ICANN Transcription

GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group

Tuesday, 27 September 2016 at 16:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GNSO Next-Gen

RDS PDP Working Group call on the Tuesday, 27 September 2016 at 16:00 UTC. 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 attendance may be found at:

https://community.icann.org/x/vAm4Aw

The audio is also available at:

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-nextgen-rds-27sep16-en.mp3

Coordinator: Recordings are now started. You may now proceed.

Michelle DeSmyter :   Thank you, Good morning, good afternoon and good evening welcome to
                 the GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group call on the 27 September
                 2016 at 1600 UTC. In the interest of time today there will be no roll call as we
                 have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe
                 Connect room. So if you're only on the audio bridge today if you could please
                 let yourself be known now.

Susan Kawaguchi: This is Susan Kawaguchi. I'm not in Adobe yet. I'm having a technical difficulty.

Michelle DeSmyter: Okay. Great, thank you and we'll note that. Also as a reminder if you could please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Also please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I'll turn the call back over to Chuck Gomes.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Michelle, much appreciated. Welcome everyone. And my apologies for the delay caused by my - I had a new link but it was a link for the leadership circle for Adobe instead of the one for today so my apologies for that. Does anyone have a statement of interest update? Okay not hearing anyone or seeing any hands raised, let's go on to our main agenda item today which is Item 2. And we'll continue our discussion on the statement of purpose. And hopefully that's being pulled up right now. How are we doing on sharing things in Adobe Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Unfortunately it doesn't look like we'll be able to do live editing live screen…

Chuck Gomes: Okay well…

Marika Konings: …share. So we'll have to go with the red line.

Chuck Gomes: We can…

Marika Konings: Sorry about that.

Chuck Gomes: …deal with that. Okay that's all right. We can - that's not a critical issue just nice to have I think so all right. And does everyone have the ability to scroll? And also - and yes there it is. I see now I have it too. So you can also control

the size of the font. So hopefully that helps people to be able to read it depending on your monitor.

So what we have in front of us is the red line of the draft RDS statement of purpose that we worked on last week. And you can see in the - and we're going to focus first of all on the first three paragraphs okay? You can see in red line if you have that in front of you or if you have the dock the red line document that was sent out to the list in front of you the changes that were made based on our discussions last week.

I'm not going to go through those individually because that's been out for just about a week and everyone should've had a chance to look at it. You certainly can look at it right now. Are there any comments, discussions in terms of the - about the edits that we made last week?

Okay Chuck speaking again. And so I'm going to assume that we're okay on the first three paragraphs. So let's go now - if you'll move down in your screen to the fourth paragraph which is the little section titled Prerequisite Conditions for Each RDS Purpose. We were right in the middle of discussing this last week when we had the switch agenda items and I promised that we would continue where we left off. And so let's - everybody please take a look at the items there and in particular the comments that were raised during the meeting last week.

Notice for Item 3 the comment says there was a comment raised during the meeting but we didn't resolve it. One of the things we're trying to accomplish is to create a legal basis for compliance with data protection laws. Is that our job or is that something that happens later by legal review? And then of course our notes on the call talked about that further.

And then the comment for the last two items Roman Numeral V and VI a proposal to move those bullets from prerequisite conditions up to goals above in other words the previous paragraph was discussed but not resolved during

the working group call. Are these goals for the statement of purpose? Do they apply to the statement overall or to specific purposes?

So just that's kind of where we were at and several people had made comments. You're welcome to repeat your comments on this from last week. That would help those - there are quite a few on our call today that weren't on the call last week so that would actually be helpful if any of you want to repeat your comments or bring up new ones. Alex Deacon you are one of them. Go ahead.

Alex Deacon: Thanks Chuck. This is Alex Deacon. Can you hear me fine?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Alex Deacon: Yes. So I reread the statement and the red line version over the past few days. And I guess let me ask a question just to make sure at least I'm on the same page and maybe that we all get on the same page. I want to make sure I understand the distinction between the overall goals section and the other two the prerequisite condition section and the specific purpose sections. Will all of this be used in a final report in total? Will parts of it be used? I guess I'm missing some context here. And I just want to make sure I understand how and where this text will ultimately end up and in what form? I think that would be helpful for me at least to comment further.

Chuck Gomes: Good questions Alex Deacon. This is Chuck. And others are welcome to jump in too but let me share my understanding. First of all note that the overall goals are for this particular statement of purpose not for the - for each RDS - for specific purposes of the RDS. So what are we trying to accomplish with this statement? Our goals are what are listed in that previous paragraph.

Now the next grouping and by the way we can change the titles of these things if they're confusing. What we as a leadership team tried to do was to take the input that was received from the group previous to last week's

meeting and form it into something that we hoped accommodated the input that each of you gave. So the prerequisite conditions so for the purposes that we're going to list down below in the specific purposes section okay this session we're on now the prerequisite conditions are prerequisites for purposes.

So for - in other words for specific purpose number one to provide information about the lifecycle of a domain name and so on a prerequisite condition for that it is that it would be consistent with ICANN's mission, that it would be consistent with other consensus policies, et cetera. Okay? Now one more comment that may be helpful what we are going to really use from this as a guideline for us in our deliberation are the specific purposes in the last section. Now if I said anything incorrectly somebody please correct me but I think that explains that. Not Alex Deacon please tell me whether that helped at all?

Alex Deacon: Yes. Thanks Chuck. This is Alex Deacon. Yes. I think it does because if ultimately the only things that will kind of move forward into an official output of this PDP is the specific purposes then yes that helps understand, you know, what parts need to be placed in what sections and what's important and what's not. And again I don't know if - I don't know if it - if I could comment now? I think I need to with that in mind I need to reread through this and make sure that we're - that we have the right text, and the right purposes, and everyone is well at least well not everyone I can't speak for everyone but myself that we're all - that I understand kind of where this will end up. But that was helpful. Thanks Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Good. Thanks thank you Alex Deacon. Good very good question. So and hopefully that's helpful to others as well. So please do take a look at it again. So let's go back up with the comment on Item 3 under prerequisite conditions. Are there any comments today on that? Does it - does anyone want to suggest a change? Is saying consistently - consistency with applicable laws good, bad indifferent? Steve, go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, thank you Chuck. This is Steve Metalitz. I was just uncertain about what this - what was underlying this. My understanding is that one reason we want to list the purposes is so that under the data protection law of many countries there has to be some relationship - the relationship between the stated purpose of collecting the data and the use that's being proposed to be made of the data has a legal significance. In some cases it's whether they're consistent. In some cases it's whether they're not inconsistent. In some cases there may be different rules about obtaining consent for different kinds of uses but you need to be able to define a purpose and define a use and then compare them.

