ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group
Wednesday, 20 July at 16:00 UTC

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 audio is also available at: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-nextgen-rds-20jul16-en.mp3

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/bASbAw

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Operator: The recordings have started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the GNSO Next Generation Registration Directory Services, RDS, Policy Development Process Working Group call taking place on the 20th of July, 2016.

In the interest of time today, there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room so if you are only on the audio bridge could you please let yourselves be known now? Hearing no names, I would like to thank everyone for joining and remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

With this, I'll turn it back over to Chuck. Please begin.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Terri. This is Chuck Gomes. Welcome to each of you for joining us on this call at different times of the day. First thing, I want to ask does anyone have an update to your statement of interest? Please raise your hand in Adobe if you do. Okay.

Another thing I'd like to do that's not on the agenda but just a quick – for those of you who are in the Asia Pacific region, or some other area where this is a more desirable time, could you raise your hand in the Adobe room just to – so – excuse me – I said raise your hand, I meant – that's fine, just raise your hand. I won't call on you to speak but good. Good. I appreciate that. So we've got at least four people that don't have to do it at a ridiculous time so some of the rest of us get to share the wealth on that so thanks for doing that, I appreciate it. You get to share the wealth on that so thanks for doing that.

So the agenda is posted in the top right in the Notes section. And the first thing we're going to do is just get – go over three updates. One of them is the completion of Work Task 11, which is the – was our task to agree on how we're going to reach consensus when we start our deliberation process. And a final version of that, which was Version 13, a clean version of that, was sent out with the agenda. So certainly if anybody has any questions on that please feel free to ask them on the list going forward.

We will use that if we see needs to refine that we can of course refine it as we move forward and discover those needs. So Task 11 is done. And what we're going to be doing going forward is preparing for the actual deliberation, which is a part of what we'll start at least in terms of use cases today.

The second item with regard to updates is the Doodle poll. And I took a look at the Doodle poll about an hour ago so if any of you have done something recently on it, it won't be seen but it looks like as of when I looked there were 38 people who responded. And this Doodle poll was just a simple one, it had three choices on it, which were if we do have a half-day or full-day working group meeting in Hyderabad in November whether or not you would – if you would participate in that in person or remotely or you wouldn't be able to participate at all.

And we had a pretty good showing of those who would participate, at least 18 out of 38 said they would. Another six said they would if it happens, they could do it. And then there were another 10 that would participate remotely. So there's pretty good participation levels but it'd be really good if we can get those of you who have not completed the poll if you'd do it. It's a really easy poll, probably take you about one minute to do at the most and because of just the three choices.

And, again, let me emphasize, as it says on the poll itself that we realize that some of you can't commit authoritatively right now but if you can just give us a general idea. We don't want to schedule an in-person meeting then if the participation doesn't look like it will warrant it. If most of us are participating remotely it may not matter to be in person but so far the results look pretty good for in-person. But for those of you who haven't participated whether you, on the call right now or listening to the recording of the meeting or looking at the transcript later, please do that this week if possible so that we can have good data for communicating to the GNSO Council. Thank you very much for that, I appreciate that.

The third update item on the agenda is an update on the problem statement work that's going on behind the scenes that several of you volunteered to participate in, in our meeting in Helsinki. And I'm going to ask Susan if she would give us what information she has on that.

Susan Kawaguchi: This is Susan. And unfortunately, I forgot to reach out to the group yesterday. It was on my to-do list and I didn't get to it. But I took a quick look at the Ether pad doc and it looks like there has been some work done. And it's, you know, people are – there's some discussion and some drafting so hopefully and if there's any members that – of the problem statement group that would like to chime in, please do.

I think they're on their way but they haven't finished it yet. And it looks like Mark has a comment.

Mark Svancarek: Hi, this is Mark. Yes, if you look at the bottom of the Ether pad, the bottom three paragraphs, basically the first one is a very high level problem statement, the second one is a statement of why these are important, and then the third one is a statement of the privacy level that will be required. So it's not one concise problem statement yet, but I think almost all the information is contained in those three paragraphs already so I think we just need to come together and edit them down.

So everyone would take a look that would be great. And you just type your comments right in, you know, it's just a scratch pad. And then maybe sometime soon we could have a call and just close it out. I bet it won't take us too much longer.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thanks to Mark and to Susan and for all of you are participating in that. Hopefully in the next week or so we'll – you can have something that will be proposed to the full working group and we can discuss it as a whole. Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. This is Lisa Phifer for the record. I just wanted to note, I believe that the Ether pad itself is publicly accessible but the page that we created for the problem statement group is not. So for those of you that might be navigating to the – attempting to navigate to the page for the taskforce that was going to work on problem statement, don't be surprised if you can't edit that page if you're not a member of that taskforce. But the Ether pad itself I think you should be able to.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Lisa. This is Chuck again. All right, so let's move on then to Agenda Item 3, which we'll spend quite a bit of time on. And the purpose here is to review and discuss the triage of the possible requirements. And I'm going to turn it over to Lisa and Susan who did a lot of detailed work, spent many, many hours doing this.

Now please understand though, what they did was not to impose their work on us but rather to give us a start so that it'll make it easier for us to comment and improve upon what's been done. And the purpose, and I won't talk too much about this, I'll let them talk, but the purpose really is to take this huge list of possible requirements that we have and that we're going to deliberate on, and begin to organize it in ways that'll improve our efficiency in deliberation on the requirements.

So with that said, let me turn it over to I think Lisa first, but if Susan wants to go first that's okay too. And what they're going to do is first of all kind of walk us through the document and tell some of the things that they thought of and did and so forth and entertain questions on that. So, Lisa, do you want to start?

Lisa Phifer: Sure. Thanks Chuck. This is, again, Lisa Phifer for the record. What you see displayed in the Adobe Connect room right now is the spreadsheet version of the Triage Draft 3 but there was also a Word version of this document distributed on July 13 so I believe that was last Thursday.

And the purpose of the spreadsheet that you see in front of you is just to make it possible for you to filter on any of the columns that appear in the spreadsheet. And I'll talk a little bit more about that. But the content of the spreadsheet is actually identical to the content of the Word document that was distributed last Thursday. And I know there was a question raised on the list this evening – well for me it was this evening – as to where some missing possible requirements went. And I think that was because a filter was applied to one column so everybody was just looking at Group A.

But in fact all the possible requirements that have been submitted or were submitted through the 10th of June are contained in the Triage Draft 3. And just to be clear, we're not stopping with Draft 3 at all. There will be a Draft 4 coming out that contains all the additional possible requirements that have been submitted since the 10th of June, but we wanted to start with the version that everyone had already seen and just perform the triage on that.

