TERRI AGNEW: We'll go ahead and begin our conference at this time. One moment, please, while we begin the recording.

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the LACRALO GSE Capacity Building Webinar on the topic of Next-Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services (RDS) to replace WHOIS (WHOIS PDP).

We will not be doing a roll call, as it is as webinar, but if I could please remind everyone on the phone bridge, as well as the computer, to mute your speakers and microphone, as well as state your name when speaking, not only for transcription purposes, but to allow our interpreters to identify you on other language channels. We have English, Spanish, Portuguese, and French interpretation.

Thank you for joining. I'll now turn it back over to our moderator, Daniel Fink. Please begin.

DANIEL FINK: Hello. Good evening, good afternoon, and good morning, everyone. This is Daniel Fink. I'm the manager for ICANN in Brazil. I am a colleague of Rodrigo Saucedo. I'm replacing him as a moderator of this webinar.

Thank you very much, Terri, for the presentation. I would like to thank our Interpreter Team that is supporting us today. I would like to thank our speaker, Lisa Phifer, who is going to speak about the replacement of WHOIS by the Next-Generation gTLD Registration Directory Service (RDS).

This webinar is part of the Capacity Building project and the LAC Strategy of the ICANN community, in coordination with the leadership of LACRALO.

Thank you, Lisa, for participating today. She's the President of a company called Core Competence, I believe. She's talking from New Mexico in the U.S., and she may correct me if I'm wrong. It's a consulting company specializing in safety and emerging Internet technology. She has graduated in computer science, and she's part the team of Policy Development of ICANN.

Her speech today is very interesting because, as you know, the reforming of WHOIS policies has been a very long and complex process. I have read about this issue, and there've been many talks about this and discussions about this for 15 years.

I'd like to pass the floor to Lisa, and I'd like to thank all of you for participating. Feel free to type your questions and comments in the chat. At the end, we'll have a Q&A session. You can use the icon of the hands up at the top of the Adobe Connect room.

Lisa, the floor is yours. Thank you.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you, Daniel, and thank you, everyone, for joining today's webinar. As Daniel said, I am Lisa Phifer, and that bio was exactly correct. I am speaking to you from New Mexico in the United States. I support the policy development process that I'm going to be talking about today on gTLD Registration Directory Services. I have been asked to provide you

with backgrounds and an overview of this PDP, from a description of what this PDP covers and its purpose, and also information on next steps. I will leave you with a few links to resources in case you'd like to read more.

I'll begin with background. As Daniel noted, this is a very long-running problem that we've been trying to deal with. WHOIS was created in the 1980s as a collection and publication mechanism for domain name registration data, and originally to help Internet operators identify and contact entities responsible for the operation of network resources.

Although ICANN's requirements were domain name registration data collection, access, and accuracy, particularly for generic top-level domain names, or gTLD registries, they've undergone important changes under the years. It really has been quite a long time since there has been comprehensive WHOIS policy reform, and that remains a source of long-running discussion related to issues such as purpose, accuracy, privacy, anonymity, cost and so forth.

To address these issues, the ICANN Board launched an initiative in 2012, which is recently reconfirmed as a Board-initiated Policy Development Process, or PDP. That PDP is to define the purpose of collecting, maintaining, and providing access to gTLD registration data, as well as to consider safeguards for protecting that data.

This group was actually formed to use the recommendations put forth by the Expert Working Group, which the Board chartered at roughly the same time to investigate possible approaches to a next-generation system that might replace WHOIS.

We refer to this entire effort as a next-generation gTLD Registration Directory Service, or RDS.

I'm going to start with some background and by defining a few terms. Some of this may be familiar to many of you, but we'll start here. First, when anyone refers to WHOIS, they may be referring to the information that is collected from registrants and then maintained by registries and registrars about every registered domain name. That's referred to also as registration data.

When someone refers to WHOIS, they also may be talking about a query response protocol that was defined by RFC 3912, which can be used to access registration data.

Third, anyone who refers to WHOIS may be talking about the global and very distributed system that is currently operated today by registrars and registries that supports the WHOIS protocol and uses it to access WHOIS registration data.

Now, conceptually, you can think of WHOIS as a system that accepts queries that are generated by a WHOIS client program, and those WHOIS queries are processed by server that acts as a data store. In this system, all registration data that's associated with gTLD domain names is public, and it is accessible by any client.

But, if you look inside today's distributed WHOIS system, we can see that WHOIS servers are not actually run by a single operator. There is no single WHOIS data store today.

