

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White  
July 10, 2013  
11:00 am CT**

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you very much (Tonya).

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the BC Members call taking place on the 10th of July 2013.

On the call today we have Zahid Jamil, Marilyn Cade, John Berard, Steve Delbianco, Elisa Cooper, Susan Kawaguchi, (Camille Stewart), (Gabiella Szlak) and Anjali Hansen, (Richard Friedman), (Laura Covington) and Chris Chaplow. We have apologies from Ayesha Hassan. I would like to remind all participants to please say their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: Well first of all thank you to all of you for attending. I know many of you are trying to get ready to leave for Durban but I thought this was a really important issue for us.

And as Susan Kawaguchi was a member of is a member of the expert working group, I thought it would be great to hear directly from her perspective and I'm very thankful to her for very graciously agreeing to present to us her

thoughts and an overview of the report. And I thought this was a great opportunity for us to hear from her and ask her questions.

We still have a little bit of time scheduled when we meet on the Tuesday next week to talk about the expert working group report and probably discuss then how we go about making our thoughts heard on it, but in today's session I really wanted to hear from Susan in terms of like what her thoughts are and how we should be supporting the report and her.

So with that Susan I'm going to turn it over to you if that's okay.

Susan Kawaguchi: That sounds fine Elisa. Thank you everybody for taking the time out.

Just a little bit of background information: I work for Facebook and I'm the domain manager there and most of you I know but I know the BC's growing so I thought I'd include that. But also I was on the Whois review team, the AOC Whois review team. I spent a year and a half working on a similar team as I'm working now, developing recommendations but we were very limited on what we could look at. The feeling the whole time we were working was Whois is a 1980 protocol, we need to move on and create a 2025 protocol.

So we delivered our recommendations and report to the board. It took awhile. It was frustrating. And the board came - and in the meantime the SSAC came out with a report that basically said we missed the point and that Whois needed to be rethought, reimagined. So the board and Fadi got together, decided that they would implement the Whois review team's recommendations as they could but really wanted to develop a whole new protocol, a whole new process. So then I landed on the next team and for some reason I applied.

So we've been working diligently since February and we truly tried to just take it from step one to say what we would like in a directory service. We try not to use the term Whois though I still rely on that a lot. And we started out with purposes and identifying needs and current needs and maybe needs going forward.

And so - but this is all board directed. We're tasked with this. We'll go back to the board and to Fadi and then to the GNSO. So we're not circumventing any ICANN processes. We may have set some things up. Fadi definitely likes to move at a faster pace. So that's how we started.

So (Bene) can you just move to the next page, the next slide?

So we published a draft report and please all remember this is still very much a draft. We don't have all the answers and we're looking to all of you to help us flesh out things and call out what doesn't seem like it will work at all.

Not that slide. It's just Page 2. Okay. Can you go back one more slide?

Benedetta Rossi: Sorry my screen froze and I'm not sure what happened there. Apologies for that.

Susan Kawaguchi: No problem.

So we looked at all kinds of use cases and we first started out with what do you absolutely need in a directory service, what makes a domain name work and what can we not live without. And servers was one of those things, some sort of technical contact. And then we moved on from there. We looked at all the data elements. We looked at what ccTLDs were doing. We looked at the privacy issues though we haven't fleshed those out completely yet either.

So we went looked beyond the lowest slide there. We looked at access methods, validations and accuracy. We really spent a lot of time just thinking hard and sort of coming up with things and tearing them apart again. And we came up with this -- and Bene if you can go to the next slide -- what we're calling our aggregated registry directory system I think. I always forget what the acronym really means.

So basically what would happen is a registrant would register a domain name. The registrar would collect the data. The data would be stored as it now at the registry. And then all the registries meet up into the aggregate database. And that is where you would go to look up information on a domain name. But not all information collected would be provided at the start.

There is - we're working out a system where you would get some of the most important elements that you need to run a domain name for a domain to work. Those would be pretty freely available. And we haven't come up to a decision on these either and actually the PDP process would probably make most of these decisions.

You would go to the aggregated database and you would have to sign in if you wanted information from the database beyond the basic minimum. And then if you have a crucial need for additional information that maybe we don't collect currently for the Whois record but there's a lot of information that a registrar collects and the registry collects, the thick Whois registry collects. And so maybe all of that information is in that record for that domain name but you only get it with an authenticated process so we now who's looking at the information and they have to provide reasons for needing the information.