That's one thing that determines consistency with applicable laws. But is this trying to get at the question of whether some purposes that might be proposed are per se inconsistent with applicable law or illegal purposes? I mean in theory I guess I can understand that but I'm not sure as a practical matter how much this really adds to our effort here. I think more likely we're looking at a series of purposes and then we need to when we talk about potential uses of the data whether those line up with those purposes. So I guess I wasn't clear on whether the idea here was we want to filter out purposes that are per se illegal under some countries law and if so I'm not quite sure how we would go about doing that. But I just want to be clear that that's what's intended by this language. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: I don't think it is Steve. This is Chuck. And I'll let Michele jump in, in just a second. But the - first of all I think we all know that different laws are going to be applicable in different jurisdictions. So it's very difficult to - and what's meant here in my understanding is not that we're trying to be consistent with all laws simultaneously. It's going to be a case by case basis in many instances I believe.

So and maybe there's a better way to word this to not imply more than what's intended. The key word in my mind is applicable. And applicable won't be the

same for every jurisdiction. That's my understanding. But let me let Michele jump in. And we'll come back to - and Mark. And then we'll come back to you to make sure that your question was addressed Steve. Go ahead Michele.

Michele Neylon: I was going cede to Lisa. She had here hand up. And then come back to me maybe?

Chuck Gomes: Lisa had her hand up? Okay it's not showing on my screen but go ahead Lisa.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks Michele and Chuck. I did have my hand up and I put it down. I just had wanted to provide a little context for the comment itself since I see that Rod is not on the call and he was the one that raised the question during our last call. And I believe he raised this question when we were beginning to parse, you know, what's the purpose of collection? What's the purpose of maintenance? What's the purpose of providing access to? And so I believe that his comment was do we have to get to that fine level of granularity in this overall purpose statement or is that something that would be done when mapping to specific laws that would apply and the specific components of those laws?

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Lisa. Michele, do you want to jump in now?

Michele Neylon: Thanks Chuck, Michele for the record. I'm not sure about jumping but I'll have - I'll throw my two cents in. I think the underlining of just putting in as a marker that any policy and purpose has to be consistent with applicable laws. I don't see any harm in that being there. I think that's a good reminder that people should bear that in mind when they're looking at all of this.

You know, you could yes of course you could get into the weeds on, you know, super fine detail around these things. But I don't think that's the - what anybody intends with this. It's more a clear marker, you know, we're going to have X, Y and Z. It has to be consistent. It can't be inconsistent. I mean you

cannot - we cannot end up in a situation where X number of months down the line we've developed a set of policies and purposes and what have you that run slap bang up against data protection law in well Ireland, or France, or Germany, or Japan or whatever. And I don't think that's - is going to cause any problems. It's just simply a marker, you know, it like you'd have a marker for something. So, you know, that if you're going to suggest that something become part of the policy around how we use EPP to manage domain names then it's technically possible for that to be done. That's all. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much Michele. Mark you're up.

Marc Anderson: Thank you Chuck. This is Marc Anderson. Michele well put. You know, I liked what you said there. I've been thinking about this, you know, ever since, you know, the call started. And, you know, I guess my two cents on this is, you know, this is maybe a goal more so than a prerequisite for each RDD as purpose. But, you know, to my thinking what we're attempting to do is come up with a framework that allows contracted parties to apply or to be on the right side of applicable law to be in compliance with applicable law. And I feel like that's the goal. And maybe that's the statement that we're trying to say is, you know, our goal is to create a framework that provides contracted parties a mechanism of complying with applicable law. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Mark. A question for you, this is Chuck speaking. Are you suggesting that maybe we should change the title of this section to goals for each RDS purpose?

Marc Anderson: Well we already have a goal statement a section above it. There's overall goals for this statement of purpose and there's prerequisite conditions for each RDDS purpose. And, you know, I think Michele made a pretty compelling case that, you know, having consistency with applicable laws, you know, as a prerequisite for each RDDS purpose is a reminder that hey, you know, contracted parties have an obligation to apply with applicable laws is a good thing. So I don't necessarily suggest changing that, you know, I just

think for my purpose or for my thinking, you know, it's a goal for us and something that we have to maintain and keep in mind that we need to provide a framework that enables contracted parties to comply with applicable laws. Yes, I agree with what Lisa just typed.

Chuck Gomes: I better look at that. Let's see I'm trying to follow let's see so perhaps for overall goals section well keep in mind the overall goals relate to they're goals for the statement that we're working on. They're not goals for the RDS. The section we're working on now relates to the RDS purposes themselves. So I guess I don't to me the two sections are focusing on something different but let's go to Greg. Go ahead Greg?

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Greg Shatan for the record. Two points responding to different concepts here. One in terms of the basic statement consistency with applicable laws, you know, given Chuck as you said that applicable laws are, you know, differ by jurisdiction and by actor there may be a purpose that is consistent with applicable laws in one jurisdiction and not in another jurisdiction. It seems to me that that's sufficient. I don't know if we want to clarify that any further but in my mind it's perhaps clear enough the way it is but it should be consistent with the applicable laws for a particular actor and purpose.

And we can't make something or try to make this consistent with every law in every jurisdiction simultaneously the walls just aren't harmonized like that. I think that would be an impossible task. And I - so that for one actor with one purpose a purpose might be consistent with applicable laws in their jurisdiction but not in others. So I guess for them it's consistent with applicable laws as they try to do it in another place it would be inconsistent with applicable laws. And that should be fine. That should not disqualify a purpose.

Secondly this is broader than just a set of purposes for registrars. Some of the purposes some of the actors will not be registrars. And so I don't think it's

broad enough to indicate that this is, you know, solely for enabling contracted parties to comply with applicable law. And it doesn't say solely. But again I just want to make sure that our focus is on more than just what registrars do with RDS data. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Greg. Chuck again, (Cal), your turn.

