments. So it is a question about the many, many jurisdictions that come into play.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Anne. This is Chuck speaking. A very good question and when we made that conclusion we weren't saying that is true for all jurisdictions. So we haven't gotten to that level of detail yet.

But the working group is aware in some of our deliberations. We are aware of jurisdictions some of which you cited where the current system does not comply. And so that is what that conclusion means right now.

As we move ahead both in developing specific requirements beyond just collection but also into access which will get into a little bit here today. And even how do we deal with different laws and different jurisdictions? Those are things that we still have to cover.

Michele Neylon: Thank you Chuck I am just going to add a comment as well just addressing the question. (Michaely) for the record.

Also bearing in mind this is – as Chuck said we haven't gone into massive detail on some of these aspects of our work so far. It doesn't mean – by saying what we have said here it doesn't mean that we won't be able to solve that further down the road.

You know that what we have said is that the current existing policies don't meet it. That doesn't mean that that couldn't change in the future. So I mean the thing I suppose is that when we are looking at some of the discussions we have been having, some of the questions we have been trying to address.

There is a risk that people will jump to a conclusion that the outcome at the end of all this will mean that certain things will not be accessible or that this

won't happen or that that won't happen or this is going to be a problem or whatever.

We haven't got there yet. So I mean what we are trying to do within this process is to address specific elements, specific questions and trying to tease out all the facets of it.

Is that okay Chuck? Okay so I have to run these things past Chuck because he will smack me as he is our chair. Any other questions or comments on this so far or shall I continue? Mr. Shatan.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Michele Neylon. Greg Shatan for the record.

First maybe I missed a meeting. I don't think I missed two but I don't recall or agreeing on 14 as a rough consensus with which I do not consent or consend or whatever the version of the word is.

I really, I particularly don't remember discussing how RDS even implicates free speech laws. So little bit less of a stretch maybe even a lot to talk about data protection and privacy.

But I specifically don't remember discussing free speech laws but I recall quite a lot of discussions of data protection and privacy laws. So that seems to have crept in there somehow. So if this is rough consensus it is very rough.

I am concerned about that. And whether it is the job of policies to address compliance or merely to provide enough flexibility for their users to address compliance is also a question I think we need to look at because I don't their policies can address compliance themselves with every law of every jurisdiction.

However, you know, address is a nebulous word but I wouldn't want to commit ourselves to somehow providing compliance advice for 170 jurisdictions for the – for Whois or RDS. I think that whatever we do it needs to be much higher level than that. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Greg this is Chuck. I think you missed more than one meeting. Not that I have kept track but for every one of these 19 conclusions the following has happened.

There has been a meeting where it was discussed and in that meeting there was pretty strong support, very few objections. Doesn't mean that there weren't any objections okay.

And then after that meeting we did a poll with the whole working group for two purposes. Number one, to confirm the conclusions that we took out of that meeting and Number two, to give opportunity for those who weren't able to participate in the meeting to express their view on the question.

Now did we specifically talk about free speech laws? I don't know that we did but I don't think that detracts from what the conclusion says. If just one of those things isn't met in some jurisdiction then the statement is correct. The current system doesn't comply with some data protection laws.

So you are welcome to go back and listen to the recordings. To look at all the poll results. They are all on the Web site and so forth. And notice that (Michaely) said that this is an iterative process. Are we saying that these are all final decisions by the working group? No and we have said that over and over again.

We will have to come back and revisit many of these. Probably reword them. Some we may delete. But I assure you that we have very deliberately followed the process I just described over the last several months.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Chuck. I noticed from Lisa's note that this was the February 14th call which was scheduled in conflict with the non-contracted parties intercessional or vice versa.

And since I had been flown to Reykjavik to participate in that call I think actually in that meeting there seemed to be higher and better use of my time and probably was asleep given the time difference.

I apologize not for attending that meeting and also for not being home for Valentine's Day.

I have got a cue here so I am going to go down through the queue. Next up Stephanie and then David.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin for the record and I am crushed Greg that you are not hanging on my every word because as somebody that brings this up fairly regularly the issue of free speech laws. It is pretty important to our constituency.

We talk a lot about privacy but there are confidentially rights. And in particular if we make a demarcation between individuals who are entitled to protection under data protection law and groups and associations particularly vulnerable groups and associations.

Those who do free speech. Those who do women's education in developing countries where this is discriminated against. They will be at risk.

And so buy me a beer now and I will tell you everything I have said on this and spare the group repeating it all. Thanks.

Greg Shatan: I recall that discussion but not about how it dealt with free speech laws.

Chuck Gomes: Let's not get into this.

Michele Neylon: Okay David.

David Cake: Really I mean Chuck has made the most important point I was going to say which is iterative deliberation ongoing. We realize that the consensus here may be pretty rough both in terms of, you know, the process arrived at this point but also when we go through and iterate through we may make some further distinctions.

I mean personally I think quite a few of the consensus on collection may change as we better understand the difference between collection and access and how do those differ, for example. So this will be iterated. Some of this may change. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: (Karen).

(Karen):   Hi (Karen) from (unintelligible) monitor. I have a comment about Chuck's – Chuck addressing Greg sort of attendance and those of us that maybe missed this stuff. This working group's mailing list is incredibly difficult for people to follow.

We had like what hundreds of emails in response to this international law enforcement letter which, you know, frankly in my opinion we just should have accepted and put into the record of the group and moved on. He had every right to comment on what they did. Different issue but.

I think that we are volunteers on this. A lot of us have other full time jobs and to suggest that we are – we somehow missed the boat on commenting on this because we didn't see an email about a poll that was buried in 300 other emails in one day on this list is I think – I didn't love your tone on that to be honest with you.

But my suggestion and my ask and my question is whether or not we can come up with a way to communicate action items a little bit better in this group so that they are not buried.

It is incredibly difficult for my clients, for myself and for my other allies in this space to follow this stuff. We are like – we are like asking each other – help ping when you see an action item. Ping when you see a poll and we are still missing stuff. Very, very difficult for our community to do that.

That is the number one message I am hearing from my side. And so when we say things like there has been a lot of support for this and only a little bit of objection. I am wondering two things.

First of all, how are we looking at that and so individual voices or are we looking at stakeholder groups or interest groups like as a whole? Or – and is it not because there isn't opposition on this but is it rather because the groups that were naturally opposed to these types of things aren't able to properly participate the way that this group is being run?

Chuck Gomes: So with regard to action items I am sorry if the tone comes across poorly. But after every meeting there are notes that are provided that have the action items. I know the difficulty of participating and I know that everybody is not going to make every meeting.

But the alternative is to finish or maybe never finish this working group in 20 years or to try and keep it moving. Now we are being very careful to not making any final decisions until later down the road when we will take formal assessment of consensus so that we make sure that there is plenty of time.

Frankly, as your Chair other than stretching this thing out for a couple of decades I don't see – I haven't seen any other way to do it. We are given plenty of opportunity. We are not making final decisions as David reiterated there.

If you can come up with a better way to do it that doesn't make this an indefinite PDP. I am getting private emails from people and some of them public on the list saying, this thing is going way to slow. It is going to take forever. I didn't sign up for this.

You probably recall, at the beginning we said it is going to take a long time but people are getting frustrated. So there is a balance that we have to maintain. We have to try and continue to make steady progress.

While at the same time not losing people. We don't want to lose people because at the end that will cost us. We have a process right now that everybody in the working group should be aware of that I described in response to Greg's question.

That requires some diligence on the part of members. I know that and that is hard. You never heard me say this was going to be easy. I know it wasn't.

(Karen):   Can I be clear that I never asked for more time. That I asked for clearer and more delineated communication so that we can more easily separate the sort of chatter on the list with the like actual action items of the group so that we can see them in a timely way when they come through?

That is what I asked for not additional time. I didn't ask us to stretch this out on 20 years. Trust me we don't have any interest in that.

Michele Neylon: This is (Michaely). I think it is an interesting question. I think maybe we can look at doing – the action items usually come from one of ICANN staff. They don't come from either myself, Chuck or David or Susan. Sorry Susan.

Now I don't know, I will have to check with staff on this. But there is a different mailing list alias which is used for the meeting invites and for other

kind of administrative things which it wouldn't be going into the same place as the actual general discussion list.

So you get the emails inviting you to the meetings. So if some of those action item things were sent to that list instead would that be helpful to you? No? I don't know I am just asking. I don't know the…

(Marie): We cannot – this is (Marie) we cannot do that because that is not publicly archived. That mailing list.

Michele Neylon: But could you send it to both? Sorry just in terms of let's say her filtering her email. If it is going to that other alias I am just asking. I don't know the ins and outs of…

(Marie): No so this is (Marie) again I don't think for that list that is an option because we use that specifically for non-archived emails. But as you noted, those emails come from either, you know, Lisa, myself or now Amr Elsadr as well.

We also always post the notes and working group agreements on the Wiki that for each meeting captures those items. So for people that cannot find it in the email the Wiki is the other place where all of this is captured.

And in preparation for every meeting we also always post all the documents and relevant information including links to polls in there as well. So again if people don't want to look at email please go to the Wiki because all the information is captured there as well.

Chuck Gomes: (Karen), Chuck again. Question, would it help if on the action item – excuse me the notes that follow each meeting if we just listed the action items at the top?

(Karen):   Probably. Because I will tell you that – I will do a search for Lisa's name because I know the messages that comes from her and I still end up with 200 emails like right?

And like she has so much work to be sending out. Updated tables and all this numbers and the thing – I mean I don't – somebody give her an award first of all.

Second of all, it is a lot of work that is going and a lot of times the polls will be like at the end of like a long list – like a recap of the meeting notes, things like that.

And it is just not easy for us to find. And as for what will help. I don't know I have to take it back to the community that I am working on behalf of.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks I appreciate that and we will try to make that more obvious. I just checked my folder for this working group and I am sure I have missed quite a few. But there over 6300 email messages in that folder.

So I understand and we will try to make the action items clearer. Pretty much we have been having a poll every week if we had some things to poll from the previous meeting. So that is fairly consistent.

And trust me I know the challenge – how much time it takes to do the email list because as Chair I try to read them all and it is hard. But if we will see if we can do better and if you have some ideas or some of your constituents have ideas please let us know.

Michele Neylon: Okay so Bradley and then (unintelligible).

Bradley Silver: All right, Bradley Silver I am just an observer on this group. So I have attended very few meetings than probably anybody else in this room. But

question about the rough consensus on Item 14. And the sufficiency of existing RDS policies.

Does that take into account mechanisms like the procedure for handling who it conflicts as well? Are we talking just about the policies on their face as being sufficient to take into account potential conflicts (unintelligible) discussion and the consensus around the sufficiency of mechanisms like the conflicts procedure?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks it is a good question. The – we didn't specifically talk about the policy on conflicts with local laws. So I will be up front about that.

What we had really focused on was the understanding we were getting with regard to especially in Europe some of the jurisdictions too where the purpose of an RDS statement needed to be clearly specified in order to comply.

And we clearly have not done that. Is that the only weakness? I am sure it is not. But that is just – hopefully that gives you a sense of how we got to this. And does that help a little bit?