And so this is all still a work in progress. There's a lot of things that we haven't thought about or we've thought about and haven't had time to face, to really flesh out, but basically we're going to a centralized database. With the new gTLDs launching, we have a potential of over, I don't know this is just a guess, 1000 registries and it does not make sense that an individual Internet user who's trying to do business of some sort with a site on the Internet has to go to over 1000 places to look up information. It's one of 1000.

So we thought this was much more Internet user friendly, consumer friendly and also the aggregated database provides a much easier method to validating and auditing data. We are not advocating that the registrars are relieved of any of the recent requirements in the 2013 RAA. Those should still be done at the registrar. The registry should still collect it. But if you have 200 million, 300 million records in one database then you have an easier auditing process.

And right now Nominet has started to do this. Nominet will go back to the registrant and say they are the registry and you have not provided the information, valid or accurate information. So there is - some ccTLDs are starting to move towards this model and we thought this would work.

So if you've read the report or if you have time to read parts of the report there are like I said a lot things we have not completely fleshed out. It's a draft report and we will need all of your input on thought processes to really get this right. But we also as a team we're not tasked with the implementation but more of a high level this is what the policy -- well not even policy -- but this is what we are aiming for. Policies and implementation will have to be fleshed out by ICANN and the PDP process.

So if you go down to one more - the next slide for me Bene. And so we do have a couple sessions or we have one session in the main room on Monday at

the ICANN meeting if you're going to be there. We hope you will - if you are in Durban that you will be able to stand up and give us your thoughts. But these are additional questions.

If you could sort of bring up the discussion questions a little higher on the screen Bene.

These are the questions that we really were asking the community: tell us what you think would be the advantage or the disadvantage, how are we going to authenticate and identify the users of this database, what are we going to do to prevent things?

So I'm going to leave the list of questions on the screen and I'd just open it up for questions from you.

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn. How do you want to do this Elisa? Do you want to take a queue or...?

Elisa Cooper: Yes that sounds great.

Susan Kawaguchi: You start Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Well first of all I want to thank Susan and I know we have a number of new members who've joined us but I want to thank Susan and confess that I actually chaired ICANN's first Whois taskforce which lasted for two years. And for the last year of its meetings. Plus we met two times a week for two hours at a time. So I really applaud the fact that you've accepted this role not only for the BC Susan but also for the CFG which is a really important contribution.

So having said that now I'm going to ask for more right? I think this is going to be a really interesting time for us to hear from others in the community about their views. Quite some time ago there were a number of questions within the BC about concerns about ICANN's failure either through resources or capability to actually enforce requirements in the highly distributed registrar and registry environment.

And I think those concerns still exist. So I was interested in the discussion that might have taken place, realizing there may be confidentiality or discussions that go on within the working group, but I was interested in the considerations that have developed so far about this ability to manage a highly distributed versus a more centralized approach.

I'm also familiar with the disparity of capability of the registrars in terms of their provision of accurate data and I wanted to hear more about that discussion if that's possible.

Susan Kawaguchi: We definitely discussed - we keep in mind the compliance issues all the time because I think we all would agree that especially previously ICANN compliance has less ability to make any of the registrars or even willing to make the registrars or registrants comply with anything in the contract. That's my personal view. That's definitely not the EWG's view.

But because we haven't really fleshed out the system, I haven't figured out where those contractual obligations would be yet. All of the existing obligations in the RAA and the registry agreement would not be interrupted in our viewpoint of this. But we are placing a total new third party that the registrant would not be aware of for the most part. I mean unfortunately a lot of people who register domains don't even understand - they're working with

the registrar, they may not even know what that term means. And then they definitely don't know that a registry is involved too.

And then to add the third, this aggregated database vendor in that list of people that they may - or entities that they may have to interact with is going to be difficult. We understand that. And then where does the contract exist. Where will they you know. And what will have to be changed to implement a system like this. So those are on our to-do list but have not been fleshed out.

One of the things - and to your, you know, the disparity of capabilities of registrars and registries, I think we all viewed a centralized database as being able to audit and recognize where the problems truly are and not, I mean if you look at today's inaccurate reports, probably GoDaddy's getting the most of those but that's not because GoDaddy doesn't do a good job necessarily, it's because GoDaddy has the volume of domain registrations.

So with a main, central database that you could audit, you could say okay well this registry has this percentage of issues in accuracy and problems in the record but they only have 1% of the records in the database. The disparity there we need to focus on that registry or registrar, whatever it may be. So I think the database would help in that element to recognize and then point ICANN compliance in the right direction to train and educate.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: It looks like Steve's got his hand up next.