(Cal): Thanks, (Cal) for the record. Why I look at the - those prerequisites potentially as a filter with which to judge the later services. And when I think about how I would use point three to filter whether I should or should not have a purpose or whether it's an appropriate purpose for the RDS I'd actually it would be particularly helpful. I understand that later we may wish to assign a purpose, or the data that we collect, or the way that we disseminate that data with that in mind and it might be something it might be a principal that we need to apply to implementation. But I'm struggling to see how that point actually helps me make any decisions on purposes for the RDS. So from my point of view and I (unintelligible) opinions that it's an important statement and that we need to bear it in mind. And I feel that's true. But I'm not sure that it belongs here and it sort of useful in helping you judge anything about a purpose for the RDS.

Chuck Gomes: So (Cal) let me -- this is Chuck -- let me make sure I'm understanding you correctly. Are you suggesting that we should delete consistency with applicable laws as a prerequisite condition for RDS purposes?

(Cal): Yes, that's my feeling. I just I guess maybe I'm misjudging the purpose of the purpose section if I can phrase it that way. But to me it doesn't provide a helpful filter to judge the letter purposes for the RDS. And so because it doesn't provide that useful filter I think it might actually work the other way. It might help or it might cause confusion in, you know, deliberations.

So I'm not suggesting it's an unimportant marker. I'm not suggesting that we ignore applicable laws. But I think that assessment might come later when we

discuss an individual purpose what (unintelligible) that purpose might require and how that data might be disseminated. I think that's probably the best time to judge applicable laws not when we're just thinking about why we have seven teams in RDS.

Chuck Gomes: So this isn't a - this paragraph is this is Chuck again. This is not a paragraph talking about why but there are conditions. For example can we - when we're working on particular requirements later on - and let me rephrase that. When we're listing the specific purposes for an RDS or Registration Directory Services you don't think that we should be keeping in mind that we have to or whoever the user is for a particular instance has to be concerned about applicable law? It seems to me that they would and so that would be a guideline for a particular any purposes we come up with but is that what you're saying? You don't think it's a helpful guide line?

(Cal): Not exactly. I think it's - I look at these that is pre-requisite conditions as a way of judging whether in fact the purpose belongs in RDS in the first place. So otherwise it's the purpose may not even be relevant for RDS. And I can align that with consistency with ICANN's mission. I can use that to judge whether or not the purpose is appropriate. I can use consensus policy. And I can use the ability to articulate rationale for RDS.

So those are things that I can use to easily judge and continue my deliberations. I don't feel that we can use the consistency in these particular laws as a filter to judge whether an RDS process is appropriate because it feels to me it's almost circular. And we have to decide what it is that you want first and then you try to judge whether that is appropriate under applicable law. It's hard to say here's a law and what should I go and collect for it? So to me it almost feels like it comes later. It's a way of fine tuning the things that might eventuate from a particular purpose rather than deciding whether a purpose exists.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks a lot (Cal). This is Chuck. And by the way I think you're absolutely right it's going to come later too even if we leave it here. And somebody mentioned implementation it certainly is going to be a key issue there. So I don't think there's any doubt that it'll come later whether we want to leave it in here is what we'll have to decide, hopefully today on that. But let's go on and give some other people a chance to talk, Alan your next.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I put my hand up when Greg was speaking saying that consistency with laws was problematic because laws vary so much. And I think the issue is here is not consistency with law but the capability of being consistent with law. We probably have jurisdictions where the law says you must retain data for two years and other jurisdictions say you must not retain it for longer than one year.

                 And clearly those two cannot meet. So whatever policy we come up with has to be capable of being consistent with applicable local laws. And conceivably there is some jurisdiction where the laws are so outrageous in our minds that we choose not to do business there. But other than that any policy we come up with has to have the flexibility of allowing the contracted parties to adhere to whatever the local law is if we're choosing to do business there. So it's not so much consistency but capability of consistency that I think we have to focus on as we go forward. I'm not quite sure how much that helps.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Alan. This is Chuck. Now you'll have to forgive me I like polls not as a form of voting but just to get a sense of the room okay? And in this case the sense of the people on the call. So Alan what I'm hearing you suggest is that we change the wording on three to capable of being consistent with applicable law, is that correct?

Alan Greenberg: Something like that yes.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And we can wordsmith it later but…

Alan Greenberg: I hesitate to raise the issue right now but as we go forward on this process if it ever comes towards an end and we start looking at implementations the implementations are also going to have to be capable of meeting local law which may say you can't ship the data out of the country or something like that. So there's a complexity upon complexity in what we're doing and it's going to very heavily from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. And I think we need to remember that as we go forward.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Alan. Chuck again. So if everybody is ready in Adobe chat would you put a green check if you're okay with that change? And I'll word it again the way I interpreted it which was changing three to say capable of being consistent with applicable laws or if you disagree with that change put a red X. And hopefully everybody won't just be uninterested and do nothing.

That change okay? I'm trying to keep this thing moving so that we don't spend weeks on this one thing. I'm seeing some green checks. There's - so (Klaus) and (Cal). Now (Cal) just a question for you is your concern the same one you just expressed or do you have a new concern on this?

And also I see Steve. And I was going to - I'm going to come back to you Steve. (Klaus), do you want to comment on why you don't like Alan's change? I guess not or you're on mute. I don't know.

So the - okay so it's kind of mixed. A lot of people and a few more agrees okay. You can remove your Xs and checkmarks now and let's hear from Michele. And then Rod I'm going to alert you that because you commented on this last week if you want to jump into this discussion on Item 3 please feel free to just put your hand up if you want to do that. And in the meantime let me call him Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Chuck, Michele for the record. And just kind of going to go back a bit on a couple of comments people have made. I mean first to Alan's suggestion yes I think I don't personally I don't see them as being a massive

issue. I mean the key thing and I think it's something that people need to bear in mind the policies end up being binding on contracted parties. On the contracted parties they're not you can talk about what somebody who has what they feel to be a valid purpose for doing something as one thing something to be there or not to be there but they are not a contracted party.

They don't end up in a situation where they're being asked to - asked well not even asked I mean where they are being forced to sign a contract that contains certain stipulations that could potentially put them at risk of breaching local law. So you need to bear that in mind. I mean the, you know, in an ideal world lots of things would happen but in the reality registries and registrars have to sign contracts with ICANN. Policies like this that get developed end up either being directly in our contracts are binding to what's (unintelligible) consensus policy on the contracts.

A third party actor who is not a contracted party isn't bound by consensus policy in the same way because it's not part of their contract. So I don't really I mean I can understand why people may not feel comfortable with some of this but ultimately they're not the ones who end up having to sign a contract knowing full well that something could be problematic or not. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Michele. Rod, go ahead.