Bradley Silver: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Michele Neylon: And just to add to that I mean one of the issues that hasn't been identified – sorry it is (Michaely) for the record. And there are lot of discussions when we start talking about privacy the purpose is missing a lot of the times.

So whether there are other things outside that is still missing the fundamental what is the actual purpose? Because that wasn't ever described.

Chuck Gomes: And just before you go to – my apologies Ann. But you will see today we are going to be continuing the work in recent weeks on a purpose statement. So you can see why we have been focusing a lot the last few weeks on a purpose statement.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Ann Aikman-Scalese again with Lewis Roca Rothgerber Christie. Earlier Chuck you mentioned the word balance. This is a word I love and it is so important in this area as you move forward.

Because I completely identify and agree with for example Stephanie's statement about the importance of free speech and that people be able to speak freely without being at the risk of being arrested or, you know, perhaps their speech is illegal in a certain country.

And as a community that we would want to protect that anonymity. On the other end of the spectrum you have the possibility of, you know, someone selling baby formula with arsenic in it.

In that context, that type of commercial speech as we call it in the U.S. should not be protected to that degree because the risk runs equally severely in the opposite direction.

And so balance here is extremely important and I think it really depends on what is the purpose of the domain and how are you using the domain? Because if it is for a pure free speech purpose there is nobody in this room that wants to dishonor that.

That you do have the kind of subset problem that you can have something that amounts to pure speech. But for example it could be corrupting someone else – something that someone else published then.

And let's say you have, you know, an (Alexander) (unintelligible) and let's say that that person's government goes in and changes, you know, whatever that person writes.

Then you can have again a copyright issue. You can even have a free speech issue by someone's speech being modified online against what they actually originally said. And in particular if it had been a political statement.

So it is a very complex issue. It is actually I think very important to distinguish between commercial transactions where things are being sold and consumer interest need to be protected. Where money is being gathered, collected for charitable purposes is it really a charity?

Those types of issues are very, very different from someone advocating a certain political point of view or I guess an opinion on laws of a country that they need to be protected from.

I had had the impression that the expert working group and I see Susan sitting right there. Had done a tremendous amount of work already on this issue.

And that there were a number of standards and guidelines that were developed by some of our, you know, deepest thinking, most experienced people. And I wonder where are those EWG results in this process?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. They have been an integral part of this process. We have referenced that document. It is one of the key documents we have to consider because it is part of our charter. That one you specifically mentioned.

We actually have I don't know if it is hundreds but a whole lot more documents from a lot of sources that we are using as resources. So it is part of that.

What you said, even what (Karen) said about the complexity. I hope those of you that are new to this will gain some respect for the volunteers in this working group in the challenges not only that they have been confronting but that we have to confront.

Because many of the things you talked about Ann we are going to have to deal with those going forward as we continue delivering. So I am sorry (Michaely).

Michele Neylon: Thanks (unintelligible) just identify yourself please.

Man: (Unintelligible) advisory council speaking in my personal role (unintelligible) at this point. I think what was said previously about balance is very important. But it is also even more complex because you get into who defines balance and how do we decide where that boundary kind of occurs?

Arsenic laced baby formula and women's rights are obvious. Right? I mean one good, one very bad. Everybody pretty much agrees. But there is this whole spectrum between free speech we want to protect and free speech that a lot of people would consider hateful.

For example, skinheads Nazi party kind of stuff. And then there is this whole spectrum in between and there are lots of things that the majority might consider objectionable that we might want to protect. Because sometimes protecting the rights of the minority is also important.

And so when we start trending on that we want to be very, very careful in how we do so.

Michele Neylon: Okay I have got a queue again. But Lisa, (Karen), David and then the gentleman who just stood up.

Lisa Phifer: Thank you. Lisa Phifer for the record. So for those that don't make meetings and calls and of course everyone is going to miss some at some time or another. If after you can pay attention to this working group again after you have missed a call just go to the home page on the Wiki.

Because there you will always find a link, direct link to the latest meeting minutes. You will also find a direct link to the latest poll as well as the date that the poll is due.

Now I did take the comment that we may find another way to raise the or highlight that for you. But for now just so you know, that is a very easy way to find out after a meeting that you have missed where the notes are and where the link is to the most recent poll and what date it is due.

Following onto the question that was raised about the role of the EWG report and our work. Also wanted to myself point out that in the working draft that we have been building with the rough consensus points.

We actually do have some excerpts from the EWG report that were relevant to the particular question that we are deliberating on. So we are trying to look at pieces of that very large report in context as we move through the questions of purpose, data elements and privacy.

And follow onto that I wanted to raise a comment that was submitted from the remote participants. Fabricio Vayra who many of you probably know is a member of the EWG.

And Fabricio said maybe this is taking so long because instead of reviewing where the EWG report fits properly per policy or tweaks per policy we seem to often be recreating the wheel.

Michele Neylon: Okay I have (Karen) and then David.

(Karen): On the first page of these initial plans for rough consensus there were a couple of references to legitimate purposes. Please go back. Can you go back?

Michele Neylon: You actually should have a copy of the slides as well. We sent them out by email.

(Karen): Yes I don't (unintelligible) as we discussed. So the legitimate purpose. Okay has there been any work on trying to figure out what legitimate purpose means? Have we done that? Is that something missed? What constitutes a legitimate purpose? Have we discussed that?

Man: No not directly but each working group member is asked to give us their opinion in terms of this particular purpose is a legitimate purpose. And what we are saying is that there is – and probably every one of these cases more than what any of us would accept is a minimum rough consensus. Okay?

And that is why we are asking working group members if you have seen a few of my emails you have probably seen me say we need your participation in this because we want your opinion.

If you don't give it to us we are going to move on because we have limited time.

(Karen): So as a follow up on that I find it very, very difficult to not have a standard for what is considered a legitimate purpose in the group because we have such wildly divergent views about this very issue.

That there are clearly things that are very legitimate to a rights owner that are like violently opposed on the list. But does that make it illegitimate because people in this working group are opposing it? What is the standard – so anything that anybody proposes is legitimate then?

Even though people agree? Do you understand like why I am confused about legitimate purpose and then I can't necessarily say there is rough consensus on these questions then because I don't know what we are saying.

Michele Neylon: (Michaely) for the record. Okay I was part of EWG as you know and one of the things that we were looking at there was the (unintelligible) about legitimate purposes.

The way we approached it back then was to try to come up with every single possible purpose that people and organizations could have. And then to try within those – I mean we had kind of general kind of – trying to work out how the best way of wording this would be.

The general idea being that if the purpose was purely to commit a crime, spread malware, damage the DNS or anything that which please tell me you can't think is legitimate. That we would consider it not to be a legitimate purpose.

But everything else we tried to look at and say okay, it is legitimate. We may not like it but that doesn't render it illegitimate. So while example there was some discussion around how CAs use Whois data.

Now whether we like what they are doing it is a perfectly legitimate use of the data. Now one could argue and some of us have directly or indirectly that there are other ways for them to get to that, et cetera, et cetera.

But it is still does nothing inherently wrong with that enough for us to decide that is a legitimate purpose. So while I can understand that if you want to kind of focus on the fact that some people may not agree with what you consider to be a legitimate purpose for the data. You are not going to actually get anywhere because ultimately if that was a barrier then it will fail.

But if you work on a basis that at a higher level we are accepting that yes there is agreement about this usage and everything else. But that doesn't render it illegitimate. I don't know if I am – am I making myself…

Chuck Gomes: (Michaely) excuse me I am going to jump in here. We are going to need to move on our agenda. Let's finish the queue that I have and then I have a comment about one thing that I am very concerned about.

Michele Neylon: I have David and then the gentleman.

David Cake: David Cake. So I just wanted to – I mean this is more or less a reply to the comment from Anne. Now I want to remind people that are working at the principle level and we have a whole Phase 2 and 3 in the future.

Where we will discuss mechanisms and a lot of the details of how we trade off one set of principles versus another or handle the contradictions to them or perceived contradictions or something might be an example.

And I really want to in case of like the free expression and things I want to draw people's attention. In the EWG report there are some really interesting discussions about this and mechanisms (unintelligible).

I mean looking at the secure protected credentials section I think. And other ideas for how we might implement this are really interesting. But they are definitely Phase 2 and 3 issues not Phase 1.

So just the fact that we are not able to sort out all the – some of the perceived conflicts or perceived, you know, issues may in fact be solvable with mechanisms we address in later sections of this probably, you know, extremely long process.

We don't need to address every find mechanisms by which we resolve the tensions between principles at this point. Thank you.

Jim Emerson: Thank you sir. I am Jim Emerson. I am with the International Association of Chiefs of Police and a member of the Public Safety working group. I understand that a resolution produced by the ICP drew informally from the working groups some questions and comments.

And so I thought that possibly appearing and presenting a 30 second iterative process of my own in terms of information might be helpful to the working group.

The ICP is 120 years old. It is a professional law enforcement organization, association. To be a member of the ICP, one the 30,000 current members that exist as active members of the ICP you have to be an active law enforcement officer.

You have to be sponsored by another existing member who became a member as an active law enforcement officer. The board of directors are elected officials within the organization. They sit for a period of five years. They move from vice presidency up to presidency of the organization.

There is an executive committee. There are 30 standing committees which deal with policy issues that affect law enforcement across the globe. We have collaborative with Europol, Interpol, Ameripol because we are affecting decisions, policies, support training, awareness for law enforcement executives across the world.

I have had representation from the Belgium Federal Police on a kit committee that I chair. I have had people from Latin American countries, Bogota, Columbia, from the national police department sit in decision making caucus.

The resolution that was presented to this working group took a year to work through and it was merely an update of an expired resolution that had been created by the organization seven years prior.

Resolutions only exist for five years. They expire. They have to be updated. The technology has changed. The technological considerations needed to be addressed in the new updated resolution.

We are very concerned that this working group understand law enforcement concern across the globe with regard to registry database considerations, data, thin, thick, et cetera as it relates to law enforcement in the sense that digital evidence is an increasingly difficult landscape for law enforcement to deal with.

And we view registry data and registrant data as the first step in understanding what legal access to that digital evidence actually is. So we appreciate your consideration in listening.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you and we appreciated getting the motion sent to us by one of our members as you know I think. And what I would do is to welcome you or someone from your group to become a member of our group. We would welcome that.

Michele Neylon: Thank you. I have Greg I think in the queue and then we are going to try to move forward with the rest of the agenda.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan I will try to be brief. I will fail. The idea here is to comment on the idea of purpose. We have talked a lot about purpose but we haven't always been very clear about what the purpose of purpose is.

Are we just talking about it is nice to identify why we are doing this thing because otherwise there would be no reason to. Or is it getting to issues of how purpose and primary purpose and secondary purpose fit into data protection and privacy laws in different countries.

And if we say now that something is or isn't a legitimate purpose or a primary purpose that six months from now we are going to find out that we just signed away the right to have a certain level of access to that data or that certain actions would need to be taken?

So I have gone with the issue of purpose somewhat cart before the horse because I don't and hopefully the iterative process will take care of this. And I have comment this regularly in the polls when I responded to polls on purpose.