The goal of the triage is really to just organize these possible requirements as a way of preparing for more effective deliberation. And we have a really long list of possible requirements and we need to have a tool that lets us look at different subsets of the possible requirements and then begin deliberation on meaningful subsets of them.

The triage isn't intended to actually start that deliberation process; it's not intended to actually change or combine or delete any of the possible requirements. It's simply an organization of the possible requirements that have already been submitted. And the triage approach actually was originally suggested by Greg Aaron so I want to give a nod to him.

But the triage approach includes four things. One is just simply reformatting possible requirements into a grid so that we could add columns. As you see in the document that's displayed in front of you – and I believe that everybody probably can scroll through this document themselves. But what you see in the document in front of you is five columns. The first two columns contain each of the possible requirements unique number and descriptions. Those are the same as you saw previously in Draft 3 that was distributed back on the 10th of June.

The last two columns then contain the suggested phase and group. And we're going to talk a bit more about how we came up with the phases and groups as a starting point for the working group to continue to massage this work.

And then the middle column there you see is prerequisites and dependencies. And that column just begins to identify some of the interdependencies between possible requirements as well as some external dependencies. And as I said, that's just a starting point. That column is certainly, you know, we didn't even take a complete pass on that column but we tried to give you enough to at least start to think about what those interdependencies might be.

So starting from the far left here, the unique number column, I think most of us have seen this. Everyone who submitted possible requirements is familiar with it but just as a refresher, what you see there is a notation of the charter question, so UP is users and purposes on this page, but DE is data elements, PR is privacy and so forth.

The source document number, so for example, D01 is shown at the top of this page. The numbered documents in the – both in the Word document and in the spreadsheet version of this, you'll find a list of all the documents at the end of either the spreadsheet in the last tab or at the end of the Word document. So D01 then is expanded with the title of the document and link to the actual document online. So that's how to navigate back to the source.

And then a unique sequence number, as possible requirements were submitted we just gave it a sequential number to each possible requirement within a particular charter question and source document. And the idea of that unique sequence number is to always let us get back to the source of that possible requirement. And also make it easy to cross reference these possible requirements when we get to deliberation so it shouldn't matter where the possible requirement ends up moving to during deliberation, we'll be able to go back to the original possible requirement at all times.

The next thing I want to talk about is the phase column. The phase column is the fourth column or it's really sort of the second from the left in the spreadsheet that you're looking at. The phase column place each of the possible requirements into one or more phases of this PDP. And the phases I'm talking about here, of course the ones defined by the charter, Phase 1 refers to policy requirements; Phase 2 refers to specific policies that this working group will end up developing based on requirements agreed in Phase 1. And then Phase 3 refers to implementation or coexistence guidance that might be associated with any policies defined in Phase 2.

So if you look at the Word document, not the spreadsheet but the Word document, you'll see at the start at each of the charter questions there's a little diagram. And that diagram is copied directly from the charter. And it describes the three phases as it applies to that charter question. And we used that guidance from the charter, and that came from the process framework, to suggest what phase each of these possible requirements probably fell into.

For example, in the users and purposes section that we're looking at right now, the second one on the list, so users and purposes Document 1, Requirement 2, it proposes that registration data be collected, validated and disclosed for permissible purposes only. Because that would be a guiding principle about users and purposes, we mapped that into Phase 1. That corresponds to the way that the charter describes what's in Phase 1 for users and purposes.

If we look down a little bit in the document further we'd find users and purposes from Document 1, Requirement 28. And that requirement proposes that – or possible requirement proposes that an application process be defined for approving new users and purposes if they should emerge in the future. And because that's actually defining a policy for an update process that's been mapped to Phase 2 for this particular question.

And then there's another user and purpose requirement, also from Document 1, it's Requirement 31, and it proposes a period – periodic implementation schedule for any policy that falls under that update process. And because that implementation schedule is implementation guidance, it would fall into Phase 3. So that's the way that the phasing was assigned to each of these possible requirements.

And sometimes, you know, we had to interpret a little bit. I did the policy assignments and Susan reviewed them, but sometimes we did have to interpret a little bit the way that the charter suggested the question be broken into the three phases, but the idea was to apply the charter guidance to figure out which phase of these fell into or probably fell into.

In some cases, though, a possible requirement might fall into more than one phase. And I'll give you an example of that. In the privacy section, also from Document 1, Requirement 6, it proposes selecting a location for data storage where applicable laws provide a high level of data protection. And Ayden actually called this out and questioned whether it might belong in Phase 1.

The reason that this fell into Phase 2 and 3 in the triage process, was because it involved a policy requiring such a location. And so that would fall into Phase 2. While implementation guidance about which locations met that policy goal would fall into Phase 3. So that was the rationale that landed it in Phases 2 and 3. And I'd just like to point out that that's an example of a possible requirement that actually fell into more than one phase and I think a lot of possible requirements end up being refined throughout the phases of the PDP.

So the bottom line is the goal of that phase column is really to help the working group focus initially on Phase 1 in its deliberations but eventually get to deliberating on the specific policies and implementation guidance as well.

The next column I'd like to describe for you is the prerequisites and dependencies column. And as I mentioned before, this column is incomplete. Not that the others are final in any way, but the prerequisites and dependencies column really is just a stab only for three of the charter questions, users, purposes, data elements and privacy.

And what this does is provide a starting point for identifying possible requirements either that are intended to support another higher level possible requirement, identifying a possible requirement that depends on some kind of prerequisite and that might include another possible requirement, or something external. Identifying possible requirements that depend on others and flagging possible requirements that are either actually identical duplicates. There's only a very few of those, or possible requirements that are substantially similar to others.

So it's – as we looked through these possible requirements and attempted to provide the triage it was helpful to us to identify which possible requirements were duplicates or very, very similar and so we included that information in the dependencies column to help give you that guidance as well.

And the goal of the column really is help all of us keep track of dependencies or assumptions that are made and possible requirements. And eventually to help this working group isolate some of the possible requirements that end up being the highest level of most foundational possible requirements meaning that they have no dependencies and so can be considered on their own. And again, this column is just a starting point so it'll be fleshed out as the group enters its deliberation phase.

And now I'll turn things over to Susan to talk a little bit more about the group column and then we can entertain some questions or comments that you may have. Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks, Lisa. And I want to thank Lisa for organizing this. I definitely worked on creating the group names and going through all the possible requirements, but she really made this an organized exercise, and I appreciate that.

So you'll see the group column that there's, you know, letters. So it references A, B, C and there's a key that Lisa has provided I think on the left section of the spreadsheet. And that you can reference to see what those are, what those mean. But as I went through reading all of these possible requirements, I tried to not put too much thought into it but just pick out whatever the main point of the requirement was.