Steve Delbianco: Hey thanks Susan. Thanks a lot for contributing on Whois which you've done for years so appreciate that.



A fast question: did you use any of the fact-based Whois studies to support your work?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes I should have mentioned that in my overview. We did. ICANN - Denise Michel's team loaded us up with every possible document and for the most part I was pretty familiar with those. Not everybody was on the team because the team was chosen from very geographic, you know, criteria, a lot of people around the world some not necessarily involved with ICANN previously so there was a lot of reading and reviewing reports and all the way back to 2000 we've been reading things. So there's a lot of material.

Steve Delbianco: Great. Whenever you're speaking about this make sure you cite the fact-based reports as being supportive of the work or we'll never get studies like that again. Do you know what I mean?

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay.

Steve Delbianco: The second point is that I'm a huge fan of centralized or aggregated access. Particularly on Page 32 your recommendation for reverse lookups should be huge. And then I had two questions.

In your view of how they would validate accuracy, do you anticipate the aggregated vendor, the RDS vendor, actually contacting domain registrants in their validation or correction process?

Susan Kawaguchi: You know, we've talked about that because that is the new model for Nominet. So Nominet came in and provided quite a bit of information to us. The problem they're having is people ignore them. So it may be that it goes back to the registry, back to the registrar, the registrar contacts the registrant.

The other thing we've talked about is freezing of records. There may be some immediate - for certain levels of inaccuracy, there may be some immediate sanctions that could take place so that you get registrant's attention. But we haven't come to a decision on whether it's the aggregated database vendor or the actual registrar and registry. And it would be great to hear people's suggestions on that.

Steve Delbianco: Okay. Do you think that the billing information captured only by the registrars since they're the ones that collect the money, does that information make its way through -- not the credit card number but the billing contact and billing information make its way through to the ARDS repository?

Susan Kawaguchi: I hope so. That's what I'm advocating for.

Steve Delbianco: Got it. Final question: what's the likelihood that this would be an acceptable model even for the country code or ccTLD operators?

Susan Kawaguchi: You know, we haven't really discussed that. We've only focused on the gTLDs. That's a big enough nut to crack there.

Steve Delbianco: Are there gTLD representatives on the EWG?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes. So we have Chris Disspain from Australia.

Steve Delbianco: On the role of trying - if we make this work maybe he could sell it into the ccs because it would be outstanding to have a repository for the whole world instead of separate.

Susan Kawaguchi: I agree. I absolutely agree.

Steve Delbianco: Susan fantastic work. Thanks for your answers.

Susan Kawaguchi: No problem. Elisa?

Elisa Cooper: So we have an opportunity to submit our thoughts about the report. Based on your perspective are you happy with all of it? Are there areas that we should focus on in our comments?

Susan Kawaguchi: Well from sort of a personal issue I feel like I'm always hammering on proxy and privacy and I think that's important to a lot of business owners. We need it, Facebook uses it, but for new brand rollouts but we don't run sites with a proxy or somebody does it without my permission at the company. And we have not given much detail in this report.

So we are meeting at the end of August face to face again and that it will be a continued topic. Hopefully we'll get - sort of flesh it out at that point. So definitely any ideas or background material on proxy and privacy that you would like to - because I know the BC has weighed in a lot on that issue. So that would be important to continue to comment on.

The other thing is we haven't quite got there as a team yet but there's a - to me there's a - to me there is a bright line between a record for a registrant that is using that domain for commercial uses and an individual that it is using it just for anything noncommercial, blogs, whatever. So input on what you, what the BC or the individual companies would view as where that bright line lays, is it a blog with advertising on it. Is that commercial use?

Because with Article 29, and I haven't read that letter yet coming out about the data afterhours storage, none of that pertains to commercial. That doesn't - I mean they have to do a lot of things but we don't have the right to keep our

information hidden from our users. We have to put more information on a Web site in the EU. And so I think we need to always keep in mind the information that's provided in this directory is it truly an individual with no commercial use or is it commercial use. So those are my two big ones.

Elisa Cooper: So privacy and proxy and then commercial use versus individual use, where the bright line is.

Susan Kawaguchi: Correct, right.

Elisa Cooper: That's helpful. Thank you.

Susan Kawaguchi: No problem. John?

John Berard: Hey Susan how are you this morning?

Susan Kawaguchi: Good.