That we have to be careful about asking for comment and considering purpose until we consider how the denomination of a purpose is used in the policy and implementation of RDS.

So any discussions about purpose I have been quite uncomfortable trying to answer whether something is or isn't a purpose because it is like trying to guess whether what's behind Door Number 3 is the lady or the tiger and the door is closed.

So I am not going to commit to a purpose unless I know what the end result of that is. So I guess this goes back to the doctrine of unintended consequences. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Greg shocked again. And I said earlier that I wanted to come back and make an observation on my own personal part.

In the early months of the working group we found ourselves periodically spending excessive amounts of time wordsmithing. And I perfectly understand that there are times when we need to do that.

But I also understand that if we spend all our time wordsmithing we will accomplish nothing. So I challenge everyone working group members and

those that are contributing to this process externally to be as constructive as you can and let's not spend our time wordsmithing.

We will need to do that sometimes but evaluate whether you think that is going to really help us. Like you just said Greg, we are doing this intentionally in an iterative way so that we can go back and fix things and so forth.

But I just ask everybody to try and be as constructive as possible and not get us stuck on wordsmithing unless it is absolutely necessary. And I know you may think it is absolutely necessary.

The leadership team and one of the reasons why when I was asked to be chair I said I would really like to have three vice chairs so that we can collaborate together and try and make good decisions for the working group.

Not based on what I think based on what we as a team think and we communicate that with the working group to get your feedback. Now I am going to draw this part of the meeting to a close and let (Michaely) finish the last slide and then we will continue.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Chuck. Okay so next slide please. Right then. So, obviously as this is ICANN we need to swamp you with lots of text by producing lots of reports. So as per our work plan we will have various draft reports at various stages.

So our initial report we use rough consensus, fundamental requirements in five areas. So you have users and purposes, registration data elements, privacy, gated access and data accuracy.

Which is all to establish foundation to answer a fundamental question which is a new policy framework and a next generation system needed to address these requirements? So that is the overarching question or the key question. The founding question.

And I will now hand over to Susan I believe. Is that correct? Thank you.

Susan Kawaguchi: Susan Kawaguchi for the record. Thank you all for being here. So we have a session there is a cross community working session with data commissioners from the EU. So we wanted to take advantage of their attendance and their expertise.

And there was a small working group that some of you – there is about six or seven of us on the working group within the PDP here. And we developed and drafted questions for the data commissioners. That was sort of an ongoing process the last two or three weeks.

And full working group provided its input. We refined the questions and brought it down. We were aiming for 10 to 12 questions and actually we came up with 19. So you can see there are a lot of questions within this group. A lot of discussion.

So we have provided those questions to the – Becky Burr Whois leaving the panel and she may or may not use these questions during the panel. But they are there. We have submitted them and hopefully some will be asked.

What we are looking for is members of the PDP that volunteer that are going to be in that session to take, you know, one of the core areas that you will see on the slide here. Purpose, registration data elements, access, et cetera.

One of those core areas and monitor the session to see if did our questions a) get asked? If it didn't get asked did it really get answered in some way? Maybe in a different version of the same question. Did we get the information we were looking for?

And also if we have the opportunity then if the queue isn't too long then would you be willing to stand up and ask questions during this session? So we are looking for a volunteer for each of these topics here.

Purpose, registration data elements all the way down to consumer protection. So if I am counting right we need seven working group volunteers. So if anybody just wants to raise their hand now and grab a subject or if you want to just send an email to the RDS email list we can take it that way too. Any volunteers?

Okay well…

Man: We have got one.

Susan Kawaguchi: And what subject? You get to pick your subject. I will tell you in just a second.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Susan Kawaguchi: Oh thank you.

Vicky Sheckler: I will take personal privacy and human rights.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. Any other volunteers? Did I miss anyone? Okay well we will be sitting in the room also and monitoring all of this and taking notes so hopefully – but if anybody wants to – yes Lisa.

Lisa Phifer: So in case it is not clear. So under each of these categories we, the working group identified just two or three questions in this category. So what we are looking for is for you to volunteer to listen for those two or three questions to come up in either Monday or Wednesday's session.

And then if they don't come up to get it yourself in queue and to raise one or two of those questions. Just as a way to divvy up the work of getting this working group's questions onto the floor for discussion.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thank you Lisa. Okay well you can always send me an email. Lisa an email or just to the regular RDS.

Man: I will take one.

Susan Kawaguchi: What was that?

Michele Neylon: Ayden Ferdeline has volunteered to take anything (unintelligible).

Susan Kawaguchi: Well Ayden Ferdeline which one – which topic area would you like?

Ayden Ferdeline: I would prefer consumer protection but I am open to any.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. Thanks very much to (Vicky) and Ayden Ferdeline for volunteering. And keep in mind we don't have any control over that cross community session. We are not running that. But will have a follow up working group meeting Wednesday afternoon. We have only got about 90 minutes I think if that much.

                We will – at least two of the data commissioners, I think only two. Me and (Peter Kimpian). Two of the data commissioners will be with us on Wednesday. But those two are going to try and speak to the whole group of data commissioners that are with us on Monday.

                And we will try to ask as many additional questions that we can in that session as well. Now our goal and our hope for the cross community session or working group session is not to deliberate and make decisions on those.

But let's make sure as a working group that we understand the European data protection and privacy requirements as best as possible. Because we have got to grapple with all of these competing issues like law enforcement and their needs and intellectual property protection.

Those are all important needs too. And you know, I use the term balance. It was repeated. We have got a challenge in front of us but hopefully this week we will leave here with a better understanding of those requirements.

Okay so we talked a little bit about purpose. Let's continue our deliberation on purpose. We have been talking about it for several weeks now in the working group. And we had a poll just last week based on some discussion that happened in our working group meeting on the 7th of March.

And so what we are going to do right now is take a look at the results of that poll. Talk about them including talking about some of the comments. And so Greg you might actually see one of your comments here. You will be welcome to jump in.

So if we can bring up the results on the poll we will move away from our slides here a little bit. The – and maybe do we have the lead in into this from the poll? Probably not.

Woman: We can load it if you wish.

Chuck Gomes: You mind loading in case we need to let's have it ready okay. All right so one of the proposed purposes that we deliberated on this past Tuesday. Last Tuesday yes or was it Tuesday. We had trouble with the wording.

This was a case where the wordsmithing was kind of important. And so what we decided to do rather than spending much more time on the call trying to agree on the wording. Staff kindly took some of the thoughts that were

shared and came up with these alternative options for wording on this statement.

And there are key words. You will notice in the first two a key word is authoritative. I am sure we will have some discussion on that. And then you go down and you see the term facilitate dissemination used instead of providing authoritative.

There are little variances. All of them are around the same general idea. But you can see in the poll and there were 18 respondents. So people were able to pick more than one if they wanted to. That is why the number of responses is more than 18.

It wasn't a great turnout but it was a very busy week and we understand that and a lot of people were traveling.

You can see the two strongest are the first and the next to last. And let's scroll down to the comments. Which I think is the next – there we go.

So these are the comments that were submitted on this one. And I will let you know that I think I have been pretty successful for so far of reading all of the comments.

In fact in the previous poll that we did after discussion with the leadership team we actually made some changes. Even though the numbers showed very strong support we thought some of the commenters actually made some points that really made a lot of sense.

And so we put before the working group a little change in the way they were worded and those changes were accepted. So I will let you glance at the comments. I am not going to read them to you. But certainly the word authoritative some people had a problem with.

What I am going to do right now is just open it up for any working group members or if you want to comment from the audience you are welcome to. That is one of the purposes of these face to face meetings.

So any of you whether you are one of the people submitted one of these comments or not let me open it up for discussion on this particular poll question.

I better look in Adobe I don't see anybody. Okay Stephanie you get to be first.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I really just wanted to respond to what Andrew just said in the chat here that getting rid of authoritative is a mistake.

I was one of those who voted in the 50% block there to get rid of authoritative. And it is not that I don't agree that authoritative data is necessary and that we have got a problem right now.

It is that there is kind of an ellipsis here by saying authoritative. That assumes a whole lot of discussion about data quality that we haven't had yet. And exactly haven't even reached the conclusion that the authoritative data source is the thin data layer in a system that we haven't decided on the structure of.

So to me I appreciate Greg's comments about the power of words. I am also pretty focused on the power of words and that is why I am trying to throw the ones out that we haven't got agreement on so far. I am sure we will at some time but we have to be patient. Thanks bye.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Stephanie. Andrew.

Andrew Sullivan: Andrew Sullivan. So authoritative has a technical meaning. This isn't just a word that people throw around for no reason. So one of the things that has happened I think over time as fewer and fewer geeks are actually involved in making these policies is that people forget that underlying all of this is a technical system that has certain properties.

And the authoritative data in a system is the data that is officially in the real repository. It is in the real records. Not some other records or something. Traditionally, and this all comes of course from the DNS which is – after all what this is all about the bottom right?

So when you get an answer to the DNS you don't always get an authoritative answer because sometimes you get it from a cache and so it is an old answer or whatever.

And when you want to know what the real answer is you ask the authoritative servers. Those are the ones that they are officially listed in the DNS for that domain name.

And so the meaning of authoritative here is exactly the same thing. That is you want out of the registration data system you want the real data and not some other kind of data.

And if we don't agree about that then I agree with you that we really had better come to agreement about it. But if we don't have an agreement about that then it is time to set this set of questions aside.

This isn't about wordsmithing anymore. This is about what kind of data is that we expect we are getting out of the system?

Chuck Gomes: Andrew if I can pick on you a little bit and do a follow up. This is Chuck. In the current system, the Whois system do you have an opinion as what the authoritative data is?

Andrew Sullivan: Yes. So there are several – well this is a slightly complicated answer and I am sorry about that but we are going to have to get into nasty details here. So when you make a query to a thin Whois system right now frequently what you get because it goes from the top down.

What happens is you talk to the registry which then gives you a referral and then you talk to the registrar. In the past there was this period where a lot of Whois clients shift with, you know, sort of preexisting servers that they preferred.

And so they would ask just any server at all. And those were supposed to refer you back the other way and it didn't work.

And so what happened sometimes is that you would get an answer from a registrar that used to be for this domain name. You would get stale data and that is actually where most of the controversy that lead to thick Whois came from.

Now that we have gotten mostly thick Whois registries running. What happens today is when you query you actually talk to the Whois server run by the registry. Most of the implementations of which I am aware are literally talking to the registry database. They are front end on some sort of query.

Now maybe it is not the one that is the rewrite database right? Maybe it is a copy of it or something like that but it is the real database underneath that. And that is because engineers are lazy. They are not going to write like a completely new database design just to solve this Whois thing right?

So what happens is you get answer out of the people who really have the data about that thing. Now whether the data is false. That somebody put crappy data in there or they lied or you know the registrar or the registry had

a bad day and so like they messed up all of the records or anything like that. That is all possible.

But what you are getting is the authoritative data. That is the stuff that comes out of the real repository that is the real source of the registration data at that moment.

That doesn't mean that it is the correct data, you know, sort of under the eye of eternity. But it is the right data under the eye of the registry at that moment.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Other comments on these options? Stephanie did you want to respond to that?