And so, you know, was it a purpose? Was it a consent required? You know, whatever the main focus of the sentence was or the paragraph I tried pull that out. In some cases, that was really easy to do and other cases it took me a few times going back to really get the main focus of the possible requirement.

So there's nothing elegant about my group names. It – they just in some cases developed as I went through, and I think there was over 800 possible requirements. So for example, there was one that started out with Group N was – started out as controller and then I realized well controller and processor are about the same and I was running into processor in some of the language. And so – and then processing and transfer probably also related so instead of just trying to group those under one name I – Group N is controller or processor, processing transfer. So because it all seemed related to me.

Now, you know, this is based on my own experience with registration data so, you know, somebody else looking at this their first inclination may have been completely different. But this isn't set in stone at this point as we deliberate and as we use the use cases to come back we can then either change these or add to these and it – but it does help us group them to start.

Also the groups are not intended to be exhaustive. You know, I mean, we could have taken this and really delved down deep and with a lot of detail but I'm not sure that that would have helped at this point, helped our work at this point. And we can – we always have the flexibility of changing these and, you know, regrouping them if someone points out how wrong I made this, you know, created that group then we can make the changes we need to.

There's also a point where some of these possible requirements fell in multiple groups. You know, there's a lot of – two different groups are indicated in a lot of the possible requirement column. And in some there's maybe three or four. There was one which, you know, was Group U which is access policies, authenticated access; L, which is consent; and D, policy needs. So, you know, but the good part about that I felt like that specific possible requirement really focused on those three different groups.

And that we would, you know, it would be helpful to sort of filter and see the subset groups, you know, making sure that possible requirement is in that group.

Mark, did you have a question? Mark?

Mark Svancarek: When I looked at this document, you know, I was pretty over-awed by how much work had gone into it. And I was wondering - and sorry if this is just a new guy question - because I've never been on one of these groups before. As we go forward will we refer these items by its number so that we, you know what I mean, so that we can always make sure we're referring back to a thing that's already been documented as opposed to – what am I trying to say?

There was a lot of talk on email the other day about is this really adding anything? You know, what is this document? And it seems like this is the way to document all the things that have been added so far if we get in the habit of referring to these explicitly by, you know, UP D01 R17. Or is that not practical?

Susan Kawaguchi: In my viewpoint it is practical as we deliberate and decide that this – that first possible requirement fits within a certain use case or a, you know, we decided is an actual requirement. And because using that document number you could refer back to the full document to make sure that invalidates sort of that individual possible requirement that was pulled out makes sense when you read the full document or the full page maybe or paragraph that it came from.

But, Lisa, did you want to weigh in on that?

Lisa Phifer: Yes, I think, Mark, you think the nail on the head that the short end unique reference for every possible requirement is to allow us to do that cross referencing and not to have to, you know, recap and resummarize the possible requirements and where they came from every time we want to reference them. Now, I also think there's no way all of us are going to remember 800, you know, possible requirements and which number they belong to.

So hopefully the spreadsheet will help us do things like, you know, search and sort to very easily winnow down the list and find a particular possible requirement or set of requirements that are related to that one. So that's the whole goal here.

Mark Svancarek: Okay. Well this will be great for that so thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thank you. And, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thanks. Hey, good job both of you. And I'm going to come back to you with – and ask you just a little bit more that I'll describe in a minute. But first I wanted to provide some suggestions to the whole group in terms of looking at this and helping us refine it.

Let me suggest that the best place to focus in my opinion right now, is the prerequisite dependencies column and the phase column to make sure that we got those as accurately as possible, understanding that there can be some debate. So – and I want to talk a little bit about the group column.

We could spend probably four or five weeks just refining the groups. And certainly if we find a critical one that's missing, we can do that. But I kind of want to discourage spending too much time in refining the groups. We'll find out if there's a group missing and we need to fix that as we go. And I really don't see a lot of value certainly Susan took a cut at this from her view, don't think that that means we're going to – it's going to restrict us in any way. It's not.

In our deliberation we'll be able to full deliberate regardless of what group it's in. The grouping will just hopefully organize our work. So I'd like to suggest that we don't spend a lot of time trying to define the groups or identify some that are missing. If we find some that are and we have to add them, we'll do that. But let's not spend a lot of time discussing that. With a group this size we could spend, like I said, four or five weeks just refining the groups.

But, it would be helpful, I think, if you take a look at the prerequisite column and the phase column and see, you know, is there one that's identified for Phase 2 that really should be in Phase 1? If you see any of those call attention to that so that if we need to cover it in Phase 1 we will. Because probably what we'll do is kind of put the Phase 2 and Phase 3 ones aside until we get to those phases and focus on the Phase 1 requirements. And of course, as we look at dependencies and prerequisites, having those as accurate as possible will help us too.

Now with regard to the description, again, don't worry too much about the description because when we actually get into deliberation we'll probably find that we will reword some of the descriptions. And I'm sure we will. Okay? We don't need to do that right now, the main thing is to make sure that the prerequisites and the phases are well captured.

Now what I'd like – and, Lisa and Susan please feel free to comment on anything I've said. But what I'd like you to also do because it doesn't show in Adobe, is I'd like you to explain – Lisa, you mentioned this early in your talk that in the spreadsheet there are little arrows at the top of each column that allow for sorting. So I'd like you – they don't show up on the spreadsheet that's in Adobe but I'd like you to talk a little bit more about that. And I'd also like you to talk about the tabs that are in the spreadsheet so people know how to navigate that if they're not very familiar with spreadsheets.

Now, the last thing then in that regard how does the Word version differ with regard to the tabs? And I don't think it has the arrows for sorting. So if you can talk about that a little bit more, Lisa, that would be helpful, and certainly Susan, if you have anything to add not only in what I just asked for but in terms of the comments I made that would be very welcome.

Lisa Phifer: Sure, Chuck. Thanks. And this is Lisa Phifer again. Yes, so I guess the way to think about using this Excel spreadsheet is that the content of the spreadsheet should match the content of the Word document in terms of each possible requirement. If you look at the Word document, you'll see a table that's very similar. Unfortunately, when copying over some text into Excel we use a little bit of the formatting that goes along with the text from the possible requirements column. But it should be word for word the same.

What you gain though, in looking at the spreadsheet is the ability to filter on any group. So for example, or excuse me, any column. And that lets us look at these possible requirements in many different ways and kind of break off sort of bite size pieces that during deliberation we might want to look at. We don't have to decide what those pieces will be in advance; we can use the filters in different combinations to do that.

For example, if you used the down arrow on the phase column you can choose to see possible requirements that fall into Phase 1, 2 or 3 just by checking off which phases you want to see. And by default the column should, at the very top of the list there's an option for all so you'll see all of the possible requirements unless you uncheck that all and check some particular phases that you want to see.