Instead, WHOIS servers are run independently by every registrar and registry. When a user queries WHOIS data, he or she submits the query through web form, or perhaps a Port 43 message. That query must then be relayed to the registry that is responsible for the queried top-level domain name.

Is the registry is thick, the query is processed by the registry. If the registry is thin – for example, .com – the query is relayed and handled in part by the registrar for the actual domain name being queried.

These registry and registrar operators are the operators that are used by the registrants when the domain name is either registered or transferred, and the WHOIS data is composed of information that's supplied by the registrant.

On this slide, we see an example of that registration information. This example, known as WHOIS data, might include things like the contact information for the registrant, similar information for the domain name administrative contact, and technical contact.

WHOIS also contains information about the registrar that registered the domain name and status information about the domain name's registration.

For example, contact information may include individual and organization names, postal addresses, telephone numbers, and e-mail addresses, just to name a few bits of information. WHOIS also contains information such as the name of the registrar, a link to a WHOIS server, and a link to abuse contact information.

Now, this is just a partial example. If you're not familiar with WHOIS, I strongly encourage you to query your own name, domain name, or a domain name that you frequent. You may find what's in WHOIS very interesting.

It is important to understand that today's WHOIS system is an implementation of a policy that every registry and registrar must support. While our cc (country code) TLD operators may establish and implement their own WHOIS policies, generic TLD operators must follow the WHOIS policies that are created and refined by the Generic Names Supporting Organization, or GNSO.

This listed on this slide are just a few of the WHOIS policies that apply to gTLD registries, including a WHOIS data reminder policy that's intended to encourage the registrant to keep their data updated, a WHOIS marketing restriction policy that is intended to discourage use of registration data for bulk marketing, a policy development process that recommended transition from thin to thick WHOIS, and PDPs looking for translation and transliteration of that WHOIS contact data we just saw an example of.

All of this is actually translated then into registry and registrar agreements. They're the contractual pools that specify WHOIS requirements. You may also see them referred to as RDDS.

Given that as background, now that you know what we mean when we talk about WHOIS, let's talk about why there is a policy development process for a next-generation directory service that might replace

WHOIS. Remember I said "might," because one of the jobs of this PDP is to answer the question of whether a replacement is really needed.

WHOIS may have started as a tool for operators to obtain information about domain names and to resolve technical issues associated with those domain names, but many other stakeholders use WHOIS today for purposes that range from criminal activity investigation, to intellectual property protection, to consumer protection, and research about the Internet, just to name a few of the uses of WHOIS today.

This evolution of uses has brought about many different issues and concerns, ranging from the inability to contact registrants because the data is sometimes inaccurate, conflicts that registrars run into when they try to meet their WHOIS contractual obligations while complying with data protection privacy laws, difficulty in securing WHOIS data, given that the WHOIS protocol itself does not support encryption, registrant concerns about identity theft and other misuses of their personal data, and costs associated with collecting, maintaining, and making WHOIS data accessible.

These issues and concerns apply not just to today's WHOIS system, but also to the many task forces and review teams and PDP recommendations that have tried over the years to improve upon WHOIS and have successfully made some improvements but have not provided comprehensive policy reform.

As I mentioned, in 2012, the ICANN Board did make a resolution to initiate this Board-initiated PDP. In doing this, it considered the WHOIS Review Team's recommendations. It also considered the findings of the

Security and Stability Advisory Committee, or SSAC. At that time, the Board issued a resolution that initiated this PDP and also formed the Expert Working Group to study the problem and prepare some background information and recommendations.

Now, recognizing the community's long-time of inability to reach consensus on this overall reform, this PDP was initiated by the Board and was asked to build on the foundation prepared by the Expert Working Group.

In addition, the Board directed staff to prepare an issue report, and at the end of this presentation, you'll see a link to the final issue report for this PDP that describes the history and the purpose of the PDP and also contains a charter for this PDP Working Group.

When I refer to the next-generation RDS, I don't necessarily mean a system, an implementation, or a particular set of policies that have not yet been developed. I'm referring to this entire effort to establish a new policy framework.

When the Expert Working Group, or EWG, published its findings in the middle of 2014, a group of ICANN Board members and GNSO Councilors convened to think about how to organize a PDP, or Policy Development Process, on this very contentious and very complex set of concerns and issues.