Stephanie Perrin: Yes Stephanie Perrin for the record. I just want to say I absolutely get it Andrew and I absolutely agree with you. And I think that possibly if we had said, authoritative (in a technical sense) – close bracket rather. I would have been happy to vote for it.

Because what I am really worried is about the verification and data quality issues that bring immense concerns from a privacy and a cost perspective. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Stephanie and thank you Andrew. One of my concerns with authoritative and I did the poll and I didn't pick one of those. And the reason I didn't isn't because I don't think we eventually want to get to authoritative information. That is I think a no-brainer.

But kind of like some of your arguments have been Stephanie on other issues not wanting to preclude what might happen down the road. I think there are still quite a few options in terms of what the RDS may look like.

One of the models being discussed quite a bit right now is a federated model. Where the RDS doesn't, you know, it is really – I am not a technical person so I have to be very cautious here and you have to be very cautious in terms of what you believe and what I say.

But the authoritative data would come from the source of that data I think in the federated model. As long as we can – I don't have any problem with the word authoritative as long as we realize let's not close our options down the road in terms of what the implementation will look like?

And (Michaely) talked about this a little bit. Our three phases, we haven't gone over this today but the first one is just developing requirements. Second one is developing policy and third one is implementation.

A lot of what we are going – that will affect this whole thing is policy and implementation. So that is another place where it will be iterative. We may have to come back and say, wait a second that requirement doesn't work because we can't implement it effectively or cost effectively or whatever.

So we don't want to spend too much time on this particular question here. Stephanie you kind of suggested some tweaks to the use of authoritative. Do you want to take another crack at that or someone else want to do that?

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin. I think there is a problem here, a broader problem that perhaps I am sorry that Greg is not in the room. We might actually agree. It happens rarely so I cherish every moment.

We need to understand how people use a particular word. And the use of authoritative is no doubt as Andrew described in the technical community maybe different somewhere else.

Accurate. Fabricio just made a comment in the chat. Yes, data has to be accurate for data protection purposes but the responsibility for that accuracy rests on the data collector.

And that actually refers to the accuracy of the records in the old sense. It doesn't mean that you get to go back every day on a real time basis and make sure your data is accurate. And we saw that in the Canadian legislation by saying, as accurate as necessary for the purposes.

That is all covered under proportionality. So I don't want to go into a big long talk but basically the way we understand these words is nuanced in each particular jurisdiction. It is partly why this is going to take 10 years because we don't necessarily understand each other.

And some of us have to break in and explain something and interrupt the flow all the time. And I am sorry but I think we are stuck doing that unless we come up with a major lexicon of how everybody uses some of these key words.

And maybe it would be worth it to do that because we seem to have these discussions on a regular basis.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Stephanie. David.

David Cake: So Andrew yes, obviously the leadership as you have heard us discuss this issue. I mean it is true that I think when you are discussing using a term like authoritative in a DNS context people are naturally going to assume that it is used similarly to the way it is used within the DNS.

And it is also true that I think we would be jumping into sort of Phase 2 and 3 issues if we were to use it to – suggest too strongly that it must always be authoritative.

Because there are certainly reasons in some impossible implementations where it might – the answer you get might not always be authoritative in the same sense that the (unintelligible) answer you would get is not always authoritative.

So I mean personally I would probably – and speaking in only a semi-personal capacity I think perhaps we should avoid the word and find even if we are keen to imply something similar we might use a different word that is not going to be taken to presume a particular a property of the technical architecture, rather (unintelligible) of the, you know, way in which (Dotter) is brought into the system or similar. And would – also like to say if anyone in the group is not understanding what this discussion about the technical use of the term authoritative I'd be happy to sort of talk you through that individually. But probably we shouldn't get too much longer in the public session. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks David. Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thank you Chuck. Lisa Phifer for the record. However, I'm actually playing the role of Fabricio Vayra who is remote today. Fabricio wanted to raise a comment that we debated this at length within the Expert Working Group and again he feels we're recreating the wheel.

Per Article 29 Working Party 76 Opinion 2/2003 the data needs to be accurate; which during the EWG the conclusion the EWG reached was that we would refer to Thick data and then sell on authoritative data.

I also wanted to raise a follow-on comment from Chuck that (Aiden) actually made; which he asked should we be distinguishing between an authoritative source of data and authoritative data itself.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you for those comments. Holly, you're next.

Holly Raiche: Thank you Chuck. Holly Raiche for the record. I actually very much appreciate the definition that Andrew gave. I think it works with us. In terms of accuracy let's also remember there are requirements in the 2013 RAA about accuracy in that sense. That's probably the standard of accuracy that we're going to have.

So we don't need to go back there because we've had those debates. So when we're talking about authoritative I think what we're talking about is the data that is in the relevant place where it should be. And assume that the other requirements of the RAA have been met.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck, Holly. So you support the use of the word authoritative there. Thank you. And I think Andrew you're up.

Andrew Sullivan: Thanks, it's Andrew Sullivan again. So I don't want to get bogged down in terminological discussions here. But I do want to make sure that we're in agreement that in a data theoretics sense what we're trying to get to here is authoritative data and not other kind of data.

And I think that we'd better – like if we disagree about that then this question is the wrong one because we need to sort out that question instead. And that's the thing that I'm really concerned about. So if we want to call it, you know, Bob the Flying Wonder Monkey instead that's okay with me as long as we're in agreement that what we're talking about is everybody is getting the same Bob the Flying Wonder Monkey all the time.

You know, probably from that source whether it's because you've got (TLS) and you're connected to it. Or you're talking to the right server or you've got signatures on the data; whatever the mechanisms are for how you get that. It's the real official data out of the repository in some sense; or going into the repository since we're actually talking about data that we collect right now rather than data that we access.

So I – maybe I could ask the chairs to sort of try to make sure that we're in agreement about that because if we're not I think we're arguing about the words is – we're at the wrong level.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Andrew. This is Chuck. I want you to do something. I want you to make that statement again and then I'm going to ask those in the room and I mean just for the sake of getting you involved out there and you're welcome to participate. After Andrew makes the statement I'm going to ask you whether there's anybody that disagrees with the statement he made.

And I want you to raise your hand in the room. If you're in Adobe remotely just put a red X in Adobe, okay? So Andrew would you restate that please.

Andrew Sullivan: Yes, let's see if I can do it. What I'm trying to make sure is whatever we want to say, the RDS is facilitating. It is in some sense access to or collection of the data from the repository relevant to that registration.

Chuck Gomes: I'm not sure that's – everybody's going to get that. Let's let David help here, okay.

David Cake: So I liked – are you trying to simply – are you trying to say that there is a, you know, there should be a single source of data to which we – and definitely not multiple or are you trying to make a – I mean basically are you saying that the way in which authoritative used within the DNS should be a principle or are you saying that - no you're definitely not.

So you're not trying to make a statement that we should like preclude under certain circumstances a query returning like a, you know, a cache store, you know, not…

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Sullivan: No.

((Crosstalk))

David Cake: No. Yes so you're just trying to…

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Sullivan: So…

((Crosstalk))

David Cake: …so you're just trying to preclude that answer. You're simply saying there is only one place that answer should ultimately come from even if in some cases you might get a sloppy qualified version of it?

Andrew Sullivan: Right. The reason I picked on DNS is because that seemed to be the one that people might be familiar with. But in general authoritative data is a data theoretic term, right. There is a repository of some data.

And there's one place that really is the current authority for that thing and that is the data that you're trying to get and not some other kind of data. So in the past we had other examples where, you know, data would come from the wrong place or whatever. And it would be the wrong data. It would be really stale cache or something like that, that's the problem with the old WHOIS system for instance.

And I just – I want to make sure that what we're agreeing to here – whatever we call it is there is one canonical source of the data. And that canonical source is the data that we're talking about, not other sources, not other kinds of data and so on.

Chuck Gomes: So Andrew, just to follow up on that. Are we then agreeing or that our goal is that if there's an RDS it contains RDS – excuse me – contains authoritative data?

Group: No.

Chuck Gomes: That's why I asked.

Andrew Sullivan: Well I don't know why people are saying no. So…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I don't know why either but…

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Sullivan: I mean it contains authoritative in this narrow sense that I'm using the term. But that's the reason that I'm prepared to say, you know, like maybe it's something else. Maybe people mean something else. (Michaely) is shaking his head like crazy so he must feel strongly about this.

Chuck Gomes: So I have to call on (Michaely)?

Michele Neylon: Yes you do. (Michaely) for the record. Okay. I think we can agree – I think we're just – there's a couple of words that have kind of added in there which is why I'm shaking my head violently.

So going back to your DNS example, we can agree that if I want to know the IP address for (Michaely) dot blog, the authoritative name servers for this are the only place that you will get that data from. But how you get to the – just hold on, wait, wait, please wait.

But the only way you get there – it's how you get to that data and get it back – but that's – there's a kind of an authoritative path as it were to the data. So having the RDS as being the authoritative path – the path to the authoritative data or the path to the authoritative source being that – I don't have an issue with.

But if you say that the RDS is going to hold the authoritative data then I do have an issue with this. And I think you actually said something similar to that already.

Andrew Sullivan: No actually I'm saying the inverse of that. I don't care how you get to the data. For instance in the DNS today it isn't true – you can get authoritative data – provably authoritative data from the DNS from a cache today. That's the whole point of DNSSEC is to be able to prove that you've got data that is really the authoritative data, even though you didn't ask the authoritative server. You didn't used to have that, but that's what DNSSEC gives you.

And so I agree with David actually that we don't want to preclude an architecture here. And so then saying actually that the path is the important thing would entail an architecture and I'm trying to, despite my natural tendencies, I know how to build this thing, dammit.

I really am trying not to preclude that architecture but I think that we need to be talking. We need to be narrowing our focus to just the repository that really is the authority for any given datum. And recognizing that the RDS might be a distributed system and so the authoritative data could lie in multiple repositories because it's a distributed database.

But for any given datum there is one authoritative source and that's the data we're talking about and not cache consistency and all of the other possible things that could be a problem in here. I think that that is – that's a distinction that I want to make sure we're in agreement about. Because if we're not clear

about it right now then six months from now – oh, let's hope it doesn't take that long.

But six months from now we'll get into trouble because we'll have cache consistency questions and how do I prove that this person isn't lying to me about that other person's data and so on.

Chuck Gomes: Lisa.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks Chuck. Again I'm playing Fabricio. Fabricio Vayra asks – it says he couldn't agree with you more, Andrew. And that is why the IRT's first decision was Thick WHOIS, that was back in 2009. And why the EWG subsequently decided in 2012 that Thick would be the model that they would recommend.

And so I feel we're recreating the wheel again. I wanted to try my hand at trying to capture what Andrew you just suggested which is maybe we could agree that registration data that is disseminated through the RDS should be authoritative. So it's the data that's authoritative. Doesn't say where it's stored or what path it comes by.

Chuck Gomes: Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. And I'm just musing a little further on this problem of the different languages. Because I will guarantee you that when people read this record, when they see authoritative they're going to parse that as accurate. And of course that's not what you're saying.