John Berard: I have three things. First I want to thank you for flying the privacy flag. My personal view, I think you and I have talked about this, is that in order for us to make sure that we have the most accurate database possible, we have to make sure that the authentication protocols and technologies are as strict as possible. And I think that would be - doing an appropriate level of privacy as distinguished from anonymity.

I have two questions and they both relate to sort of trying to get a sense of the discussion that might not have been revealed in the report so far. The first one is was there any discussion about what I think of as gray market TLDs, so a country code that operates as a commercial entities or are we - did the group

persist in the sort of legacy and artificial distinction of country code and gTLD?

Susan Kawaguchi: So far we are using ccTLD's policy and processes to help to review and to help data discussion but we definitely are staying away and that's basically the mandate of our team from ccTLDs. Now I think like Steve's suggestion like maybe if we do such a good job and they'll want to be part of this. That's one thing. But I think you're entering into, you know, those are all individual governments so I don't know what the answer is there and we're not really discussing ccTLDs as being part of this.

John Berard: Right and the discussing view of .to, .me, .tv as ccTLDs right?

Susan Kawaguchi: Correct.

John Berard: Okay. And the other question I have is spinning off the one you had, the kind of ultimate question, how could the next generation or generating RDS operating costs be borne? Was there any discussion about charging for Whois lookups?

Susan Kawaguchi: You know, we sort of evaded that question yet even though we've asked the community. As we talk about this it's a constant question. Well wait that sounds expensive, how is this going to work. We don't know to be absolutely honest. And hopefully we do have a session in Durban on Sunday, a closed session, where we're working all day and maybe we'll get to that. But we truly ran out of time on some key issues. So we will continue the work.

John Berard: Do you think that might be an appropriate subject for the policy development process?

Susan Kawaguchi: It may be. It may be. And I mean, this is truly my own personal point of view and not a very well received one in most areas. To me Facebook.com is not a 999 domain name. Domain names require - there are people paying for all of the things - for services that do not exist really in the initial cost of the domain name, whether it be in the fraud, combating fraud or you pay extra for security.

So my viewpoint is that maybe it should be both ways. And this is not the EWG's viewpoint. Maybe there is a cost to getting this information if you're wanting to review the record and an additional initial cost going forward on a domain name. That would be what I would suggest we talk about in our group. That's not what the group has decided.

John Berard: All right thank you Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: (Stefan)?

Stephane Van Gelder: Yes thanks hi. I just wanted to go back to the ccTLD point that you just mentioned and you mentioned with Steve earlier on. Just not a question but a comment. I know from very recent discussions certainly with a couple of ccTLD operators that they do not want to be included in the model as suggested, the RDS model. Well to be more specific they don't want to be included in a single model. It seems that they value their independence a great deal.

And when people like myself or I guess Steve shares that same view suggest that certainly for business and in general for Internet users out there a single unified database would probably be easier to use and more useful to people who don't know the intricacies of Whois and the domain name system. They say that - they respond, that they are the keepers of their own domains, it's a

national interest and they have specific laws to respond to and those are frequently misunderstood by ICANN.

And one of the examples that was given to me in a conversation I had on this last week was that Article 29 letter which I have read and which clearly states that the current RAA falls afoul of certain European directives on registrars with regards to personal data and the way they should both record it and keep it.

So just to put that out there and to add that to the discussion because I think it's probably in most BC members' interest perhaps to go towards a unified Whois model and if that's the RDS then fine. And it seems like we've got our work cut out if you'll agree on that to convince the ccs that that's the case. Thank you.

Susan Kawaguchi: Stephane I would completely agree with you. You know, right now just getting all the gTLDs to conform to one policy is pretty difficult so I can't even imagine. I'm not sure I want to be on the team that tries to convince the ccTLDs to sign onto something like this.

But there are industry, you know, products out there right now, I can go to domain tools and look up a lot of ccTLDs so the information is being gathered and provided. So it's obviously a need. Whether or not ICANN can figure out a process to fill that need that's anybody's guess.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks.

Bill Smith: This is Bill Smith. Can I get in the queue?

Susan Kawaguchi: Sure Bill it's your turn then.

Bill Smith: Okay. So as I said at the larger webinar my concern is - one of my concerns on this is the fact that it is centralized and it supposedly will support the Internet.

I agree with the centralized access but there are things that we had in the review team's report that having centralized access does not require a centralized database. And as example of that we have the DNS itself. It appears centralized to the user but in fact is not. It is highly distributed. So that's just generally a concern of mine that we are working on from my perspective an assumption that this will be a good thing, centralized access (unintelligible) to a centralized model. That's again my viewpoint having not been part of the discussion. Again thanks to everybody on the working group who did this work.