In the same way, if you wanted to look at all of the possible requirements that happen to be mapped into a particular group - like say a group on purpose. Then you can use the group column, pull the little down arrow in the top of the group column, uncheck all and check only I believe it was Group A was purpose. And in fact that's how the spreadsheet was saved and that's why Kathy actually thought that a whole bunch of possible requirements had been lost because the was a filter applied to the group column.

And then you can filter on document number as well by filtering on that first column. So for example, if you wanted to see all the possible requirements that came from document 43, then you could just select that one, that happens to be the RFCs on EPP. But just so there's just different ways that you can use filtering in order to create those particular subsets.

And then of course you can filter on multiple columns to make that subset even smaller if you want to focus in on something particular. And we can add more columns during deliberation if there's other criteria we decide it's useful to filter on but that's the objective here.

Now Chuck mentioned that there's multiple tabs in the spreadsheet and so you'll find a tab for each of the first five charter questions. So user purpose, gated access, data accuracy, data elements, and privacy, those are the foundational questions from the charter. So you'll find a tab for each of those in the spreadsheet. And then you'll find a sixth tab, which is the key that gives you the – what the different groups are, what UP or PR or GA means. And then a complete list of all the documents hyperlinked to the source of the document.

I believe, Chuck, you also asked about the difference between the Word document and the spreadsheet. And one of the things that the spreadsheet does not have is the introductory material that the Word document has. So there's introductory material about what possible requirements are as well as introductory material about each of the charter questions that's in the Word document, and then the other big chunk that's in the Word document that's not in the spreadsheet are the cross cutting questions that are identified in the charter.

So those are questions on things like coexistence, for example, system modeling and so forth. They could certainly be triaged and put in this format but we started with the first five questions, since we knew that that was the work that the questions that the working group would likely tackle first. We wanted to get the methodology right before we attempted to cover the rest of the questions.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa. This is Chuck. Just one more thing. So how does the Word document compare to the spreadsheet with regard to the tabs?

Lisa Phifer: So the tab on users and purposes corresponds to the section of the Word document on users and purposes. The tab on data elements corresponds to the section on data elements in the Word document. The tab on privacy corresponds to the section on privacy in the Word document so the actual list of possible requirements, the table itself, should be identical with the exception of the formatting should be identical to those sections between the Word document and the spreadsheet.

Chuck Gomes: And is there a way for – you just have to scroll down to get to the different sections in the Word document, is that correct?

Lisa Phifer: That's correct.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay. Okay, I appreciate that. I don't know if either of you had any comments on the suggestion I made with the focus on the prerequisite and the phase columns, did either of you have any reaction to what I suggested there since I didn't clear that with you first?

Lisa Phifer: What was that suggestion?

Chuck Gomes: Well I suggested that people focus on the prerequisite column and the phase column in particular in providing feedback on this because we want to make sure we have those as accurate as possible. And did either of you have any comments on that suggestion? Does that make sense, in other words?

Lisa Phifer: I think that makes sense. I think at this juncture because what we're trying to do is really prepare to have a tool that we can use during deliberation. If people try to use the tool and have feedback on, you know, or on the usability, you know, is this is format helpful? Do you understand, you know, how we came up with the phases, how we came up with the groups? Do you have any suggestions for, you know, how to refine that methodology that probably would be the thing that the working group wants to settle on before we, you know, attempt to continue to use the triage format and begin our deliberations?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa. This is Chuck again. Susan, did you have anything to add?

Susan Kawaguchi: No, I think Lisa has really explained it well.

Chuck Gomes: Good. So let's open it up now for questions from anyone on this. And no questions inappropriate, okay? There are no dumb questions because this is a lot of material to look at. And as several have noted in the chat, there's been a huge amount of work going into this. Now just because they spent a lot of time doesn't mean it's perfect or anything else, but please let's first of all understand what we have in front of us and what this tool is. And so please ask questions like Mark did so that we can add the clarity.

And that'll help us then, in this meeting, in the next meeting, or two, in terms of refining this as we go. So please raise your hand if you have a question or even a comment, that's okay too, but in particular want to try to answer any questions that will add more clarity in terms of this tool.

And while we're waiting, Chuck still speaking, Stephanie, you don't need to be an Excel expert to use those little down arrows. If you'll pull up the spreadsheet and experiment with that you'll probably see that it's been designed to make that easy. You don't have to know how to sort. You don't have to know anything except just click on that tab and any column you want to look at you'll see the options. Pick one of them and you'll see what happens.

So again, that really takes very little Excel expertise. So whether you're a klutz or not, and that's your term, right, it should be easy to use, that's at least the way it was intended. Go ahead, Stephanie.

((Crosstalk))

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks, Chuck. Believe me, my accountant has been trying to train me for the last 16 years, and so far no luck. So if I manage to figure this out it'll be a minor miracle. But I'm just – I'm just a bit mystified, and may I say that kudos to Susan and Lisa for all this work. It's a tremendous amount of work. My fear is that it is very sort of idiosyncratic the way this is being grouped and organized. And I fear that it's – it isn't going to make sense to others. So in particular I'm looking at the group key – the groupings – they just – I can't figure out how they're being sorted.

You know, why do we have a group for name server data? Why do we have a group for unique contact data? Why do we have a group for applicable law? And then why do we have a group for – I'm trying to think of something that would otherwise logically fit into applicable law, right to privacy for instance. Transparency. That's all governed by applicable law.

So, you know, there's apples, oranges, grapes and black currants in this list. And I realize we have to come to grips with a way of sorting but I would have been more comfortable if we had, as a group, figured out which categories made sense.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stephanie. Great issues to raise and good questions. Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. We actually tried – and Susan can chime in here too but we tried not to, you know, put too much judgment into what the categories should be. What we tried to do was take obvious keywords out of the possible requirements themselves and say, hey, all these requirements mention applicable law, for example. Shouldn't they be in a group? Or all of these requirements mention consent so shouldn't they be in a group? So those categories or excuse me, those groups, they came directly from the possible requirements themselves and they don't – they're not really an opinion about the possible requirements. And they're absolutely apples and oranges.

They're more just what popped out of those possible requirements that made them similar to each other. So the focus was similarity amongst possible requirements. Susan, did you want to add anything?

Susan Kawaguchi: Just to agree. And it – and like I said at the beginning of this, this is not elegant at all. And it was sort of quick and dirty maybe is the way I would describe it. But as I read it, as I read the possible requirement whatever keyword popped out that was the sort of what I took. And if you really, you know, if I went through the 800 possible requirements again with a fresh look I might choose different keywords – different keywords would pop out.