Rod Rasmussen: Thanks Chuck, Rod Rasmussen here. I just was going to chime in that I was bringing up the fact last call that we had we were spending a lot of time on this and that at the end of the day it's going to have - probably have some sort of legal review to make sure we're all whatever bases we're creating here is - works no matter what, you know, what the - what we put down here. So I just didn't want to spend a lot of time fine tuning this at this stage.

It's - I think the latest rev of the kind of prerequisite language here works fine as far as I'm concerned. I just didn't want to, you know, get buried in the minutia here at this point and stage in the game. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Rod, this is Chuck. Steve Metalitz let me come back to you and see whether we've made any progress in terms of your concerns and what would be your position? You had a red X in there for Alan's change. Maybe you could talk about that a little bit too?

Steve Metalitz: Yes thanks. This is Steve. My - I think I put in the red X basically on the basis of cap concern. Is this a usable filtering criterion for looking at a purpose saying no, we can't list that as a purpose? And I think he's also right that it becomes even less useful if it's capability because then, you know, almost anything is potentially capable of becoming inconsistent I guess with applicable law.

I thought the idea of putting this up as an overall goal may have made more sense because as Michele said it's kind of a marker it's a reminder that we do have to bear this in mind. But it's just not clear to me that this is a when we say a pre-requisite condition it does imply that anytime anybody suggests a purpose in the next section we say does it meet these goals?

And I don't think that these conditions and I think it's very as for the reasons Greg stated it's very hard to make that determination. You one at one end of the spectrum you could say almost anything potentially is inconsistent with some countries law because countries have a very wide range of laws. But it's almost a matter of degree. So that again suggests to me it's more an overall goal rather than a usable filtering criteria. That's my main concern about it. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Steve. This is Chuck. So that takes me back to Mark's comments. And maybe we should change the title of this section here to goals for each RDS purpose. Would anybody be opposed to that? If so put a red X in there or raise your hand to comment. Anybody opposed to changing the title to goals for each RDS purpose?

Okay. Well let's make - and we're unable to edit live but please watch the notes better than I am. So and then I'm looking here at - and I see some green checkmarks. So repeating the earlier - overall goals sections - so this is - Lisa you're suggestion goes back to the previous section to provide a framework that enables contracted parties to comply with applicable laws.

So I'll come back to that. Have we got - I think there's support for changing the second underlying section there from prerequisite conditions to goals okay? Now let's go to Lisa's suggestion. And I'm having to scroll a little bit. Okay, so Lisa go ahead and talk to your suggestion.

Lisa Phifer: I just repeated that earlier suggestion because I'm not sure that we came to closure on it and Steve in his comments that was referring back to this being a goal rather than a condition of whether our purpose was going to be considered legitimate or not. I think and when we talked about the adding this possibly to the overall goals for the statement of purpose you questioned whether it was a goal for the statement or a goal of the RDS? And I guess I would like to share a view that it is actually a goal of the statement of purpose that by virtue of having a clearly stated purpose of the RDS you're providing a framework for that compliance.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Lisa. Anybody object to adding that? And I'm assuming you're suggesting that we add it to the overall goals for the statement of purpose section. So it would become Item F I think in the above section. Is that right Lisa?

Lisa Phifer: Correct.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Anybody object to that? Okay then let me I'm going to have to catch up on the chat because a whole bunch was added there. I'm looking (VA) at your comment there. It seems to me you're getting ahead of the game in terms of possible requirements rather than anything here. If I'm incorrect on that please let me know but it looks like what you're talking about are possible

requirements rather than what we're talking about here. If I'm misunderstanding please let me know?

Yes. And I don't - it may very well be part of Clause III of the - or ICANN agreement the RAA but that doesn't mean it fits here. Okay so and it's fine to have the discussion. No problem with that. And it sounds like that's what you're doing. That's okay.

All right so let's try to get moving a little bit and make some more progress here. So let's go to the second comment that relates to Items 5 and 6 oh now let me confirm. So if we change the title to goals instead of prerequisite conditions does anybody object to saying consistency with applicable law or it sounds like there's a little bit of preference for consistency rather than capability based on at least one comment but is that okay?

And let's not wordsmith too much guys. This particular document is going to be helpful for us going forward but where we're going to need to be more precise in language is when we actually word requirements and then end up recommending those requirements. And I thinks that's where we will need legal review in some cases too to make sure we have it right. I'm not sure we need to be that precise at this stage. So again I'm trying to keep us moving rather than get too much into the weeds as long as there's no big disagreement with what we're saying.

So on - I don't - there were no comments I don't think last week on Item 4. Certainly someone can make one now. But on five and six it was suggested that those be moved by some that those be moved up to the overall goals for the statement of purpose and some disagreed in that. Let's see if we can reach a reasonably good decision on that right now.

Any of those of you - and make sure you differentiate between the overall goals for the statement of purpose and goals for each of the RDS purposes below. Those are different things. Is there anybody that still thinks we should

move 5 and 6 or 5 or 6 up to the overall goals for the Statement of Purpose Section? If so, please raise your hand and tell us why. Go ahead (Vicki).

(Vicki): Hi. I just wanted to confirm that the way we're describing it now this section won't be called to regular conditions. It's going to be called Goals for HRDS purpose. So we're just saying we'd like to see it an easy way to understand what the purpose is or what the use is. Is that right?

Chuck Gomes: Run that by me again. I didn't follow it totally, please.

(Vicki): That - and I wasn't on the call last week so I apologize. But my guess and part of the concern before was having it as a prerequisite as opposed to a general goal for a specific purpose. And then once you...

Chuck Gomes: Well...

(Vicki): ...(unintelligible) that.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yes we may end up deciding that some of the things are specific pre-requisites. I think we can deal with that once we're looking get into the specifics in our deliberation. Several people were just most comfortable with a goal because in some cases it may not be achievable when you're talking about varying goals by jurisdiction and so forth. Again my suggestion is let's not get - do too much wordsmithing and try to be too precise as long as there's nothing that's strongly objectionable to anyone. Does that may any sense (Vicki)?

(Vicki): Yes except that if that's what we're thinking about then it may make for it to be more of a goal as opposed to a pre-requisite because how easy the communication is, is a question, right? That's - w- that's the interpretation. That - I'm so...

Chuck Gomes: Yes...