So I'm wondering do we achieve that with footnotes? I mean heaven forbid that Lisa's notes are going to look like a legal article with three quarters of a page of footnotes for, you know, a paragraph of prose. But I do think, you know, and it might actually stop me intervening all the time and slowing down the wheels of progress here.

Because you have to note that. People will come in cold six months from now and thing authoritative means accurate and it doesn't right?

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead David.

David Cake: Yes well I'm going to get to illustrate one way in which that sort of confusion. If you interpret authoritative in the way that it's interpreted in the DNS an answer like well the last time I contacted the authoritative source was, you know, 20 minutes ago and at that point the data in there was – is perfectly accurate but not authoritative.

But I can't really see any situation in which it could be authoritative but not accurate unless some, you know, some way that source had been – unless the system was broken. And not working too – as designed.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you David. Rod.

Rod Rasmussen: Rod Rasmussen. So I'm going to put aside the accuracy issue and just talk about this from a technical sense. And I think that whatever decision you make here it actually drives your architecture and your solution.

If you think about authoritative data, right, if I'm going to make a query to this RDS to do something like change the ownership of a domain name, right, does that – or that means I need to have the exact, absolute freshest information from the registrar or wherever or validator of whatever the model is of who actually owns it at that moment.

So caching of some sort has a – creates an issue there from a legal perspective of domain transfer. Like if I'm looking up something that – because I want to make a contact to somebody on a technical issue. I'm probably perfectly fine with the, you know, low latency cache in that RDS-type system if it was stored there as a caching mechanism.

The actual what – where you have an authoritative source based on your use case actually drives architecture down the road. So these are important distinctions to make now because the implementation phase is affected by whatever you decide on at this point. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Rod. Now I'm going to ask Lisa to share a restatement of this possible purpose and after that Andrew I'd like to see – if you're okay with it – okay. And then I'm going to come back to the – to polling you to see if anybody disagrees with the restatement.

And then I'll give you an opportunity to explain that. And certainly if it's not clear what we're doing you can stop us and we'll talk about that. Now Kathy do you want to comment before I do that or after? You have the choice.

Kathy Kleinman: Probably before.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, go ahead.

Kathy Kleinman: It's just that I'm hearing the same term used in different ways. This is an old ICANN problem, right. The same word used in a technical sense and also in the legal and policy sense.

I mean we come here from different places and we have different definitions. So I was just wondering if instead of authoritative data; which is introducing a lot of interesting construction problems, data from an authoritative, technical source gives us a better definition.

So that it doesn't bring up ambiguities from different places; or again data from an authoritative, technical source.

Chuck Gomes: Kathy stay there if you would please. Let me ask Lisa to read what she's come up – and if you're in Adobe she's put it in the chat. Okay? And let's go ahead and we'll spend just a few more minutes on this, okay? Go ahead Lisa.

Lisa Phifer: Actually Chuck what I put in chat was not a statement of purpose. It was actually just the statement.

Chuck Gomes: Okay yes.

Lisa Phifer: Right.

Chuck Gomes: So and that's what Andrew was suggesting earlier, so that's fine.

Lisa Phifer: Right. That registration data disseminated through the RDS should be authoritative in a technical sense.

Chuck Gomes: Andrew, you're good with that? Read it one more time for those that may not see it.

Lisa Phifer: Registration data disseminated through the RDS should be authoritative in the technical sense.

Chuck Gomes: Now we're not looking at that as a purpose statement as Lisa clarified, okay. But can we agree that that is a valid objective for us, okay? Anybody need it read one more time? Does anybody in the room and – go ahead, join us if you can. I know that there's a lot of background in context with all of this that makes it hard.

                 But if you think you're comfortable and want to weigh in you're welcome to. Anybody disagree: Oh, Kathy, go ahead.

Kathy Kleinman: I think the first question that will come to those reading it is what does that mean? Authoritative in a technical sense? Is it possible without putting a

footnote in? Is it possible to define what that means because I don't think that totally solves the problem of people coming from different perspectives and putting their own definition (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Let's handle that this way. We'll add a footnote to make it clear. Because it's a valid point, okay. But I don't want to spend more time writing the footnote here. Okay?

Lisa Phifer: Just to note that This WHOIS actually did have a working definition for what authoritative meant. And so what we could do is refer directly to that. And give it in the footnote as well.

Kathy Kleinman: But is that the definition that we're talking about from Andrew Sullivan?

Lisa Phifer: So Andrew if you don't mind listening. Authoritative – this is from the Thick WHOIS. Authoritative with respect to provision of WHOIS services shall be interpreted – boy this is wordy. Shall be interpreted to signify the single database within a hierarch of (gold) database structure; holding the data that is assumed to be the final authority regarding the question of which record shall be considered accurate and reliable in the case of conflicting records.

Administered by a single administrative agent and consistent of data provided by registrant records to the registrars. Through their registrars, excuse me – that was backwards.

Andrew Sullivan: Okay when I saw that go by in the Chat I had no problem with it. But the reason that I don't want to say that's what the definition is now is the very problem that David was raising earlier, right, that that involves an architecture and an implementation that sort of determines how you would have to deliver this.

And much as I prefer that model because I think it's distributed and I therefore think that it's going to be more resilient than the alternatives; I recognize that there are people for instance who want one giant, central RDS for the entire universe. And, you know, we're going to have that discussion on another occasion.

So I think that, you know, like it's a good definition given the WHOIS system that actually existed. And it exists today. But I don't know that it's the one that we will ultimately come up with. But something along those lines is the right one.

And just one other thing. The only reason that I would be concerned about the alternative that you proposed was the same problem. That is if you say like from the – it was something about the path to the authoritative source or something like that. It actually entails like rules about how you have to implement this thing.

And so it's the same objection that David made before.

Chuck Gomes: So let's work on the rewording offline on that. I reacted because it sounded like the same problem that all of you had with when I used the word contain. That presumes that this – yes – it is going to be stored. And I wasn't intending that much but obviously it say that. So let's work on that.

Is there anybody who disagrees? Holly? Go ahead.

Holly Raiche: I would like – you used one sentence. I would like a very shortened version of what I think it – Andrew said – which is somehow make authoritative in the sense that we're using it now, the authoritative data. That's the data that is held in the registry. Or however you want to word that. Just refer to the fact that there is one place where it is authoritative, no cached.

And that is what we're talking about. It shouldn't be anywhere near where as long as what's in the Chat.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Stephanie, your turn.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin for the record. I think I'm kind of agreeing with what Holly just said because my concern about any use of the word accurate is – it's only as accurate as what was provided to the registrar for the purposes of the RDS. And any use of the word accurate may be construed to imply real identity verification which nobody is in a position to provide at the moment.

So the data that was collected, you know, something along those lines; as long as we don't use the word accurate. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Looking at – I think I – the queue is handled. So here's – oh, (Michaely). Go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. (Michaely). Just speaking in my personal capacity and not as the Vice Chair and (unintelligible). I hate disagreeing with Andrew but I have to. The data that's in the registry when it comes to domain names can and often will contain at least one element which isn't actually correct; which would be the expiry.

Because the expiry date – you're looking confused. Most registrars use the auto renew function in order to give people the 30 days so that the date will push forward one year even though in reality it actually hasn't. Apart from that I'm happy with you but that one I think is something that needs to be flagged early because that's just we're, you know, hacking around things a little to make things work.

Andrew Sullivan: So I agree with you but I think maybe that's refining that we could do on the list.

Chuck Gomes: So what I'm going to ask and I'll come right back to you here is I'm thinking of
                 Andrew and Lisa and Stephanie and probably (Michaely) – anybody else is
                 welcome to join them. If you could either at the end of this meeting or on our
                 breaks see if you can come up with – and it can be more than one option.
                 And we'll do a poll like we did last week where there's some options and
                 maybe help us.

                 Because I don't want to spend any more time trying to refine this in this live
                 meeting. I think this has been very constructive and I appreciate so many
                 people being constructive on this. That's much appreciated.

                 So we'll handle it that way.

Jim Emerson: Jim Emerson, Public Safety Working Group. I'm struck by one thought. I
                 understand this is an interactive process. We're not anywhere close to the
                 final on the product.

                 But I'm struck by the fact that while we're strenuously arguing for privacy and
                 human rights, the protection of people, that at the same time we accept the
                 fact that someone could give us Donald Duck at 555 Elm Way Drive and that
                 we don't bear an obligation to do something about precluding arsenic in baby
                 milk or pharmaceuticals that take lives or human trafficking or any other form
                 of criminal behavior.

                 Maybe I misunderstand the accuracy issue. But from a verification standpoint
                 I don't understand how the discussion could be imbalanced one way and not
                 want to drag the other side of the victim equation with it.

Chuck Gomes: First of all let me say we haven't decided one way or the other right now.
                 We're not there yet, okay. (Michaely) go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. (Michaely) for the record. So back to your answering his – Holly could you let me answer him and then you can answer him. And I'll actually have his attention so don't have to repeat myself. Thanks.

We haven't got into that. At the moment we're still looking at data elements. And we're having conversations around, you know, how an RDS could or should or would function. So we're not – it's not a question of getting into your registrant verification or any of that kind of thing. We haven't got anywhere near that.

That doesn't mean that I'm going to agree with you. That doesn't mean I'm going to disagree with you. But I (probably) will disagree with you just on point of principle. But that's another conversation.

Jim Emerson: Jim Emerson. Just to respond to (Michaely) with a question. I'm still having a hard time getting my mind around how you split the difference between one form of victim and another. That's – but at the end of the day I understand there's a differentiation in the process and who's responsible for various aspects of the process.

However, the RDS system does present an opportunity for gatekeeping. And frankly we would not argue from a law enforcement perspective as strenuous as we do about retaining access if we weren't concerned about the amount of fraudulent data in the data set already. And the process that leads to that.

So I just wanted to explain, you know, the way I have that trouble with that.

Michele Neylon: Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Let's let Holly jump in.

Michele Neylon: Yes let Holly jump in but I'll just say that I think that's further down the line essentially.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. You're okay Holly? Okay. Okay, very good. All right. So if you – and if you don't get that then the little small group I just created…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Oh we had more added. Okay.

Man: Small group (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Yes you're part of that small group.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yes you and Holly and Stephanie and Andrew and Lisa and the others can join you as long as they know when you're doing it.

Woman: No Chuck they're in queue.

Chuck Gomes: I know. I'm getting to that. Okay. Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Just small (notice). I think we're talking about technically accurate data. Because yes data gets old the moment you enter it into the system.

So we might take approach that we're responsible for – the system might be responsible for the deliverance of technically accurate data set and not authoritative because or technically authoritative; because we need to refer to the DNS, no to the technical part of system not to the legal.

That's it.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Maxim. I think you're going to have some people react to the word accurate there. But let's let that little work group and if you want to join them feel free. Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I just wanted to respond to the gentleman who's representing the International Association of Chiefs of Police. Those of us who fight very hard for privacy are quite outnumbered here at ICANN. And we're trying to get clarity of language.

I think as (Michaely) said we're going to deal with data quality and data accuracy later. But sometimes people assume because we push back on some of law enforcement's positions; i.e. open access to WHOIS that we're against law enforcement.