I see - my initial reaction from my first read of the report was this is a great way for the registrars to save money. They are no longer going to be required to maintain a port 43 or any type of service or Whois at the best I can tell from the report and that being claimed at various times by registrars it in fact is an expense to them. So it must to be an expense if they're having to offload so I see that as a gain for registrars and I'm wondering if there's anything to offset that.

I think having a centralized way of auditing may be useful but I believe there are ways that that could be provided potentially to registrars themselves or done in some other way that wouldn't require centralization of the data for access. I'm concerned about the speed with which this will be updated especially given things like (unintelligible) that are still (unintelligible).



Costs generally I think could be highly expensive and then just issues related with centralizing the information especially that information relating to law enforcement, security researchers and operation security codes. This will be a target, a highly desired target, to both breach and then to offload the data associated with those folks.

And I have no idea how to do authentication on an international scale and to do so in a way that will both ensure that we don't have bad actors gaining access to the system, number two. Two, being certain that people who should have access have access but only when they are authorized to so, as an example when an employee comes on board or leaves a company and then the liability that may attach to an employee of a company that says I'm using this data for this purpose and then that data is used for some other reason unbeknownst a company or even the individual that is using it for another purpose.

So I think there needs to be - there's an awful lot of work that needs to be done on the details on such a thing. It's such a significant change. While such a significant change may be required, I have a lot of concerns about how this could play out especially (unintelligible). Anyway that's a lot I know.

Susan Kawaguchi: Well I did take some notes. So I share most of those concerns but we have to move to something, what's working, isn't working. We think this would work. Do we know all the details? No I'm not going to say we do.

We've discussed the fact that we'd be leaving the registrars with the responsibility for a port 43 they probably would like. We also got into a heated discussion over what is authoritative, you know, and I think we finally left it as the registry's record would be authoritative so therefore you could get an up to date registry record through the RDS.

And so one of my concerns was wait, wait, wait if this is not authoritative then what am I putting in my UDRP as a registrar record, the domain name record. I want something that the courts would view as the record, the authoritative record. So there's a little - we need to sort of figure that one out.

We do see this as there could be some lag in updating these records but then you'd have real-time access back to that authoritative record at the registry so as long as the registrar and the registrant was communicating as they should with the registry, I think we'll be fine there.

The auditing I still think is something that's extremely valuable out of this. And security I think we have security issues with each and every Whois database around the world right now so we need to put those security measures in place.

And this is not a huge number of records. It may seem like that but the telephone company, how many records does Verizon and AT&T have for each mobile user and how many financial transactions records are kept. So there are good practices and best practices that are already established for protecting this database. And I think we need, you know, whomever runs this database needs to be fully responsible for that.

The system will always be gamed to a certain extent. And I think when you brought up the authentication and the liability to a company or employee that uses - states they're going to use the information for one thing and uses it for a completely different reason; I think LexisNexis faces that issue right now.

I can go on through our membership with LexisNexis go on and really look up almost anybody I want to look up, anybody in the U.S. at least I can look up

and I can figure out, you know, where they own their house, how many mortgages they have and a lot of information. But there are safeguards for that and there's some internal auditing in our company to make sure that nobody's using that for the wrong reasons.

So I think there's already good use cases, examples of a database with so much information and valuable information on how to protect it.

Does that answer your question or Bill is there anything else you want to...?

Bill Smith: It answers the liability thing, you have the ability to add and remove people, granting them access. It just becomes yet another thing that has to be done potentially on an onboarding and off-boarding. But I'm not sure how - so for LexisNexis I'm not sure how that is handled, how an account is shut off. But Whois currently is run entirely differently so making this change is a huge change in these businesses.

You suddenly have, as the report says, people will be licensed to have access. That's the word that was used. That's a pretty strong word. And companies will need to understand that that liability will attach if someone, one of their employees, requests information and then does something inappropriate with it, or anyone in the company does it, whether it's inappropriately disclosed or whatever.

So it's a pretty big thing. And at this point we don't know, or at least I haven't been able to glean from the report having read it a couple of times, what information will be available without login and what will be restricted to various levels of login and purpose. And without knowing those things it's really difficult to make - really to analyze and offer up much of an opinion sort of as I have with these are the areas that could be problematic.

Susan Kawaguchi: Right. No and you could say the thought that was put into this, you know, that is one of our discussion questions that we've out to the community: how should public and gated data elements be classified, using what criteria.