But I think as I have reviewed most of these twice at least, if not three times, that I think we're on the right track with this in the grouping. But as we filter these and group them and then start talking about the possible requirements in groups or subsets of those groups I think it'll really show – I think you'll find that they are related and that they should be grouped together.

They may also belong in another group and that I've indicated, you know, with another group, you know, some of them have two or three groups. But I think it's the best way we could have done this to start with the use – it was a good use of time, let's put it that way.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Susan. It's Chuck again. Stephanie, so one of the possible advantages, and we may find in some cases they are and other cases they're not, of grouping is that we can look at a group of related requirements together and hopefully improve our efficiencies. In some cases, that may work, in some cases not, but we'll be flexible there. Now, is that a – you have a follow up question or a comment, Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: Well I think that there are policy decisions based on the keywords you're pulling out. I give you, for instance, consent. Consent is a very highly problematic principle in privacy particularly as applied to Whois. My objection to the EWG was based on the reliance on consent. And the fact that you have managed to pull it out of the very few documents that talk about it strikes me as implying – I don't wish to sound overly critical here – but I don't know how you can justify pulling consent out.

Chuck Gomes: Well don't…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …too much in that, Stephanie.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Nobody should imply…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …that any of the grouping or anything else where implies a particular conclusion. All this is…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …is a way of organizing potential requirements so that we can then deliberate on them and decide whether consent is required or anything else that's required as stated there. So my suggestion is…

Stephanie Perrin: Why use it at all? Why use it at all? I mean…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Well if you find…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …we'll dump it. That's one of the things we'll talk about when we deliberate.

Stephanie Perrin: I think analytically if you're going to pull out one of 10 basic sets of principles in data protection law then pull out all 10. Sure, Fab, it was written in the documents but so were thousands of other words. Rule of law.

Chuck Gomes: Remember what I suggested, Stephanie…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Don't get hung up too much on the groups.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: The issues on that will fall out when we deliberate.

Stephanie Perrin: It's going to shape thinking. It introduces bias…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: If you let it shape thinking it will. And that's to everybody, not just you. And what I'm saying is don't let it shape your thinking with regard to any conclusions. This is an organizational effort to try and help us deal with over 800, it may be over 900 now, requirements. And hopefully we can accept that. Mark, go ahead.

Mark Svancarek: This is Mark. Stephanie, it might be – I think the word group is what's throwing you off here. It might be better to think of them as just keywords or even hashtags if you're a Twitter person, I don't know if you're a Twitter person. So it's just we say, you know, UP D01 has the following attributes. One of the attributes is, you know, keyword A. UP D01 R20 has the following attributes, it has keyword A and keyword D.

And we could add as many of the keywords as we want, you know, if you notice that there's any sort of trend so, you know, as you mentioned, there could be 10 different words, you know, words of art that are related to privacy, privacy law. You could, if you found it interesting, you could tag multiple requirements with those keywords and then we'd be able to see the patterns as they, you know, as we use the document and go through things.

We could see patterns and say oh those really do need to be grouped together, or we might question, does that keyword really apply to this one or not? So I think that your concern gets resolved sort of organically just by the act of assigning the keywords, looking at the groups of keywords and challenging does that keyword really apply to this one or not? So I think it'll really be okay.

Well why is it a keyword? Okay so where's the – I don't have my hard copy with me. But Group A, what does that mean? Remind me again what Group A is.

Lisa Phifer: Purpose.

Mark Svancarek: Purpose. Okay so what – so this says I think this goes to the – this requirement is – yes, it goes directly to the purpose of having the thing at all. So because there's a mission we have to do this, so this is a purpose. Okay so purpose, principle, privacy. I guess I don't understand the question of why keywords. Just so that you can, at a glance, say show me all the ones that are related to registries versus registrants. Show me all the ones at a glance that apply to Topic A versus Topic B.

And I think that that will help to organize the way that that we discuss the thing. So okay so far we've documented 15 of these things that are in Category A, and I'm just making up these numbers. We'll look at those 15 things together whereas Category H maybe we'll only have two of those. Do we even need a Category H? You know, so I think when you think about groups it's about thinking of things being in something whereas I think this is actually the opposite which is these are keywords so we just have hundreds of independent rows that have just been tagged with particular attributes. And we just happen to be calling them groups.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Mark. This is Chuck again. Stephanie, go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: I would suggest to you that – Stephanie Perrin for the record – that I cannot see a logic in this series of groups and therefore to agglomerate things in a group let me see one that I found particularly bizarre, registrar transfer policy. How many times in the many documents that we listed did registrar transfer policy come up as keywords? And why would that be pulled out?

Chuck Gomes: So…

((Crosstalk))

Susan Kawaguchi: Let me talk. So, you know what? You'd have to go back, Stephanie, and go through every one of those. That one actually was one that was hard for me and – but referenced the registrar transfer policy from the RAA. So that made sense that we group it that way, in my opinion. But if you want to go through every one of the 800 that were reviewed multiple times and question that, that's appropriate to do in the deliberations. I don't see why it's appropriate to do it now.

Stephanie Perrin: I think it's appropriate, respectfully I would submit that it's appropriate to do it now because we are categorizing all of our documents and proposed requirements or potential requirements or whatever they are, and we are sorting them into groups. And therefore, the categories are extremely important. And I would suggest that there is no way these are pulled out without a policy thinking behind them unless you have gone through the data analysis to see how many times the words are used and you haven't done that – at least I haven't heard that you've done that.

I mean, please, I'm not trying to suggest that this wasn't a pile of work. What I'm suggesting is it's idiosyncratic and every single person here might come up with a different way of sorting it depending on their policy bias.

Chuck Gomes: So, Stephanie…

Stephanie Perrin: And that policy bias is extremely important.

Chuck Gomes: Stephanie, this is Chuck. You are illustrating exactly the point I made earlier. If we had just the 27 people on this call do the grouping, we would probably come up with 27 different groupings. And so is that time well spent? Could we ever even come up with groupings that we agree with? I seriously doubt it. And I personally think that our time would be better spent starting to deliberate and if the groupings help us fine, if they don't, we'll ignore them. The groupings are not going to determine our deliberation unless we let them.

Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the records and what have you. Stephanie, and somebody needs to mute their line because it's terrible feedback. We're not trying to categorize anything. I think you're confusing one thing with another. I mean, the – what this exercise is more around – what I do is like tagging. So you're putting keywords, phrases, with document so it's whether you want to explore all the documents that have a particular concept associated with them, you can do that.

So a single document could be, I'm using the term tagged because it seems to work for me – could be tagged with multiple keywords, multiple concepts so it could appear in multiple places. It's just a different way of viewing all the documents.

Now you can disagree with some of the tags, some of the assignments, but it's not a matter of categorizing anything. Nobody is saying or even suggesting that, you know, these 10 documents are the only documents associated with concept X or Y. It's an attempt to bring some level of organization to a very large amount of documents.