But we're pro poison baby formula, that we don't care about child trafficking and obviously those of us who care about human rights, we care about all those rights including safety and security of the person and access to food and all of these things. We do.

So please don't assume that if for instance I am being a real pain in the neck about the accuracy thing that I don't believe in getting accurate data from people. I don't believe in the Mickey Mouses' being allowed to register.

But we need to shape that very carefully so that we don't wind up with a burden that puts domain names out of the reach of the average citizen falling somewhere in the chain of the contracted parties and the individual. Because day-to-day accuracy might be very useful for some of the people who access the system but it has to be proportionate to the purpose of ICANN running this system.

The other point I wanted to make; which I refrained from making earlier and that was when it comes to the question of balance, you cannot balance away legal rights. You have to deal with the proportionality principle in terms of how

you manage that. So that's going to be a whole other discussion down the road. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Stephanie. Philip.

Philip Sheppard: Philip Sheppard from (Zafarati) Conservancy and speaking partly in a capacity as a former chairman of the WHOIS Working Group. And how nice…

David Cake: Which one?

Philip Sheppard: Back in the distance of time. This discussion is one that's familiar of course from that same group. And that is the difference between the technical definitions and the policy or common understanding definitions.

I was inspired (unintelligible) when I listened to Kathy just now. And we had a natter outside and talked to Andrew. And we were wondering if wherever you're using authoritative in this context now if we say authoritatively sourced that tells you everything that is correct in terms of the technicality but it also puts up a nice red flag to the rest of us who are more in a policy world to tell you what that – how we're qualifying the word authoritative.

Because I think with that word and also accuracy which I know we were getting onto of course, both tell you nothing about the quality of the data. And having that statement so I'm very clear it's also going to be very important to (unintelligible) quality, accuracy.

Also here told you about sourcing. And that's different to again some common understanding. And there's data quality. So I think the earliest suggestion somebody made of a glossary or so would be terribly helpful. Now I'm one that, you know, perhaps appeared early in the report rather than late.

So you are – unless you understand what it is you are reading. Thank you very much.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Philip. Okay, Maxim is that (our old) hand? Thank you. Okay now we're at a point where I know I need a break. We only have about an hour to go.

We can keep plugging away and I can turn the next couple slides over to one of the vice-chairs or we can take 10 minutes and resume in 10 minutes. Is there a preference? You want to take 10 minutes? Or do you want to continue?

How many want 10 minutes? All right, we're going to take 10 – well (unintelligible) enough and I'm one of those. So we're going to take 10 minutes and we really will resume at the top of the, you know, within 10 minutes. And so try and come right back. And then we only have till 4:45 and then our time is up. Thanks.

Okay we're going to resume in about two minutes.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay did the recording stop? If so please restart it.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Welcome back to our RDS PDP Working Group after a short break. Looks like we've lost a few people. I can't imagine why. But this is what it's all about. We've got to go through this to make some progress. That's the reality of a multi-stakeholder model.

So this is Chuck speaking again. And you'll see there's a new slide up. This is the second poll question that was sent out last week. Over the last few

meetings there have been like two or three people that suggested that maybe there's some purposes of the RDS that we haven't included.

So we gave opportunity for people to suggest them. You can see that – excuse me – that question is is there anything missing from the latest draft statement of purpose - add that statement of purpose was in the poll, sorry about that – that you suggest be added. And then two responses. No, not at this time. Notice we're realizing that we may come up with one later. Or yes and then we ask you to describe it below.

Now actually I think of the five comments that you see there there's really only one that suggested a new purpose. There was some suggestions and rewording the existing ones. And I think that's Comment D, a purpose of RDS policy and we're really not talking about policy right now but we'll forgive that – a purpose of RDS is to protect the privacy of individuals and ensure that gTLD registration data is disseminated only as authorized by (apha) gold policy.

Well part of that statement obviously goes beyond what we're talking about right now. The purpose of an RDS gets into implementation and policy and so forth. So if it was a policy statement it might be okay. But what I want to ask right now is what do people think about that statement that a purpose of RDS is to protect privacy of individuals? Let me open that up for discussion.

(Vickie), go ahead.

(Vickie):   I don't know if that is a purpose of the RDS per se, is it a goal that we ought to discuss or a consideration that we ought to discuss, certainly. But is it a goal of the RDS? I'm not positive I would put it in that light. To me it's more a consideration that we need to think about.

Chuck Gomes: Thank (Vickie). (Michaely).

Michele Neylon: (Michaely) for the record. I'd have to disagree. I think it should be a purpose because the current system as there is no differentiated access doesn't allow for a registration to be marked as personal and for the data associated with it to be marked as slightly more confidential.

Whereas if you're designing the "perfect system" you could do that. Now in the – I mean again a lot of these discussions are all kind of predicated on people's experience with dot com and gTLDs. So I find a lot of these (fit) conversations in general at the highest level quite frustrating. Because it's assumed that all WHOIS is public, that all – everybody has free unfettered access to everything, whereas in reality, you know, in the ccTLD space that was not the case at all.

And nobody is saying that all ccTLDs are cesspools of horrible activity. There are ways and means to get that balance between having data and not having it open to everybody. So for example we are the largest registrar in the world for Dot IEs and the Dot IE ccTLD so I can speak with a certain degree of authority on how the Dot IE ccTLD works because we process more of them than anybody else.

It is an incredibly painful, awkward and headache-inducing domain registry to work with on a daily basis due to the amount of verification and validations that they put each and every registration through. End result of that – couple of things. One, the chilling effect in terms of number of registrations; two, even though you go through all that you still end up with inaccurate data.

And but the third part of it is there are processes available for people to get access to data if they need to combat various forms of crime or whatever. So I think people just need to remember that. So I would say that if you're going to build an RDS then it does need to address this in some way.

Now I'm – the semantics about what is a purpose and what is a this and what is a that is something that just causes me a massive headache. Just from my perspective I would think it needs to be able to deal with it. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Michaely). Now I don't want to – well I don't know whether I want to cause you headaches or not. But you think the purpose of an RDS then is to protect privacy?

Michele Neylon: Well much (reference) (unintelligible) – see this is the thing where we're getting into the semantics. That's, you know, is – if you're replacing the current system the question one has to ask is why. What purpose or goal is served by investing time, energy and effort in replacing it? Yes, no? Okay.

So if you're going to replace it, replace the current system with a new system, then one is replacing something that is deemed to be imperfect in some way with something that is better. So answering that question I would say yes. But if you ask me does the – is, you know, the WHOIS today is fundamentally flawed because it doesn't support and you can give a long list of different names. Then my answer might be well, no.

It depends on what question you're asking me.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Did I see a hand up over here? I saw a couple hands – okay.

(Chris): (Chris) for the record. Going back to the point, the (unintelligible) individuals shouldn't be used because anybody – certainly on the (BPS IRC)…

Chuck Gomes: Get closer to the mike please.

(Chris): Sorry. (Of course I'm in shout mode). Individuals shouldn't use because then anybody could be registering into (unintelligible). It's a registered (unintelligible) that could be corporate, individual or anything. Could be even

a club or any form of – I love the (example) Andrew used earlier about the monkey. It could be anybody registering in the (unintelligible).

And therefore in this certain (D comes) out, carry-ons will determine – (Kelly) was saying individuals or individual word itself shouldn't be used as a word to define it. Because that's what one of the things (PPSOI) are currently going through with (unintelligible) services. (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: So (Chris) would you – I'm not clear in terms of do you support or disagree with this purpose statement?

(Chris):   The only part I disagree with is the word individual.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, that's what I wanted to clarify. Thanks. I missed that – so that's good. Thanks. Okay.

(Mark):   (Mark) for the record. I disagree that it's part of the purpose. I agree with what (Vickie) said and I disagree with (Michaely) again on principle. (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Sullivan: Recurring theme here I noticed.

(Mark):   Yes it seems to be that the purpose of an RDS is to provide access to a certain set of information. And our many attributes of the RDS, namely that it should be, you know, it should support laws and certain jurisdictions – it should be respectful of personal privacy and things like that. But those attributes do not seem to me to be purposes.

And I'm sorry if that's being semantic. I don't think you can avoid that at this point. And, you know, given the last hour here it doesn't appear to me that

we're even trying to avoid semantic differences. So we should just embrace them for what they are.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Andrew.

Andrew Sullivan: Oh thanks, it's Andrew Sullivan. So we spent – I mean most of the time that we've spent so far has been about collection of data. And that has been instructive to me because I of course always thought of the RDS as the way you publish this thing. And the collection stuff was registration stuff. It took me quite a bit of time to get my head around that.

But if I use that filter then it becomes obvious that the purpose of the RDS can't possibly be to protect individual privacy because if what we were trying to do was to prevent that, you know, to protect that then the most obvious thing to do would be not to collect any information.

And so it can't be a purpose but it still, I think (Michaely) is right, that it's still a requirement of this. And we need to make sure that we are quite, quite clear that any future development is going to need to offer protections of some sort along these lines.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Andrew. And I think you're making a really important distinction there. If somebody doesn't agree that this is the purpose of an RDS doesn't mean that we won't come up with a requirement to protect privacy. And my prediction is we will. Sorry about that – a little personal interjection.

Because I don't think anybody wants – we know we have to follow laws and there are jurisdictions that require that. So let's not debate that now. But well said. Marc Anderson, you're up.

Marc Anderson: Thank you. Marc Anderson for the record. I don't think I have a whole lot new to add at this point. I agree this is a requirement statement not a purpose statement. We spent a lot of time initially gathering all the possible

requirements. I'm (wounded) that we actually already have this as a requirement for RDS, you know.

So I, you know, I think just to piggyback on what other people said, I agree.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Marc. Any other comments on that comment? Yes, Holly.

Holly Raiche: I just want to go back to the statement that (Michaely) made. It's not about protecting privacy. I think it's managing the requirements for data retention. And then what we mean – what should be retained and released or not is then something we worry about. But one of the purposes surely is to be able to manage – and I hate the term - appropriate management of data or something like that.

Chuck Gomes: And the RDS if we go with a new RDS would be a tool...

Holly Raiche: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: …used for that. Okay. Any other comments on that suggestion? Oh, okay. Now let's go to the next slide and I'm going to turn it over to David, keeping in mind that for however long this goes if we find some other purposes that we need to add, we will do that. Okay? And certainly if you think of some communicate them on the list.

But let's go to David Cake with the – can we go to the next slide? Slide 15. Having trouble getting there - there we go.

Now we had hoped, naively, to finalize the purpose statement at least for this stage of our work today. We're not going to be able to do that because Number 2 still needs some work on the wording, okay. That's the one - that the small group I created there – volunteering several of you – to work on some wording there. That's where we talked about authoritative and so forth.

But here's a chance to look at where the statement of purpose stands right now. So I'd like all of you and we'll pause a couple minutes here just to lever – this is where we're at on our purpose statement. Then I'm going to ask David to certainly comment on this if he has any comments of his own but also to lead discussion on where we're at now.

We're not going to try and finalize it today. But look at that. Think about if there's anything missing or whatever and we'll discuss that right now.

David, go ahead and take it.

David Cake: (Hoped) to get a little bit of time to look at it. But does anyone at this point already has suggestions or something they believe is missing from this statement of purpose? Yes, Andrew?