(Vicki):   ...(unintelligible) one way or the other. It's just it struck me that you're change
                 of taking out the pre-requisite conditions would solve this problem but now I'm
                 hearing perhaps it won't.

Chuck Gomes: Right. And - and - and I hear what you're saying. I mean I think we all agree
                 for example on Item 3 that we're going to have - all the people that are
                 involved in an RDS are going to have to follow after the laws. So by calling it
                 a goal I don't think anybody is suggestion that we - it might not be a
                 requirement. But I think I understand what you're saying. Let's see if Lisa can
                 help us here.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks Chuck, Lisa Phifer for the record. I think what we might be struggling
                 with is that we're dealing with two different dimensions in these sections. So
                 there's the question of whether it applies to overall or to the specific purpose.
                 And then there's the question of whether the goal applies to the statement of
                 purpose or to the purpose of the RDS itself. And I think that that's probably
                 what's causing us a little bit of consternation here.

                 From last weeks' call the suggestion to move these items up VNVI up to
                 become the new D&E under goals for the statement of purpose was because
                 it was felt that they applied to the goals of this statement, why are we creating
                 this statement, not the question of what's the purpose of the RDS which is
                 listed under pre-requisite conditions. But I think that's the distinction that was
                 being made in trying to move it. Now if it' s a goal or a condition of the
                 defining something as a purpose of the RDS itself then it belongs in this
                 section that we're talking about. If it's a goal of a statement that we're trying to
                 craft here then it belongs in the top section is my interpretation.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Lisa. So where would you put them?

Lisa Phifer: My personal opinion is having them listed on as a goal of this statement of purpose is probably sufficient for now. As purposes, individual purposes are being diverted upon it might end up being helpful to have a - some set of guidelines for how purposes are determined to be in or out shall we say. But I'm not sure we're at that stage yet.

Chuck Gomes: And Lisa Chuck again. So would you move both 5 and 6?

Lisa Phifer: Yes I believe that 5 became D under overall goals and 6 became E under overall goals.

Chuck Gomes: Oh that's right we- that's what D and E - so okay got it. So I forgot that we had already put them in up above. So we had them in both places basically. So D&E so the new one that we added that you suggested earlier would still be F.

Lisa Phifer: Yes the new one that we added providing our...

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Lisa Phifer: ...framework to enable…

Chuck Gomes: ...yes.

Lisa Phifer: ...contracted parties comply with applicable laws that would become F then, yes.

Chuck Gomes: And Chuck again. And so and then 5 and 6 would be deleted underneath the goals for each RDS purpose?

Lisa Phifer: Correct. That was the...

Chuck Gomes: Anybody...

Lisa Phifer: ...proposal that was on the table when we ended the call last week.

Chuck Gomes: Yes so any - correct. Thanks for remind us of that. Chuck speaking again. So is there any objection to that change? So we would - what are 5 and 6 now essentially are what are shown as D and E above under overall goals for the statement of purpose. Anybody object to those changes? Okay any other comments? Is that a new hand Lisa?

Lisa Phifer: Old hand, apologies.

Chuck Gomes: No problem. So okay so let's - any other comments on the section that we're now calling goals for each RDS purpose? Additions, edits, anything? Okay not seeing any hands let's go to specific purposes for registration directory services. And let's look at Number 1 if everybody can focus on that one which is the purpose of gTLD registration data is to provide information about the life cycle of a domain name as specified by ICANN's diagram of gTLD lifecycle. And there's a link to it to enable management of a domain name registration. Mark go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Thank you Chuck. This is Marc Anderson for the record. And let me apologize for not being on last week's call. I assume this was discussed but I see that the title it was…

Chuck Gomes: Mark this was not discussed. We didn't discuss anything in this section last week, okay? There hasn't been any discussion on the list that I recall seeing. So sorry for interrupting but I wanted to clarify that. This is Chuck.

Marc Anderson: Fair enough. But what I was going to say is the - you know, I noticed the title has changed from draft registration data and directory services to just draft registration directory services. And that seems applicable here because, you know, it seems that last week a discussion or decision was made to remove

the data part of this. And then our very first specific purpose deals with registration data.

So I guess, you know, I'm asking for a, you know, a quick summary of why we removed data. And depending on that I'm wondering if this first purpose applies anymore because this seems to pertain specifically to the registration data, not the registration directly services. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Mark. Lisa I think you are the one that suggested that change. If not, correct me. But if you were would you like to comment on that?

Lisa Phifer: Sure Chuck. This is Lisa Phifer for the record. I didn't suggest removing data. As a matter of fact I probably was the one in the Leadership Team that added the distinction between data and directly services. And when we did strike data from the - both the title and first paragraph we put in a placeholder to ourselves that we would have to revisit that when we got to the section of specific purposes because it was structured in a way that Mark just flagged starting with the definition of the purpose of the data and the purpose of the system that surrounds the data.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Lisa and forgive my bad memory. The - so, I mean, so should we then put data back in there in both instances in the overall title and in this particular section. And before we talk about that further let me go to Greg.

Greg Shatan: Hi. Greg Shatan for the record. And I think that this is a change we may have discussed earlier but doesn't seem to have been reflected. But I would think that for Number 1 and for - probably for Number 2 it should begin a purpose, not the purpose. The purpose makes it sound like this is the sole purpose. Or perhaps maybe the distinction is that we're talking here about registration data. But I guess the question then is, you know, what - is there a difference between registration data and the data that's going into a registration directory services? And that's - that doesn't seem to be the case in Number 2.

So if we're saying that everything that's going into the RDS is what we're calling registration data then the purpose is broader than just Number 1. And so agree that this is a purpose but disagree that this is (unintelligible). Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Greg. Lisa you want to comment on that?

Lisa Phifer: Thanks Chuck, Lisa Phifer again. I - I'll echo I think it was (Holly) from our last call who was positioning out that there is certainly registration data that is collected and used to support the lifecycle but does not end up being part of the data that's collected by the RDS in a relationship between registrars and registries and doesn't end up being accessible through whatever access the RDS provides. That was the distinction that was being made originally in this point.

Greg Shatan: But if you look at Number 2 it says that the purpose of a system to collect, maintain and provide access to gTLD registration data hereinafter referred to as the RDS. So there's an inconsistency here. You know, it may be that the data is being collected, you know, for the purpose of registration but it really is that is not the only purpose in the statement that is being collected for. So I think here, you know, we're narrowing it down too far.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Greg.