I mean, if you look at academic publications, if you go into a library, I mean, I think it was the Dewey system that's used there for categorizing books. I mean, you know, sometimes you'd look at a book and you'd think, you know, why on earth is it categorized under sociology when it's more to do with history. But somebody added, you know, they had to add something to it.

I mean, I think, you know, it's not – nobody is suggesting or trying to say that Document X can only belong under Concept A or B, it's just a matter of helping to kind of triage the documents so you can sort them and review them in different ways. So I mean, if you don't agree with the way that these – some of these documents have been tagged, or sorted or the keywords or whatever they're assigned to them, then you can add or suggest differences. Thanks.

Terri Agnew: And, Chuck, this is Terri. If you're speaking we're no longer hearing you.

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry, I was on mute. So we're going to move on to Agenda Item 4 after I let David jump in here, so that we can talk about use cases because we may need to – some of those for our meeting next week. So, David, jump in and then we'll go to Item 4.

David Cake: Thank you, Chuck. I just – I don't – I think we all agree that, you know, the current grouping and classification is not perfect. But it's a grouping. And, I mean, it's obvious to anyone that has looked at an academic library, as Michele suggested, the Dewey Decimal system is not perfect for sort of modern uses either.

The – there's no reason why we couldn't go through and have other people have an attempt at it. I mean, I would be very happy if Stephanie wanted to go through all the items and suggest other ways to group it. But I think the issue here is as an organizing – the first grouping is valuable – or the first attempt at tagging, grouping is valuable, the second one is just by its very nature, slightly less valuable. If we all did it, you know, by the time we got the 27th grouping we'd be adding very little.

We can do more, just but there's diminishing returns on that exercise to continue sort of finer grained grouping. And I mean, the question I guess is not so much whether or not this is perfect, but whether doing a whole lot more work on grouping is the best use of our time. If we could make at this point or whether to – whether most of those imperfections in the grouping system will get shaken out when we do actually come to a consideration. And we can look at – when we consider a bunch of things that are grouped together some of them will obviously belong together but there may be some that don't and we can further sort that at the time once we're looking at them in detail.

That's – I mean, there's nothing wrong with doing more grouping or with sticking with the ones that's just – what really is the best use of our time? And we may not know that in retrospect. We are going to look at all these things in detail. I think the most valuable being here is whether or not the groups are perfect, what they will have done is captured the – enough of it so that the requirements that are very close duplicates, so those are a lot of requirements in there that where we've got essentially the same principle restated in, you know, multiple different documents.

And those things where there is obvious redundancy and things that obviously should be captured together, are captured together. There may be a few where things – you know, a few disparate things are thrown in together, but that's all right, we were going to have to, you know, we'll see that when we get to them and we'd have to consider them separately anyway. But capturing that huge amount of redundancy and the things where it is clearly, you know, similar ideas restated in multiple places, I think is the most important thing. And we've done that with this grouping and it will help us move us forward. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, David. You said some things that I didn't do a very good job of saying. This is Chuck again. The – what is the best use of our time? Again, is it the best use of our time to spend the next five or six weeks refining the grouping and maybe not ending up with any grouping that the majority of support even then? Personally, I don't think that's the best use of our time. I assure you, I'm going to do everything in my power to make sure that we're not unduly influenced on any of our deliberation regardless of the grouping or anything else. But we do need a way to organize our deliberation efforts going forward.

That said, let's go to Agenda Item 4. And let's look at an example use case and related data annexes and I think that Michele is going to do that, am I right on that?

Michele Neylon: Chuck, it's Michele. Yes, I think. Unless Lisa wants to help me with this. But anyway okay, so…

Chuck Gomes: Now if we can change what's in Adobe – Lisa, you want to jump in, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Yes, thanks Chuck. As we're changing to another document here, to – I'll just kick off things and then we'll switch to Michele to walk through some examples of use cases here. But during the last working group call staff had an action to distribute the EWG's example of use cases to the working group. And so in your meeting materials you'll find what's displayed on the screen here. And I just want to briefly tell you what's here and then let Michele drill into a couple of the examples that are actually mentioned on this page.

What's in this – this is actually an excerpt, right, from the EWG's final report. It's Annex A, which has a list of example use cases. They were drawn from today's Whois. And in the list you'll notice that there's some permissible purposes. The EWG ended up recommending they were permissible but this working group might not. But I want to show you that for each purpose there was a list of use case examples.

So those of you that have been asking what example use cases have been worked, this is the list that was worked by the EWG and might be available as raw material if you should volunteer to develop a similar use case. And Michele will talk about some of these example use cases here which he actually developed as a member of the EWG, just to give you a feel for what they might contain.

Also in this document except is Annex D and that's mapping between permissible purposes and data elements. And I included that in this excerpt because the EWG's use cases were drafted very early on in its work and thinking evolved about how to group use cases into purposes and so did the specific data elements that were then associated with purposes. So wanted to give you a mapping from use cases - the purposes to the data elements that the EWG ended up with - just so that you have all the pieces in one place.

For example, domain name ended up being relevant to all the purposes and all the associated use cases while DNS name servers were actually mentioned in a smaller subset, including the subset that Michele is going to intro. And then there are three tables at the tail end of this handout. There's a table of RDS users and purposes mapped to use cases. And that provides a summary description of each of the example use cases that are listed here. Just so that you know what's in there without actually going and reading the whole use case.

There's also some definitions for these RDS purposes that the EWG came up with again just so that you have it handy if you were curious what the purpose domain name control is, for example. And then a table that includes the registration data needed for each purpose, again, just so that you have it handy in one place. But all this was excerpted from the EWG's final report.

And I'll turn things over to Michele now to talk about a couple of domain name control use cases just to illustrate the concept here.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Lisa. Michele for the record. Okay so the domain control use cases that I worked on - and this is all going back a couple years - these were the kind of scenarios that my staff deal with on a daily basis, both in terms of what they're doing when they're interacting with domain names and our clients and, you know, addressing queries from our clients in relation to domain names.

So the – bear with me one second. So for example, let's see, we've got a number of them. So, you know, updating and domains DNS, so the scenario here is you could change the DNS, in other words, the name servers for a domain name. Very brief overview, when a person wants to find out where they're being hosted they can review the name server entries for the domain. So, you know, pretty straightforward.

If a domain name is using the Blacknight name servers, then you can – it might be hosted with Blacknight, obviously it could be pointing somewhere else, the record could be pointing somewhere else but at least you'd have some idea as to who to go to about making changes to DNS.