Andrew Sullivan: I've been mentioning this in the Chat – it's Andrew Sullivan. I'm mentioning this in the Chat but I – but somehow I missed the point at which we lost the bit about containing, you know, the information from the registry about resolution data and so on. We had that early on and it seems to have eroded here.

So if we added a tiny amendment to Number 1 here – if we just added "and its resolution on the internet." That would complete that feature. Because one of the things you do, right, if something stops resolving on the internet one of the things you do is check with (Liz) to see if maybe you've got a cache problem.

David Cake: That's a very useful comment. Do we have any history on why that was removed or?

Andrew Sullivan: I think actually I remember when the discussion happened that caused that to be removed. And I didn't probably object firmly enough and so on. But, you know, it was just a – I think it was a color kind of thing because it was when

the life cycle language got introduced and I think some edits happened. And it's just the way it happened. There's a tiny little thing.

David Cake: And I think it's worth – well does anyone have any further comment on that change? Does anyone think that adding the phrase about resolution would significantly – it would be a problem with significantly change the meaning of that? (Michaely)?

Michele Neylon: This is (Michaely) for the record. I'm just to Andrew just to understand. So I have not seen your recollection of being removed but just to understand one thing around this.

Are you saying that the domain resolves or are you saying that it would have a record where one might find information about resolution? Because I think that's – I'm not trying to over-think this but this is ICANN so we're all kind of – tend to over-think everything.

But I just want to understand what it is that that would actually say?

Andrew Sullivan: So when you have a resolution problem there are two obvious sources for it, right. One is that you've got an expired cache and so you're going to the wrong place. But the authoritative servers have a different answer. And the answer in that case is clear cache and you can get the current data and it will be fine.

But the other possibility is that the registry has changed and for some reason the authoritative servers haven't updated. And the only way you can find that out is by looking in the WHOIS and looking in the authoritative servers and comparing them. And so that's the thing that people do when they're doing DNS troubleshooting before they contact anybody or call anybody or anything like that. First thing you do to diagnose the problem.

Michele Neylon: Okay thanks. Just one thing. Somebody could clarify, maybe one of the other registrars. If you put a domain (on find) how will it get removed from the DNS? Does that remove the main servers from the WHOIS record or not? No it doesn't, that's what I thought. And that's the problem.

Andrew Sullivan: Well no, no, it's not a problem. Because then when you look at the WHOIS record, right, you've got both the status and the name servers. So if you see that the status is – it's on hold well then you know it's not going to resolve. It shouldn't be in the authoritative at all.

In fact at that point you've got a different test you want to do, right. You check the authoritatives to make sure that it's gone from the authoritative servers. So there's actually enough information there that you can do a lot of this troubleshooting before you get to anything.

Michele Neylon: And it will still be in the authoritative – well that's the problem – thing you're – it won't be observed from the (roots). If I – okay I'll give you a concrete example. We get a notification from the (unintelligible) script. We remove – we put a domain on hold.

Our name servers will still – or somebody's name servers will still be published in the WHOIS. And if you query those name servers directly and know to query them, using a host file or whatever, you will get back DNS records. But since we set client hold at EPP various (sign) affiliates or whoever it is – whoever is the registry will have removed the domain from the zone file.

Andrew Sullivan: Yes, yes, yes. Because you check both sides of the…

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: You see the problem though. If you're saying that that – what's in the WHOIS but the name server's is authoritative in this instance it isn't because…

Andrew Sullivan: (Michaely).

Michele Neylon: …my client holder is overriding this.

Andrew Sullivan: I think you are over-thinking this. If I do this lookup what I do is I say oh wait I've got this problem and it looks like there's a problem in the authoritative name servers. So I check the WHOIS and I say oh, okay, is what's in the authoritative name server supposed to be doing something. And there are two things that I get from that.

First, do I have the right authoritative name servers? And secondly, that is according to the registry. And secondly should this name be resolving. That's the status.

The client hold tells me that the parent doesn't have those name servers and that's information that I can glean from the WHOIS record. Both data are useful for exactly this point. And this forward phrase or whatever that I said would be enough to cover that purpose anyway.

David Cake: You know, I think it's a fair point that the enabling resolution also involves enabling when it shouldn't resolve yet. Do we have a – Peter Kimpian ?

Peter Kimpian :   Yes, thank you. This is Peter Kimpian . I have just a remark on the side. The accuracy is normally a requirement. It's – we are not there?

Chuck Gomes: Yes hang on. Let's come back to – let's make sure we're finished with Number 1, okay.

David Cake: Yes like to make sure we're finished with Number 1. I think Marc, Marc Anderson want to?

Marc Anderson: Thanks. Marc Anderson. Andrew I guess this is for you. I'm thinking Purpose Number 2 covers your use case. Purpose Number 2 – so it could – specifically calls out name servers for detailed (duties). I think that's probably what you're looking for.

Andrew Sullivan: Yes, so that was the original thing. But we've been rewriting Number 2, right. So and we rewrote it without that. This is how it got dropped. So the text that we were working on earlier over Number 2; which is the argument we had before the break doesn't seem to still include this.

So I don't care where we put it. If it remains in Number 2 that's also fine with me; however we solve this problem.

David Cake: Right but you'll – as long as there's a specific comment to, you know, the name servers are other mechanisms of resolution. Resolution in a more general – you would be happy? So I guess for that – I mean our conclusion of that one is we may need to alter Question 1 based on whatever this small group comes up with for Question 2. So that it includes mention of resolution on name servers somewhere.

With that understood can we move on from Question 1 or from that particular issue? And I think we'll go with Peter Kimpian 's question. So could you – well go back to Peter Kimpian and could you restate your issue.

Peter Kimpian :   Thank you. But this concerns some of five's. Can I?

David Cake: I think we've moved on from Number 1, we can talk about Number 1.

((Crosstalk))

Peter Kimpian :   Right, right. Okay. So I'm – I was ready to point at accuracy's normally a requirement, not a purpose itself. So I would think about saving it here.

David Cake: Do we have anyone – any responses to that? Okay that seems to be…

Peter Kimpian :   (Unintelligible).

David Cake: Yes, could you – if it seems to be that's going unchallenged could you repeat it.

Peter Kimpian :   Normally accuracy is a requirement for data purchasing. It's not a purpose itself. So I understand it is – it's (sad) that it's – the purpose is facilitated accuracy of detail of the registration data but from data protection point of view it doesn't say anything as you are obliged to do this.

                 So I don't think it should be a purpose. So it should be mentioned as a purpose, it's a requirement for this processing.

(Chris):   (Chris) for the record. (Did anyone) ask a silly question – are we to (unintelligible) over viability?

David Cake: I don't think that's a silly question, I think that's a good question. But I'm not sure about the answer.

(Chris):   Going back a number of years one of another working group the only way we can particularly verify information is if that information is given to us or we have a central pool to verify the data list. At no point in any of the seven years I've been doing this now has any GAC member and then sorry – just spouting off here. Any GAC member or any law enforcement agency put their hands up and suggested and come forward and suggested – let's give them a mechanism for testing this, improving it.

                 So accuracy and verifiability at the end of the day is neither here nor there because we can't prove the data. I'll give you an exact example. Kenya doesn't have addresses. That's just one country I can names drop at the top of my head. I have hundreds of issues with ICANN compliance risk.

So the accuracy of data – how can you table the accuracy of data when you have no model to put it against in the first place? I know that's a very far-reaching point and this covers a lot of other working groups as well.

David Cake: Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin for the record. And I've already said this once today but I'll probably say it again because I think it's important. That, you know, whole concept of accuracy is many-layered and for the purposes of data protection law it's as accurate as is necessary for the purposes for which it was gathered.

So when we say that accuracy is a requirement of data protection that doesn't mean that you get to go on a fishing expedition and get all kinds of accurate data about the individual – it's proportionate. And once the purpose – the key purpose – has been served you don't necessarily get to go back and refresh the data on a regular basis.

So I think the – I mean I'm back to the, you know, one paragraph of text and three quarters of a page of footnotes here. When we talk about accuracy we need to be very specific about accuracy as it was given to the registrar – or the registrar rather. And you have a responsibility as the data processor to maintain the accuracy.

In other words you have to be accountable for making sure that you don't introduce mistakes and changes; calling people defaulters when they weren't defaulters, mixing up the credit card numbers, etc., etc., etc. All of that comes under accuracy. That's not the same as what we're looking for from the perspective of the outside users of the WHOIS database. When they want accurate data they're looking for somebody other than Mickey Mouse.

And that's quite reasonable. But that's not the same nuance that we're talking about here. Thanks.

David Cake: Okay currently I think the queue is Marc, Chuck, Lisa. I'm just going to assert myself in here and make a very short comment which is that one way we could interpret this is that it's not actually about that we could have data elements whose purpose is to – one way we could interpret this is that it was acceptable to have data elements whose main purpose is to aid in assessing the accuracy of other data elements.

So we could have a data element that says, you know, data block validation or something like that. That's just a suggestion. As I said, Marc, you're up.

Marc Anderson: Thank you. Marc Anderson for the record. When this purpose statement first came up we had a very interesting discussion around it. You know, and this is a fairly old topic. We got off of the purpose statement for a while so we're coming back to this.

But I think this purpose came up, you know, as a way of demonstrating that having this data visible is a means for somebody to realize oh hey, my data's out of date. I moved, I forgot to update my WHOIS record. I can look and see there, oh, this is wrong. I need to go and change my, you know, my information with my registration.

And I think Susan – I think this might even have been you that suggested that. So I'm getting some nods there. So as far as, you know, is it a requirement for it to be accurate, you know, that's a whole other conversation. You know, I think the, you know, the way you get to the accuracy is on the collection, on the registrar's side.

And registrars have that requirement in their RA. And the RDS is really a mechanism of displaying the information that is. It doesn't really make

judgments on whether it's accurate or not accurate. It just displays what is has.

And so, you know, it can be a mechanism to promote accuracy; which up until last week was the language we actually had. Last week it changed from promote to facilitate. But, you know, I don't think it's a, you know, I think its purpose there is to help promote accuracy of data. Thank you.

David Cake: Thank you. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I'm going to follow up on that but didn't you want to add something earlier?

David Cake: It was – I need to say I'm pretty happy with Number 5.

Chuck Gomes: You're happy with Number 5? Okay, thanks. Good. And this kind of – this is Chuck speaking. And I'm just kind of to address Peter Kimpian 's statement that it's a requirement so it shouldn't be a purpose. Can't it be both?

And I think that's what – why not?

Peter Kimpian : I mean those two issues are different. I mean the purpose for data processing tells you why you are processing the data. It cannot repeat all the requirements and it shouldn't repeat all the requirements you have to be aware when you are processing the data. Accuracy is one of the requirements but there are other requirements as well.

And out of the discussion I think it is important to really make a distinction or to have clear definition what we are talking about because with – I'm not hearing or only accuracy argumentation here but data verifiability or yes I cannot put it in another word, accuracy normally means that Peter Kimpian is spelled P – E – T – E – R and not P – T – E – R or P – T – A – R or something like this.