((Crosstalk))

Lisa Phifer: I just…

Chuck Gomes: Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Sorry, I apologize, didn't mean to clobber you there. I just wanted to point out that it was the system that was referred to as the RDS.

Greg Shatan: Well if it's still a system only to collect gTLD registration data, that's what it's a system for. So it's - the system is being defined by what's going into it. So again it doesn't' work.

Chuck Gomes: So first of all...

Greg Shatan: My...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...the easy decision I think is to change in Number 1 the to A. Any objections to that? If we make that change - well we'll come back to Number 1. But what about the title, the title of the overall document and the title of this section Should we put registration data and back in there? Alan go ahead. Oh, I'm sorry Mark you were up first.

Marc Anderson: Thanks Chuck. I mean I was going to comment on a different item. You know, I guess I'm still...

Chuck Gomes: You want me to bring you back in if - you want me to - you want to come back in later?

Marc Anderson: Yes that might make sense because...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Just leave your hand...

Marc Anderson: ...I'm still wondering why - you know, at some point this must have been discussed and, you know, it was agreed that it should be taking out. And I'm not necessarily opposed to taking out registration data. I'm just wondering, you know, what the rationale why that decision was made. Thanks Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Well you're welcome Mark. I confess I don't remember why we took that out. I'd have to go back and see if I could figure it out. But Alan why don't you jump in?

Alan Greenberg: Yes I raised my hand when you asked should we change in one change the to a A. And I just think to remember about two meetings ago having that discussion to making the change because I raised the point.

Chuck Gomes: Yes I kind of do too.

Alan Greenberg: So I'm not quite sure what's happening here. Let me make an umbrella statement. I think we are spending far, far too much time on this for the value it's going to give us in the end.

Chuck Gomes: I have lots of sympathy for what you're saying. That's why I'm trying to push it along.

Alan Greenberg: There's a phrase I will not use in public that this sounds like right now and I do not think it's a production use of our time. However I'll be quiet.

Chuck Gomes: No that's okay Alan because I've been having the same thoughts. That's again that's why I'm trying to move this forward. Greg or Mark go ahead, come back in.

Marc Anderson: Thanks Chuck, Mark again. Okay to jump in ahead to specific purposes, you know, I guess I'm looking at specific purpose Number 2. You know, if you're okay with me delving into that. If not I can hold my comments till…

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Marc Anderson: ...appropriate. So, thank you. So I'm reading that and it says, you know, the purpose of a system to collect, maintain and provide access through a gTLD registration data hereafter referred to as the RDS that statement really

bothers me because I think that's way off track frankly. The shared registration system, the SRS which registrars, you know, connect to the registry via EPP, you know, that is the system that collects, maintains and provides access to registrars or registration data.

RDS is a completely different thing. You know, that provides, you know, a view or a visibility into, you know, public visibility into that registration data. But that has nothing to do with the collection or maintenance of that data. It does provide access to the registration data. But to say, you know, the purpose of the RDS is to collect and maintain that data I think is way off track. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Mark. Greg?

Greg Shatan: Thanks Greg Shatan again. And at the risk of spending yet more time I wasn't sure if Alan was referring to the amount of time we were spending on whether - why we crossed that registration data and - and whether it should come back in or on the wordsmithing of the specific purposes. If it's the former I agree, we don't need to spend a lot of time on the heading at this point, whichever. But if we're talking about the entire statement as Alan confirms then I think the wordsmithing is important especially if we are going to - a lot of it depends on how we're going to use this statement.

If we're going to use this statement as kind of a statement of boundaries of what we're doing and whether something is in or out or good or bad or a purpose or not a purpose then this is a critical document. And if it's something that we're going to iterate or - and reiterate and not say is kind of authoritative at any point at least until the end of our work then it's less important too. So I guess the use of the tool indicates whether the wordsmithing is worth the candle here in terms of getting it really right or just right enough. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Greg. So I'm going to draw this agenda item to a close here and which two changes under specific purposes there changing the word the to A

and Number 1 and Number 2. And Mark I would like on Number 2 I would like you after this call to communicate on the list your concern about Number 2 so that everybody can grasp that because we need to follow-up on that next week.

(Michael) as chair next week is to finish this next week. I hope we can do that so we can move on. But I - at the same time I think Greg's point is well taken. This can help us going forward. Let's just not spend all of our time on that because we're going to need a lot of time in our deliberation and we need to get to there.

So what I'd like each of you to do -- so this is an action item for everybody -- is certainly focus on where we're at. And we'll send out - I suggest rather than that for the first one, two, three, four paragraphs that we send out a clean version to the whole group and that we put registration data and back in there in both places and we make the two - and they can be redline changes in one and two. That's fine and that we send it out.

And I'd like everybody please to try and discuss the specific purposes on the list between now and our meeting a week from now which will be at the same time as today so that when we get to our meeting next week we will have covered some ground and won't have to spend the whole meeting finishing this off.

Now not only do I ask you to look at the wording of the three purposes and the two sub items under Number 3 but, are there some things missing that we should here? Please suggest those. Or if you think that maybe one of them should be deleted. But rather than waiting till next week's all please try to get - let's try to get a little work done on the list between now and then.

Now the reason I'm bringing that to a close because there's a couple other thing we need to do today. So let's go to agenda Item 3 which is to review the draft Number 4 of the triage possible requirements list. Now we're not going

to review the whole draft. It's a huge document. But the first thing we want to do there were some items flagged. If we can bring up the document that shows those that are marked with questions marks on the Adobe screen I would appreciate that.

And by the way I really appreciate the discussion that occurred on the list after our last meeting. And one of those items I think at least as far as I can tell there was decision on the discussion on the list that it should not be deleted. So unless somebody wants to discuss that or disagree with it we will not delete the one. But unless there are objections we will delete all the others. So hopefully that's coming up now so you can take a quick relook at those.

We asked you last week to - those on the call or if you listen to the recording to take a look at those and see if any of them need to remain. And one of them was identified in that sense. So I hope that ICANN's new setup for Adobe improves over the next few weeks. It seems to be taking longer for everything today so thanks. Okay, (Anne), (Kent). Okay. And if everybody can be given the ability to - there we go, good, so we can - I know it's too small for me even on a fairly big monitor.