That group developed a process framework, a bit of which you see here. The process framework started with the task of defining the purpose of collecting, maintaining, and providing access to gTLD registration data.

The framework then split the PDP into three phases. Phase 1 asks the working group to establish requirements for if and why WHOIS should be replaced by a next generation system. If a replacement is recommended, and if it is approved by the GNSO Council, Phase 2 would then begin. In Phase 2, the working group would develop very detailed policies for a next-generation system. Remember, we only go to Phase 2 if, in Phase 1 the group concludes a new system is needed. Phase 3 would then include developing implementation guidance as needed to support policies.

The objective of this framework is to help the working group reach a consensus on this difficult issue by using explicitly defined and explicitly agreed-upon requirements to work out policies.

The hope of this framework is to avoid the problems that were encountered in past efforts. Many times, different stakeholders had different views on what the problem was that needed to be solved, or even whether WHOIS should exist in the first place.

Now, if we drill down, what are the questions that this PDP is attempting to answer? This slide lists eleven questions that are to be considered at minimum by this working group. You can see that the questions are very closely related to each other. Answers will be influenced by, for example, requirements that are associated with protecting data and protecting personal privacy.

Of course, those requirements need to be put into the context of gTLD registration data, and the specific data elements that actually are collected, maintained, and made accessible. For data to be useful, it

must be accurate, at least to the extent required by a particular purpose.

So all these questions are very tightly interrelated, but they all must be addressed. This PDP is tasked, then with considering at least these questions before attempting to consider and then recommend whether or not a WHOIS replacement is needed.

This slide shows a bit more of the process framework and how each of those eleven questions is mapped onto the three phases. I will talk more about the questions in just a moment, but for now I'd like to call your attention to these points.

First, all 11 questions that you see listed here apply to every phase. This PDP will iteratively refine requirements in the policies and then implementation guidance for those policies. However, the group has been asked to make progress on all 11 questions in each phase, leaving nothing behind or until the end.

Second, all 11 questions are interdependent. Purposes depend on available data, but data access may depend on purpose, and also on data protection and privacy laws.

Many of the questions on this list, such as cost, cannot even be considered until there are at least some fundamental answers proposed.

Third, at least two GNSO Council decision points are identified. That's the little red triangle you see noted at the bottom and appears in two places in the overall process. That is to make sure that there's formal

agreements on the requirements that reflect community input and working group consensus before moving forward from Phase 1.

Now I would like to look a little bit more closely to the questions that this PPD Working Group is expected to answer during the first phase of its work. As a starting point, this PDP is expected to reach consensus on the fundamental requirements for gTLD registration data, independent of the system or the implementation that is used to fulfill those requirements.

Now, as part of this effort, the working group is expected to consider users and purposes, as well as associated access, accuracy, data elements, and privacy requirements.

Once the working group has agreed upon those fundamental requirements, they must then try to reach a consensus answer on that question of whether a new policy framework, a next-generation system, is really needed in order to meet those requirements. If not, if the WHOIS policy framework and system can be made to do that, the working group must describe how that could be accomplished.

If a new policy framework and system is recommended, the working group would then continue its work by drafting specific policy requirements and continuing on to Phases 2 and 3 of its work, drafting policies and implementation guidance.

Now, I should mention that this is a set of question that at minimum must be addressed. If the working group determines there are other

areas that need to be addressed in order to answer that key question of whether a next-generation system is needed, it can certainly do so.

On this slide, we see those five fundamental questions highlighted. The PDP Working Group is currently reviewing the questions that are listed on this slide. To do that, it is developing a list of key input documents and is using those documents to extract possible requirements associated with these charter questions, especially who should have access to registration data and for what purpose they should have access, what steps should be taken to control data access, what steps should be taken to improve data accuracy beyond improvements that have been made to WHOIS recently, what data should be collected, stored, and disclosed, and why, and what steps are needed to protect data and privacy.

Now, given the 15-year history of debate on WHOIS, considerable work has already been done to examine these questions, identify positions and concerns, and even to propose some answers. But the goal of gathering possible requirements is really to start from all that existing work and help the working group begin its deliberation by building on the past, as well as reflecting adequately the diverse community perspective on this issue.

Now, many of you may be familiar with WHOIS. Some of you may work for registrars who collect WHOIS data. Some of you may work for registries that store and provide access for WHOIS data. Some of you may access WHOIS data to carry out your jobs in your normal daily life, including registering or transferring or supporting domain names.