A lot of discussion has gone on around that but we have not really made any decisions and we're really hoping the community can guide us there. I mean personally I think I have a pretty good faith in what I would recommend but that's not, you know, that it not a EWG consensus agreement yet. So do we - the question is do we start off okay servers and a technical contact, start there, you know, and what else do you need to be shown to the public.

I think that anybody doing business with an entity should know the name of the entity and where their home office is and all of that -- not home as in your home, like house, but more like this is our corporate office and you can double check that with our trademark registration data to make sure that it is Facebook.

So we're really hoping that we get a lot of input on those data elements and, you know, the verified credit card information, not the credit card number but who's paying for a domain name. You know, that I think should be pretty not available. We should make that very stringent to get that information because for the most part, at least for my needs in my job day to day, I don't need that credit card information. I might need it if it's a bad guy as a way to find him but...

So maybe in October you'll have a better idea of what, you know, of what those data elements are. That's our hope to have this all wrapped up in October.

Bill Smith: Yes just one final thing Susan. I think I'm very much aligned with you on what data should be available and why and pretty much the bright line is commercial use and if it's being used in commerce in any way, and I think that's even just ads on a blog, that means you have to have a disclosure of the "home office" and all that information that goes with that. Because if it's truly personal and private then perhaps a technical contact is sufficient provided some other things happen as well on the security side.

As an example, and this is getting into the details, but that domain may be subject to not resolving if they're not aware on other things right, that's going on?

Susan Kawaguchi: Right.

Bill Smith: Because if we can't contact somebody to deal with issues or it's a phishing site, we do need to be able to deal with these things quickly. So I'm certainly of the mind commercial use absolutely so broader information that's available; purely private less but there needs to be in both cases we need ways to remediate and mitigate security concerns.

Susan Kawaguchi: Right. No I would agree. And one of the -- it sort of relates to this -- is one of the things we keep talking about is truly anonymous registration, few and far between. When it really comes to the needs out there, there are some critical need for someone to be able to advocate against the government and not be known, but in my mind we need to identify someone in that community to step up, take that on and provide a service where when the FBI or the CIA, Interpol comes to them they're completely armed to say no you're not conforming.

Because anytime you give someone anonymous information and register a domain name at a register that leaves that registrar very vulnerable to turn it over, do they agree to the CIA or to this individual, who are they going to protect. There's a desperate need for a truly anonymous registration information but it has to be a service and someone has to identify that from that community and develop something. That's my opinion. So there's a lot to this.

And it looks like Steve you have a question.

Steve Delbianco: Thanks Susan. It's a general question to say that when we evaluate your recommendations, what are we comparing them to, the best of all possible worlds, the optimal solution or does it merely need to be an improvement on that system of distributed Whois with uniquely applied rules for validation, verification and access from all the different registrars? In other words, do we have to be just incrementally better than the status quo or have you been charged with something in terms of optimal outcome?

Susan Kawaguchi: Well you know we've been charged with thinking completely out of the box and absolutely designing the best system. Unfortunately a lot of times thinking is sort of guided by what you know. So it has been really hard to go oh we don't have to adhere to that, we don't have to do that just because the Whois protocol did that. So we would love to hear ideas that are completely - that we haven't come up with and that is completely different but workable.

Steve Delbianco: Yes but think about my question. My question is after all the new ideas have been stirred into the pot, there will be a go/no go decision about whether to proceed with it and when that decision comes up there will be both costs and benefits and that's where this criteria is that do we need to just be better than the status quo or is there some higher bar they're asking you to reach? And I

know it's tough to answer right now but let's keep that in mind. If it's the current system, well it kind of stinks so it really wouldn't be hard to do better.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes I think we have a lot higher bar than to do better. To be perfect I don't think we have that bar. But I will keep that in mind. That's a good point.

Anybody else?

All right well it sounds like we've answered all the questions today. If you're going to be in Durban, please come to our session and then we'll be also talking again on Tuesday I think. So thank you all and I appreciate you listening to me.

Elisa Cooper: Well Susan I just want to take this opportunity to extend my sincerest thanks for all of your work and everything you do for the business constituency and in particular your work on this expert working group and in addition to the thick Whois working group you worked on before -- or the Whois policy review team that you worked on before. So thank you for everything and it's greatly appreciated and it's very helpful for me and for others to hear directly from you your perspective.

So thank you so much and yes we'll see everybody that's attending Durban very shortly. So thank you.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Bye.

END