So, you know, main use case, checking where the domain name is being hosted, coming up with casual format use case, changing domain DNS records, so the primary actor would be the registrant, other stakeholders, the registrar. You could expand on that. You can say maybe the registrant's sys admin or technical contact or something like that you could come up with a bunch of different ones you could have in there.

There might be some interaction with the registrar. The data elements you're going to be dealing with, and this is based on the data elements that we have at that stage when we were working on the EWG, so the registrar information, the name serve entries. And then the use case it'll have a story, or kind of do, you know, how and why you've been doing this. The registrant wishes to point to a new hosting provider, this involves updating the DNS for the domain first looking up the domain, the domain is registered because a parent through whom the update must be carried out.

And the name server entries to the domain can be used after a lookup of the domain. When a change is made to a domain's DNS through the registrar the update can take time to propagate globally, checking the name server entries to the domain will confirm that these changes are being carried through. And then you can, you know, you can check the Whois and you can do DNS lookups, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera.

Another one in the same group we had was renewal of a registered domain name. So the whole scenario to renew the domain, when domain name is due for renewal the current registrar must issue the billing contact with renewal notification in advance of the domain expiry. Billing contact must ensure to agree to the renewal during the domain alter a new period, and receives the renewal request the registrar must bill the billing contact, submit the renewal to the registry and ensure the expiry day is updated.

So, I mean, these are all kind of things that if you have domain names you deal with this, I mean, essentially, you know, if you do not pay the registrar or the other service provider dealing with your domain will not be renewed. So going through that in a bit more detail, the primary person who's going to be dealing with this is going to be the registrant or whoever is looking after the billing for the domain name.

You could – other entities interacted with, you know, other stakeholders, you could the registry, the registrar. So the data elements you might look at because the kind of thing we would get here sometimes is somebody might ask us, A - you know, when is my domain due for renewal or, they might have looked at the domain and they might get confused. I mean, there's a whole range of different things that could happen here. So the data elements, domain status, domain expiry date, the billing details and the renewal period in years.

Now of course bear in mind, that these are all the data elements at a high level. This doesn't necessarily – nobody is suggesting that all of these elements would be publicly exposed. I mean, these are just the elements you're going to interact with in some shape or form.

Excuse me. So the registrar will need to note the expiration date of the domain and ensure to contact the registrant/billing contact in advance of expiry to request the renewal. Again, that's pretty logical. The registrar will need to note the billing contact details for the domain name. These can be different than the registrant, the name contact details shown (unintelligible) Whois. Data protection – those are complicated, who can and can't be contacted in relating to the billing of the domain. This is, again, standard to, you know, nonpublic information.

A receipt – upon receipt of a renewal confirmation from the billing contact the registrar will need to check that the domain is not past expiry and the domain status is still within the auto-renew period. I mean, if the domain has gone way past expiry for whatever reason this can cause extra complications.

So if – so if you renew the domain name before the expiry it is not an issue. If you leave it to way past expiry this becomes an issue. So once the eligibility of a domain for renewal has been confirmed the registrar must submit the domain name for renewal with registry for a specified period of years. Following renewal of the domain name by the registry the registrar must ensure that the domain name expiry date has been updated to reflect the added registration period and that their billing records are updated to account for this. That's just the renewal one.

What was the other one? Another one which we talk about a lot is around the – is everybody able to hear me okay because I'm seeing people on the chat who aren't – are you able to hear me or are just not sure who's speaking? Okay. Perfect, okay.

So transferring of a registered domain to a new registrar. So you have a domain name registered and you want to move it to a new registrar. So when someone wishes to transfer the domain registration to a new registrar they must contact the losing registrar to ensure that the domain name is unlocked so the losing registrar is the registrar with whom it's registered at present. EPP key is issued and the Whois information is correct because I see probably no – if – all the transfers and stuff that goes on behind the scenes requires interaction via email a lot of the times. So if those email addresses are incorrect, or the records are incorrect, it can cause lots of headaches.

So on receipt of a transfer request the receiving registrar will check that the EPP key is valid. The domain name is unlocked and the admin contact email address is valid. Transfer authorization email will be sent to the admin contact by the gaining registrar and so on so forth. So, I mean, I'm not going to go through this in absolute detail. But, you know, stakeholders, it's the registrants or the person whose domain name it is. There's going to be interaction with the registry, the gaining registrar, the losing registrar, so the primary contact is probably going to be the new registrar to whom you're moving the domain.

You know, common issues around this kind of scenario, the domain name is – you know, if the domain name is locked or if the domain name is not more than 60 days old, or if the domain name has gone way into its expiry which means it can't be transferred.

So the use case goes though that in a bit more detail. And, you know, these are use cases that, as Lisa said, we came up with quite early on in the EWG. Just to kind of see, you know, what – which elements – which bits of information people would interact with. Some of the bits of information – some of the bits of information, you're going to get them – directly from public Whois. Other bits of information, you know, they're not going to be public. Nobody is suggesting that they be public.

And the fourth one that set that we had was deletion of a domain name so in this case, you know, it's – there's a number of reasons why this would be of interest to somebody. The basic view we have here is if someone wants to know when a lapsed domain name is due to drop they can check the expiry date and the domain status. Using this information they can tell when it will drop, in other words, when the domain will become free for registration again.

I mean, kind of scenario that we see sometimes is that people forget to renew the domain in time. It goes into extended expiry so that the renewal is going to cost them a lot more. So it might work for them, look, it's easier just for them to wait until the domain becomes available or maybe scenario where a domain name that somebody wants to have, wants to register and they're keeping an eye on it to see when it becomes available for them to register. Not that complicated really.

Again, you know, you're looking at interacting with potentially both the registry and the registrar. And the things they're interested in is the domain status, so these are the EPP statuses that goes into Whois and the expiration date. And so these were just, you know, these are just a few examples of use cases all around maintaining and managing domain names.

I don't know does anybody have any questions about any of this? Any thoughts? Were these all – was this all wonderfully clear? Or was this terribly boring?

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Michele. This is Chuck. In our – much appreciated. In our last 10 minutes what I'd like to do is to pull up a template for use cases that will be sent after this meeting to the working group list. And we can improve on the template. But for some sort of consistency – and I'd also like to ask any of you who are willing, we don't – we just probably need two or three or so, to write up a use case that you're particularly interested in so that we can begin discussing some use cases in detail.

For example, if we don't get any volunteers we could take one of Michele's use cases and go through that and discuss it. And Lisa, you formulated it really well I think in our leadership call earlier in the week. If you could talk about the purpose of use cases that would be great.

Lisa Phifer: Sure. Thanks, Chuck. And this is Lisa Phifer again. What you see displayed on the screen here is a possible draft template for use cases. This template actually is the template that was used by the Expert Working Group. And the four examples that Michele just gave, but there've already been some additional fields that have been suggested over email that could be added to the template.