This GNSO PDP Working Group is focused on the requirements, policies, and guidance for gTLD registration data and directory services; that is, data associated with gTLD domain names. As such, this working group is seeking input, both formally and informally, from GNSO supporting organizations, advisory councils, stakeholder groups, and constituencies.

On possible [inaudible] concerns about today's WHOIS system, if you have a need for gTLD registration data, if you would like to see a WHOIS problem fixed, or if you would like to see a WHOIS feature used today maintained, this working group welcomes your input.

Now, this slide lists just a few of the possible requirements that have been gathered by this working group in order to show you what this approach is that is being taken by the RDS PDP Working Group to gather input.

For example, the first possible requirement listed on this slide is implied by the original WHOIS RFC 3912, which noted that WHOIS lacks mechanisms for access control, integrity, and confidentiality. These are gaps that may be addressed by adopting a new access protocol, quite possibly RDAP, as well as some policies that would make use of RDAP's features.

The second example on this slide is taken from the Expert Working Group's final report. It recommends that a next-generation system be developed to collect, validate, and disclose gTLD registration data but for permissible purposes only. This would be a significant change over

today's WHOIS system, which of course makes all data publically accessible to anyone for any purpose.

The examples at the bottom of this slide come from SAC 051, and they set expectations for what GNSO registration and data and directory services policies should address. It does not say what those policies should be, but it does insist that, for example, all registration data should be the subject of accuracy policies, even internationalized contact data.

Inputs like these and many others from many sources will help this working group consider diverse needs and perspectives when formulating its own recommendations.

Before I conclude my presentation and answer questions, I would like to briefly touch on the PDP Working Group's work plan. As explained, this PDP Working Group is in Phase 1 of three phases. The working group was formed this January. It is now on what is listed here as Tasks 9 through 11; that is, gathering input, drafting a list of possible requirements and then agreeing on how they will be used to reach consensus.

Now, as the working group goes, it continues to run into challenges, and this will happen throughout the PDP. This is a very difficult PDP. For example, currently the working group is drafting a set of use cases. Those are scenarios from the real world involving WHOIS data.

The purpose of the use cases is to explore users of WHOIS data, their purposes, data elements that they need for those purposes, privacy

considerations involved in these scenarios, and much more. These real world scenarios that involve WHOIS today and some that may identify problems or improvements possibly used tomorrow will help the working group examine and test out possible requirements as the group tries to reach some agreement.

The next task for this working group after we complete that input gathering and possible requirements gathering effort will be to deliberate on all of those possible requirements, attempting to first answer the five fundamental questions. Based on recommended answers to those questions, the working group must try to reach consensus on the big question: should we attempt to repair WHOIS or replace it? That is, do requirements that have been identified and agreed upon actually require a new system, or can the requirements be met by a modified WHOIS?

Now, I should note that there will be many opportunities for the community to provide input and feedback to this working group. This PDP will culminate and this first phase will culminate in at least two initial reports, with opportunities for public comment before a final Phase 1 report is delivered to the GNSO Council for their consideration and approval.

If this working group proceeds from Phase 1 to Phases 2 and 3, what would those phases look like? This slide is drawn from the approved process framework, and it demonstrates how the charter questions might be approached in three separate phases.

Giving just one example, the example is a question of users and purposes. During Phase 1, the working group must recommend whether gTLD registration data should continue to be accessible for any purpose, as it is in today's system. If the working group should reach consensus that data should be accessible only for specific purposes, then it must recommend what those purposes are. It must recommend what users should be allowed to access data for those purposes, and it must give rationale for why.

If the PDP Working Group finds that a new policy data framework is needed to meet that and other consensus requirements, and the GNSO Council agrees, then the PDP will continue to Phase 2, drafting specific policies to support requirements.

For example, you might identify policies for data element collection, collecting the data required for some permissible purposes, and the conditions under which that data is made accessible through the registration directory service.

Finally, in Phase 3, the working group will test its policy recommendations by considering implementation as well as co-existence guidance because we only get to Phase 3 if the group recommends, and the Council agrees, that a new system is needed to replace WHOIS.

If we get to Phase 3, this may result in refining some of the policies that are developed during this PDP until the working group reaches consensus on a workable answer to all of these questions.

In closing, I would like to note that this PDP has been structured into three phases, but all those three phases, this entire PDP, is still part of the normal PDP process. As such, this PDP is unlikely to finish quickly, and we have a long road ahead of us.