Okay, so let me - so hopefully you can see those. Lisa could I ask you in case people can't read them on - in Adobe and may not have these in front of them could I ask you to read just a description of each one and then we can decide whether anybody has any objections to deleting that and then identify the one of course that we decided to do that. Before you jump in though Lisa, Steve go ahead. Steve Metalitz are you on mute

Steve Metalitz: I'm sorry, I was on mute. I'm fine to have Lisa go through these. I had a question on one of them but when she gets to that I can...

Chuck Gomes: Okay good. Thanks Steve. You can leave your hand up. That's fine.

Steve Metalitz: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Just let us know verbally when you - when we get there. Good. Lisa can you go through them one at a time and we'll pause between each one?

Lisa Phifer: Yes. This is Lisa Phifer for the record. So the first three are in the gated access section. Now all of them come from a GAC communique. The first one is of GA 50R01. According to that Singapore GAC communique of 2015 the ICANN board should amend the current process for request to realize or release two letter codes to establish an effective notification mechanism so that the relevant government can be alerted as request are initiated. So these are requests for two letter codes.

Chuck Gomes: Is there anyone that thinks that should be left in? Seems to me it's not one of our possible requirements but that's my own personal opinion. Oh thanks Steve. I see your response there. So if you don't have it - you can take your hand down if you - unless you want to jump in again.

Steve Metalitz: No that was seen earlier.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay.

Steve Metalitz: I'll take my hand down though and I'll put it back up.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, all right that's fine, okay. I was out of time looking at your - at the chat. Sorry about that. (Fabrizio) I'm sure what you're saying there. So maybe we'd leave the entire statement to deliberations? You're talking about this purpose statement we've been working - that we were working on? Is that what you're talking about there? Or are you talking about one of the items - the item that Lisa just went - read to us?

Lisa Phifer: Chuck this is Lisa. There was a sideline there in chat about the very last bullet in the specific purposes that was asking whether one of the sentences really even made sense. And I believe...

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay.

Lisa Phifer: ...(unintelligible) response.

Chuck Gomes: So we'll come back to that when we continue next week on that. Or certainly (Fabrizio) if you would put that comment in the chat like I asked Mark to do his comment that would be very helpful in terms of getting some discussion going on that. So I request that if you would. Yes thanks (Maxim) for your comments. So okay so I'm going to conclude that we can delete that first one. Lisa let's go to the next one.

Lisa Phifer: The next one also from the Singapore GAC communique is the ICANN board should extend the comment period referred to by the one we just discussed, the 60 days. Seems to me pretty clear if the first one is struck this one is struck as well.

Chuck Gomes: I would agree with that. Anybody disagree? Okay let's go to Number 3.

Lisa Phifer: The third also comes from the Singapore GAC communique. The changes recommended by those first two should be implemented before proceeding with pending and future requests to release two letter codes.

Chuck Gomes: Any comments on that? Go ahead Lisa. You can comment.

Lisa Phifer: I was just going to say again it depends on the first two, striking the first two leaves three irrelevant.

Chuck Gomes: Okay any objection to striking that one? Okay the fourth one. Oh, thanks Michele for the check mark. Michele go ahead and speak.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Chuck, Michele for the record. Why are we discussing two letter codes? I'm a bit confused. What's this got to do with what we're doing?

Chuck Gomes: That's why it's being deleted Michele.

Michele Neylon: Okay, no sorry. I'm just trying to understand how I missed something completely.

Chuck Gomes: No, no. No. That's - it's - (Susan) and Lisa went through all these and they identified these as they didn't seem relevant to our work. But for some reason doesn't matter why, they were listed as possible requirements. And by someone in the group or more than one in the group. And so we're just cleaning it up a little bit right now, that's all, okay?

Michele Neylon: Okay so I can go back to sleep again. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Next go ahead Lisa.

Lisa Phifer: The next one on the list is in the data accuracy section. It is a safeguard that registry operators should undertake periodic security checks to analyze whether domains and its gTLD are being used for threats to security such as farming, phishing, malware and bot nets. And this is the one that received some discussion on the list. And the proposal on the table from the list is that this be moved from data accuracy, the users and purposes and revised to indicate that registration data would be made available for the safeguard purpose.

Chuck Gomes: And so I suggest that we do that. We'll get a chance then to deliberate further on it so I don't think we need to do that now. It was good discussion on the list. Thanks again for that. I appreciate it. Let's go to the next one.

Lisa Phifer: The next set or in the privacy section the first is 49 requirement, possible requirement four which is that the RAA PIC specification requires - requirement for category two new gTLDs to - must include a non-discriminatory requirement to provide registrants and avenue to seek redress for discriminatory policies that should be amended.

Chuck Gomes: Okay and let's go to Steve now so that he can come in with his thoughts here.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you. This is Steve. My only comment on this was that I think the reason that this one just proceeding it has been accepted or has been saved is because it basically references a requirement in the public interest commitments that most registries have signed on to. I just wanted to point out this also addresses that - a topic that is in those public interest commitments which is to have a - to have a non-discriminatory registration policy that's publicly available. It does not include the requirement to provided registrants an avenue to seek redress for discriminatory practices. But that's something I guess GAC asked for that didn't end up in the public interest community.

But all I'm saying is this is relevant, seems relevant to an obligation that registers have and therefore I'm asking the question is the same - by the same logic that we saved the last one which is that who is - excuse me, RDS data is important or plays a role in fulfilling this obligation would the same be true here?

So for example if you - how would you prove if you - that you had been discriminated against in a registration policy? One way might be to see who had registered other domain names that, you know, you think were similarly situated in some way and you weren't allowed to do it? I mean, it all depends on the facts. But, it just seems as though there might be some relevance here to fulfillment of what is in Specification 3C of the public interest commitments there is a specification about non-discriminatory registration policies. That was my only point. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: So Steve let me - this is a Chuck. Let me ask you a quick question here. So do you think this could be reworded so that it is more of a requirement rather than just a reference to some request by others?

Steve Metalitz: Yes I think that's - that could be done. I mean it could be made parallel more or less to what...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: ...Lisa's done on the proceeding one.

Chuck Gomes: So I'd rather err on keeping them if there's any doubt at all than taking them out. But I would like to ask a favor of you. Could you maybe put on the list - you don't have to do it right away but before our next meeting maybe how this could be reworded? And is the category okay that it's in?

Steve Metalitz: I'm honestly not sure about that but...

Chuck Gomes: Okay if you have thoughts on that share them. But let's - for now we'll just leave it the same.

Steve Metalitz: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: If you think it should be moved you could suggest that too.