But the purpose of these use cases really is to allow us to look at particular real world scenarios involving registration data and directory services. And through looking at those real world scenario to identify and better understand existing Whois uses. Now those uses might end up being, after this group deliberates permissible or impermissible. They might end being primary or secondary. But just looking at uses to understand them before we begin that deliberation.

Also identifying the users that are involved in those cases. The users that actually seek to access gTLD registration data. Their specific purposes for doing so, the specific data elements that are involved and in the EWG's template also we identified a list of stakeholders that were potentially impacted by each example use case. But identifying all those elements of use cases will allow us to step back and look at uses and perhaps look at which uses are similar, which data elements are commonly used across use cases and really then link back to and provide context for deliberation on possible requirements.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa. Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Yes, thanks. Michele for the record again. Just to kind of drive home the same point I've already made a couple of times. But just so that we're clear, when we're looking at these use cases we're talking about information that somebody – be that the registrar, registrant, registry, or third party, is interested in, has access to or would like access to, not every single one of those elements is going to be public, nor is anybody expecting it to be public.

So for example, billing information, you know, how somebody has paid for something, the email address associated with their billing account on our systems, for example, that's not public.

The user name and password or other authentication mechanism that somebody's using to access a system - be that a registrar's system, a hosting provider's system, a DNS provider system. These are bits of information that somebody interacting with that system would need to have access to but it's not being suggested that these are going to be subject to any – to being, you know, being public or being pulled into any kind of directory service or anything like that. This is just down to, you know, practical thing. If you need to log into the Blacknight control panel you need to have the user name and password. That's – and how you store that, what format that's in is completely outside the scope of anything that we're doing here.

But you still need to have access to that information to be able to log in to make an update. Just in case people are worried about, you know, data privacy concerns around some of this or security concerns, it's more down to just this is the story about how somebody updates their domain, this is how somebody, you know, does a particular thing. It's not suggesting that all of the elements in there are going to be public, in any kind of directory or subject to any ICANN policy or anything like that.

Also, Stephanie is asking on the chat a round who the primary actor is. I mean, the primary actor, I suppose, is also going to be whoever is going to be initiating the action, whatever that action is. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Stephanie, please go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, thanks, Chuck. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I was actually asking not about primary actors but about primary purpose and secondary purpose when we actually decide wat the primary purpose and what the secondary purpose and what's an impermissible purpose because we haven't done that yet. Lisa answered me and that's in the deliberation phase.

I just wanted to draw to everybody's attention - that those of us who are concerned about privacy - we are not just concerned about what is in the Whois. We are concerned about how, let's take on Michele, how one Michele Neylon manages his company to ensure that my credit card information that I provide to him for the sole purpose of paying for my domain name, is not accessible by all of his staff for any old law enforcement agent that wants it et cetera, et cetera.

In other words, that he has reasonable controls in place and that he recognizes that that is highly sensitive personal information that he has a responsibility to protect. Sometimes I fear that when we look at privacy or privacy law, at large, we don't understand that that means he has to put user access controls in to make sure that only the guys in accounting get access to my credit card information. Just thought I'd throw that in there. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stephanie. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Well as Stephanie called me out personally I have to defend myself. Michele for the record. I mean, first thing is first, you know, access controls, security levels, etcetera, etcetera, these are things that are outside the scope of the PDP. But in terms of, you know, how anybody interacts with their providers be that registrar's hosting providers or whatever, I mean, most of us are going to, you know, we're going to comply with best practices.

You know, in the case of my own company we spent thousands of euros getting ourselves ISO certified. So I can assure you that, you know, nobody has access to credit card information unless absolutely – unless they absolutely need to.

You're asking about data protection law in relation to registration data in terms of the Whois data is, within scope, fine. But how we handle credit card information is outside the scope. Let's, you know, they're three different things. So, you know, I don't know what you want me to answer you with, Stephanie. But, you know, the point being ultimately that, you know, you choose your provider based on how comfortable you are with what you think their business practices are. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. This is Chuck. And by the way, for those that have been bothered by the noise from my mic, apparently it's when Stephanie and myself have our mics open at the same time is when it's a problem. So I don't know how we avoid that because it's probably going to happen. But we're out of time. I don't want to drag the meeting on. I would like to ask if there are any volunteers to write up a use case of your own interest and submit them to the group before our meeting next week.

Certainly if you're willing to do that, and I think Mark already kind of volunteered on the list to do that, so, if you will follow through on that, I would like to ask you to at least follow the template as it is right now. We may change it. But if a couple other people would like to volunteer to write up a use case doesn't have to be overly complicated or long, it can be simple. But then we would try to talk about one or two of those use cases in our next meeting.

And let me commit also to the fact that we will continue the discussion that we've had on the grouping, okay, and the next week – so we won't just let that ride. I wanted to spend a little time on the use cases so hopefully we can get a few to before next week to just talk about in detail so that we can begin to see, you know, is this a valid use? Is it not? And so forth.

So I think that'll help us begin to get our thinking in order when we actually start actual deliberation. And hopefully by then we'll have the working group purpose statement that we can talk about as well. Don't know if that'll happen next week but hopefully in the next couple weeks.

So let me stop there and open it up to anybody on the leadership team that wants to point out something. Marika, if you can talk about our next meeting? And then if anybody else on the leadership team has something to add that we need to cover before we adjourn, because we are over time.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. The next meeting is on Tuesday the 26th of July at our regular time of 1600 UTC.

Chuck Gomes: Marika, anything else that I've left off? And I'm sorry we want to cut it off but it don't want to get in the habit of running over our 90 minutes. We will pick up next week on the things that we didn't get to get resolution on today. Again, if a few of you would – if one or two of you, besides Mark, would volunteer to write up a use case otherwise we can use one of the ones from Michele or one of the ones from the EWG working group.

Or if somebody wants to take one of the EWG ones and modify it to your own liking - the main thing is for us to have a couple use cases that we can start talking about. And instead of just having them be illustrations like we did today, and like we did in our last meeting, that Rod helped us do. Anything else we need to cover? Okay, thanks everybody.

And let's have some activity in the list in the coming week. And, again, if you want to volunteer to write up a use case please communicate that on the list in the next couple days and then provide it – and we're really talking about a page or a little bit more than a page is all we're talking about on those. So that would be appreciated.

Not seeing anything else that needs to be done. Stephanie, is that an old hand? Okay, thank you. All right, everybody, the meeting is adjourned. Thank you and have a good rest of the day or night. There's not much night at least until midnight for some of us. But – and then we will communicate on the list. Meeting adjourned.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines. And have a wonderful rest of your day. (Mike), the operator, if you could stop all recordings.

END