I mean this is accuracy, this is not that I'm Peter Kimpian , this is verifiable data or authentication or, you know, another issue.

Chuck Gomes: So this is Chuck again Peter Kimpian . I want to come back to you on that. So let's say that for some reason, who knows why, Peter Kimpian is misspelled. And you go to the RDS and you see that it's misspelled. You can now correct it.

So the RDS in essence facilitated accuracy in that case. And that's, I think, all this is saying. The purpose of RDS was to facilitate accuracy. Is that the only thing it does? No. Does that lessen the requirement for accuracy? No.

But it can be used as a tool to facilitate accuracy. You can use it that way or somebody else can.

Peter Kimpian : I'm sorry but to my name it is not the RDS who can grant this but my contract with the registrar. I mean I – it's with him that I have to see and if it's not accurate it's not through the RDS that I have to go. I mean…

Chuck Gomes: And Chuck again. So are you opposed to the RDS being used to facilitate the accuracy?

Peter Kimpian : No I'm – I mean we have to think about it but as it is phrased right now I mean to facilitate or to promote maybe that's a better wording, but I mean I think that we have to bear in mind that the accuracy is a requirement of data processing. And as such we don't need to phrase it or put it as a purpose.

And until we understand accuracy the same thing.

David Cake: So can I just – you are saying you don't necessarily object to it but you think it's redundant?

Peter Kimpian : I think it's redundant and needs to be rephrased maybe.

David Cake: Thank you. Are you done Chuck or are? Okay, Lisa was next in the queue.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks. So I need to read a comment from Chat. But I'm not sure that it's pertaining to Number 5 still. Do you want to take other questions on Number 5?

David Cake: Sure, okay. I'll remember your place. We have – I'm sorry I don't remember whether it was (Vickie) or Rod was next. So one of you want to jump in? Okay then its Rod.

Rod Rasmussen: Yes Adobe does that automatically. Rod Rasmussen. The – and a couple of people have touched on this already – but the system itself can be used, especially if these people look at this holistically as a way to facilitate better accuracy, especially when people are entering data in the system initially.

We have the proposed in EWG the system of validation and the ability to provide differentiated levels of accuracy and certification around that validity. And then use the system to be able to report that. So and this also ties back to some of ICANN's missions and statements around ones to promote better accuracy in the data in general.

There's a lot of driving forces behind this. But it's also relative to the current system. What can we do to actually improve and make it more – a more readily or easier I guess is a better term – easier for people to have and maintain accurate data. So it's not as much of a burden to do that.

Particularly when one wants to do that on a continuous basis, say if you were a large commercial enterprise and want to maintain control of domain names that may be worth, you know, billions of dollars. So there's a lot of different purposes or use cases that are served by creating a system that promotes or as has now been changed to facilitate accuracy in the system.

And I think it really is a purpose of building a system like that is to make that happen. Thanks.

David Cake: Thanks. And I think Stephanie is next in the queue.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin for the record. I mean I have to agree with Peter Kimpian that – when I flip this around is a goal of the RDS to collect inaccurate data? I mean no, of course not. It goes without saying that one of the – if you're collecting, using and disclosing data that it should be accurate.

I worry about the use of the word facilitate because I don't know where the end stop is on facilitate. And I don't know about the proportionality or the accuracy. And this causes me concern. I mean it's not – again it's not like we want inaccurate data. SSAC put a comment in the Chat about how its responsibility of the individual to maintain accurate data.

Only for the purpose - and I will repeat an example that I used back in the old EWG days. If I have a three-year car loan and I pay off the car loan. The bank may have a very strong incentive to keep my address up-to-date because I'm a person who pays off my car loans and they might want to market more services to me.

I do not care about whether they have an accurate record of my address. And so there is no reason for me to go and update the address, right. Now I realize that's not the same situation that we have here. We do have, you know, registration data that needs to be updated according to the contract. But the example shows how you think about it in terms of data protection purposes.

It's for the purpose of the collection use of the data, not for any potential disclosures. Other people have a strong incentive to get accurate data out of the WHOIS. But that's not necessarily related to the overall purpose of why we collect registration data. Thanks.

So I haven't got any useful proposals for how we deal with this except to say that as a grammar nerd I really don't like facilitate – how it's constructed right now. I'd like another verb in there. Facilitate the maintenance. Facilitate the collection. But not just facilitate the accuracy. Thanks.

David Cake: Okay Lisa did you have a comment from the Chat?

Lisa Phifer: I do. So there was a comment from Fabricio. Stephanie actually brought up one comment already. But another comment that we seem to be conflating the issues of purpose and requirements to fulfill a purpose.

And so one way to address that and this is me speaking now for myself would be to say that a purpose of RDS policy is to facilitate fulfilling requirements for accuracy of data. So that says your – the RDS is actually attempting to support requirements, not to institute requirements itself.

And Fabricio had a follow-up that requirements support the purpose.

David Cake: Thank you. (Michaely) and then Kathy do you want to comment? Okay, yes. (Michaely), then Kathy.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, (Michaely) for records or what have you. I was one of the people who objected to the promoting accuracy and would – pushed for facilitate. But quite happy to add flavor to facilitate if somebody want to reword it I don't really mind. But I did have problems with the concept of promote by itself. Right. Happy to explain why if anybody wants to ask me. But this should be pretty clear why.

David Cake: Kathy.

Kathy Kleinman: Kathy Kleinman and thanks for opening up the mike to those of us that are listening and trying to follow. It sounds like the compromise has already been

made that makes – the comment I was going to make – although it looks like the solution is out there is that this seems to be the same problem we were having before with a technical expert having one definition and kind of the common sense definition being different.

Except here Peter Kimpian is our technical expert. You know, he's council, Council of Europe specializing in data protection and came out of Hungary where he was with the Data Protection Office. So if it doesn't make sense to him, he's kind of our technical expert on the requirements of data protection law.

So it sounds like there's a new version that does. This same issue kind of translating the words from their technical sense of the experts to the common sense. Thanks.

David Cake: Thank you Kathy. Now I think we're pretty much out of time. So I think we'll leave it there. We may have to – I think we more or less seem to have resolved the – how we'll deal with the issues with one and two.

And I think we can maybe re-raise if anyone wants to discuss the wording of Number 5 though I think the things about requirement's an issue, you know, there are some deeper issues there we might want to discuss.

Anyway I'll throw back to Chuck for the moment.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thanks. So we need to wrap up and let's see what kind of conclusions we may have reached in this meeting. On Number 1 did we agree that we'll add the text or are we going to change 2 back? Was there an agreement on that?

Go ahead Andrew.

Andrew Sullivan: I understood the agreement was that either one or two will change to make this in there. And as long as the set contains the relevant that it doesn't really matter where it goes.

Chuck Gomes: On name servers?

Andrew Sullivan: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. A compromise wording was given for five. Do you have that Lisa? To facilitate what was it…

Lisa Phifer: Yes. Purpose of RDS policy is to facilitate fulfilling requirements for the accuracy of gTLD registration data.

Chuck Gomes: And I looked straight to Peter Kimpian when that first was proposed. He was okay with that. So I think Kathy had too. She seemed to know that.

So we have two things there. I'd like to test those in a poll. We can just make a decision which way we want to go on one or two. And for those that aren't here of course to give them a chance to weigh in on those changes as well as to confirm with those who are here to do that.

Now looking ahead where are we going to go next? Yes, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: So before the break we actually had a – I believe you asked a few people to go off and…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Oh, did you do that?

Lisa Phifer: …propose – no. I know that there was something in Chat suggested for it but in the interest of time I'm not going to open that discussion. I think the way to

move forward on the addition to one or two is to add it to one and poll on that. And then to come back with suggested wording for Number 2; which we will also poll on. Is that correct?

Chuck Gomes: That sounds good. Okay. And then that takes care of that other. And let's send out – and when we send out the notes let's put action items at the top. I know that sometimes it makes more sense to be in context, but obviously some people don't see them. So go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: And just to note, as of several meetings ago we started having a separate section in notes that list the action items and the agreements separately at the end as well as in context. We'll just move that section to the beginning of the notes.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you for that. Now what I wanted to – we had hoped to get further today than we did. That's okay because it has been very good interaction from a lot of people. And so thank you for that.

But what we're hoping to do in the near future, maybe in our next meeting, to expand our discussion about collection of Thin data. And start talking about display and access of Thin data.

Okay. Do - we've got our purposes for that. So that should be fun. As we get further. And we'll get past that confusion that we've had for a while with regard to this whole idea of collection.

So just to hopefully motivate you for the near future we're going to get – we'll stick with Thin data for a while longer. But let's start talking about what do we do with that Thin data besides, you know, just collect it. Okay?

So that'll be that. Now our next – again please remember the cross-community session Wednesday afternoon. Again that's not our session but

it's a very critical session for us, okay. And thanks to Peter Kimpian for all the work he's done in coordinating with the data commissioners on that.

And we'll look forward to that. And then on Wednesday we have a follow-up working group meeting Wednesday afternoon. It's not long like this one. I think it's our – fairly typical – plan about 90 minutes. Peter Kimpian will be there. And who's the other person that will be there Peter Kimpian ? Go ahead and share with the whole group.

Peter Kimpian : The U.N. Rapporteur for…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: The U.N. Rapporteur on this. So and Peter Kimpian and the Rapporteur are going to try and coordinate with the other data commissioners that will be here on Monday to make sure they can, as much as possible, speak for some of them as well. That may not be perfect but – and questions that aren't asked in the Monday cross-community sessions we will make sure we ask, if we have time, we may run out of time.

But we'll be asked on Wednesday. So those are the next sessions. Now in terms of regular working group meeting – that's going to happen – we're going to skip next week as is practice after an ICANN meeting. So keep that in mind.

So what's the next date of our teleconference call meeting? (Maurika) do you have that handy?

Marika Konings: Twenty-eighth.

Chuck Gomes: Twenty-eighth. Okay the 28th. And that will be at our regular time. Because – okay. Now what have I missed? Besides thanking everyone for bearing with a long session? Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: So I believe that we're going to be testing a couple of rephrased statements for the statement of purpose with the poll. And so the time frame for completing the poll?

Chuck Gomes: Let's make it to the – I don't know – somewhere in the week after if we – in fact we can probably go clear to the end of that next week, right, because we don't have a meeting that week. So you can name a time that you'd like it that works best for you. But let's – after the end of this ICANN 58.

Lisa Phifer: So in keeping with our normal time frames we could do close of business or the end of day Saturday before the next meeting. That would be the 26th.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Lisa Phifer: Just to give everyone advance notice that that will be the due date for responses to the next poll – 26th.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Lisa. Now I hope that if nothing else we accomplished today that people realize more than ever how helpful it is for us to respond to these things.

We try to keep the polls short. But it's the only way we can keep it moving and give opportunity for other people to participate, for you guys to make sure that we capture the tentative conclusions accurately.

So please do your best to contribute so that we get as broad a spectrum as possible as we're moving. If we don't do something like that this is just going to drag on forever. And it already seems like forever, doesn't it?

So thanks for your cooperation on that. Anything else before I adjourn? Okay. Meeting adjourned. The recording can stop. Thanks again.

END