Steve Metalitz: Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay?

Steve Metalitz: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Let's go to the next one Lisa?

Lisa Phifer: This is from the same document. It's another GAC communique. The GAC
                 reaffirms its advice from the Toronto, Beijing, Durban and Buenos Ares,
                 Singapore and London communiques regarding the protection of IGO names
                 and acronyms at the top and second levels as implementation of such
                 protection is in the public interest given that IGOs as created by governments
                 under international law are objectively different right holders.

Chuck Gomes: So this really is a new gTLD policy issue, not an RDS policy issue. Anybody
                 disagree with that? Okay let's remove it. Next.

Lisa Phifer: Again from the same GAC communique, concerning the preventative
                 protection at the second level notice of a match to an IGO name or acronym
                 to prospective registrants as well as the concern to IGO should apply in
                 perpetuity for the concerned name and acronym in two languages and at no
                 cost to IGOs.

Chuck Gomes: I think this is the same as the previous one as far as I don't think it's an RDS
                 requirement is it? Anybody disagree? Okay, we'll delete that one. Next?

Lisa Phifer: The last this is again from the same GAC communique. Concerning curative
                 protection at the second level and noting the ongoing GNSO PDP on access
                 to curative rights protection mechanisms any such mechanism should be at
                 no or nominal cost to IGOs.

Chuck Gomes: Again I don't think this relates to the RDS. Does anybody think it should be
                 left? Okay. Now if somebody after the fact disagrees with any decision we
                 made today please feel free to communicate it. Otherwise we will assume
                 that we've kept two of these one- and we're looking for some additional
                 wording on the one that Steve talked about. And we will delete the others
                 barring any further discussion that changes our decision on our possible
                 requirements list.

Okay we're just about out of time. But let's do a couple other things that hopefully we can get - take care of before we adjourn. In the new system I don't know if we can bring up just a subset or something of the titles, the column titles or something. But one of the things that is in there is a column that gives a - some code mapping. And the leadership team thinks that maybe it would be good to have a few people that would take a look at those code mappings. And I think you have to scroll to the right to see that column. That's the C column is - am I correct on that Lisa? Yes.

Lisa Phifer: Yes. That's correct.

Chuck Gomes: So the code mappings with the key words. So she has it circled there. And you can see the description up above circled in red as well. What we'd like and I don't know if we have time to get - it depends how quickly people might volunteer. But if we could get just a few people who would volunteer to check those and confirm that the mapping works that would be very helpful. So any - do we have any volunteers on the call right now to help do that? You can take, you know, a couple weeks or if you need more than that even more than that but it would be good to do that. Lisa go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks Chuck, still Lisa Phifer. The concern that I had in doing the triage for the - this code column is I applied the mappings which mapped, you know, key words to codes across the board. But when you read the actual possible requirement often I found that the code value didn't seem to be the right one, that perhaps there were other code values in the chart or the set of coding values that Stephanie had proposed. There might be others that were more appropriate.

So just to reiterate and build on what Chuck described what I'm thinking is that if we can get volunteers to each take one of the tables, so the table on users and purpose, the tables on gated access, the table on data accuracy, the one on data elements and the one on privacy. If we can split this up amongst stay five people have some - have each of those volunteers just

look at that code column, look at the list of codes and think to yourself is this - does this code make sense? And if it doesn't make sense what is the other code that really should make better sense? I think then that code column will be much more useful to us when we get to deliberation because things will be sorted into the right bucket.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Lisa, Chuck again. And Lisa you will work with those volunteers right?

Lisa Phifer: Correct. I'd be happy to, you know, help explain the task to anybody that volunteers and I'll certainly work with you on taking your output and applying it back into the next draft of the document.

Chuck Gomes: So do we have any volunteers on the call today or and you've - and of course the first volunteer gets to pick the category so you have some advantages of jumping in early. All right let's make that an action item and put out a request to the list that we would appreciate five volunteers to help on that. And hopefully all of you will think about it and we can get that. We all need to review the list of possible requirements anyway so it can be part of your overall review. And again I encourage everybody to be looking at that, the full list of possible requirements. We made some changes today for the few that we deleted and we're getting close to deliberation I hope so the more we can do to refine this the better.

Now the last thing I want to cover very quickly because I know our time is up is the possible requirement assignments. There are still I don't know if we can pull up this - the slide on that. There are a few that haven't been done. And so I sent out some emails to individuals. Greg Shatan assuming you're still on the call did you get my email? I didn't get a response from you.

Greg Shatan: Yes I did. I'll come back to you on that. And I think a divide and conquer plan probably makes good sense.

Chuck Gomes: Good. Okay so you do. So it would be good then if - and so we'll work in that direction. Are you - do you still want to work on it with others?

Greg Shatan: Yes I've already done a good bit of the work. It's just a long slot and I've had to put it aside a number of times but…

Chuck Gomes: Excellent. Thank you - appreciate the status update too. Marika you were going to - you reached out to some people as well. Do you have an update? Marika are you on?

Marc Anderson: Yes this is Marika, sorry, takes me a bit of time to get off mute. No I didn't' receive a response yet to my inquiry.

Chuck Gomes: So what the plan is the Leadership Team decided in our call yesterday that if we don't get some progress or responses by the end of the week we're going to seek some other volunteers. And in the case of the one that Greg signed up for - and by the way in fairness to Greg he picked a really big one. It's a huge task. So what we'll do as he just indicated is get some people to join him. And we'll do that because we're out of time we'll do that on the list and get some other people to help him.

But I think and then some others if we don't hear from them by the end of the week because there's one or two others that I reached out to that I haven't heard back from like Marika we will take some steps to try and get these finished so that they don't slow us down when we get to them later on. Is there anything else we need to cover in today's meeting? I already said that we will - our meeting time next week's the same time. So for going I think just a little bit over or maybe just on time. But we made some good progress.

Hopefully we'll finish up the problem or the purpose statement next week. That'll be the goal. And we'll try and make some more progress on the list of possible requirements. Please help us by a few of you by picking one of the five categories to look at the codings. I don't think it's a huge task but if a

people spend a couple hours trying to - doing that and Lisa you - it'd probably be helpful if that once we get the volunteers if you arrange a little call for them to make sure everybody understands and to make their task easier and the time they need to commit easier.

So and so okay and there's some stuff in the chat. I'll let you take a look at that. Our time is up, thank you very much and have a good rest of the week. Meeting adjourned.

END