Now, I'll leave you with a few resources that you may want to consult to learn more, and of course, take your questions. If you are new to WHOIS, I recommend watching the RDS PDP Beginner's Tutorial that is listed here. If you're already pretty familiar with WHOIS and you want to learn more about this PDP, I recommend taking a look at the Phase 1 link here for the documents that are in progress so that you can see what the working group as developed and whether you wish to contribute to that effort.

A full library of input documents has also been compiled on this working group's wiki, the first link on this page. If you know of a key document on WHOIS that is not yet listed, we do welcome your input.

Thank you, and I'll now turn things back over to Daniel to moderate questions and answers.

DANIEL FINK: Lisa, thank you very much for your presentation. It was a brilliant presentation. You explanation about the essentials of the PDP was very well-explained. You showed us the ongoing process and the opportunities and the importance of the participation of the different communities. Thank you for the links to understand better this whole process. Thank you.

Now, we have some time for Q&A. I see here in the chat that Antonio Medina wrote a question. I'm going to say it in Portuguese for translation. Antonio says, "In Columbia, there is a new bill for data protection that's being put forward by special entities on the digital economy. This is also happening in other countries." He's asking if ICANN knows these bills of law and if the WHOIS policies take into account these scenarios.

I'd like to pass the floor to Lisa to answer this question.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you, Antonio. That is a very good question, and to be honest this is one of the biggest challenges this PDP Working Group will face – not just compliance with data protection laws throughout the world, which will be challenging, but the fact that there are constantly new data protection bills or new versions of existing data protection laws.

The first challenge for this group, of course, is inventorying what data protection laws exist. The group has actually begun to identify that as part of its input gathering process and also to understand the trends of these data protection laws and how they apply to registration data because I know you appreciate that the bill itself will not refer to registration data. Someone must interpret how that law applies to registration data, and especially to contact data for registrations by individuals.

This working group will need to come up with in Phase 1 some general requirements for policies that, for example, might determine that

ICANN's policies for registration data need to allow routine compliance with data protection laws in applicable jurisdictions.

Now, the group hasn't gotten to the point of making that recommendation, but, for example, I expect something like that to come from Phase 1. Actually working through the consequences of those data protection laws in each jurisdiction will come further in this process in Phases 2 and 3.

I hope that answers your question.

DANIEL FINK: Thank you, Lisa. Natalia Enciso from Paraguay asks, "What kind of data protections are you discussing for implementation? Will you follow the EU [European] model?" I pass the floor to Lisa.

LISA PHIFER: Natalia, thank you for that question as well. I know that you asked that before I answered Antonio's, but I will build on the answer, which is that the working group must take into consideration all of the applicable data protection laws. The EU data protection directives and its successor, the GDPR, are both considered very important documents by this working group, and the group is currently extracting possible requirements from the new GDPR and will consider them as part of all the possible requirements to be considered during Phase 1.

Now, considering that particular model does not preclude the working group from considering models that are in place in other countries and

other regions, the group must consider all of the laws that are applicable an all the jurisdictions where data may be accessed.

DANIEL FINK: Thank you, Lisa. Ricardo from Venezuela is asking: "If the new system is approved, when do you expect that the new system will be implemented?" It's about schedules. When will we have the new system implemented if the new system is approved?

LISA PHIFER: Ricardo, I wish I could give you a better answer than: not for a long time. We first need to actually agree that a new system is needed, then define the policies for the new system, and then look at the requirements for co-existence and on implementation. Then there must be an implementation plan, and of course there are approvals that are required at every step of the way. So we have quite a few steps left to do before we can come up with an actual concrete timeline.

What I can say is that it is built into the process and considered a requirement that this group look carefully at co-existence between systems and not make any assumptions that a new system would immediately replace WHOIS. That is, WHOIS would go away overnight and be replaced by a new system. I think we all know that's not practical. What part of this working group's recommendations must be: how would two systems coexist for a reasonable period of time while the new system is being tested and verify that it meets the design goals and objectives before WHOIS would ever go away?

So I know I didn't actually answer your question of a concrete schedule, but hopefully you can see that the timelines and establishing a timeline and a process to implement that is part of the plan.

DANIEL FINK: Thank you, Lisa. Another question from Natalia: "Can we still join the working group?" I would add another question. It's a complementary question: what are the expectations that, Lisa, you would have for feedback from our region, from the LAC region?

LISA PHIFER: I'll answer Natalia's half of the question first, which is that, of course, we welcome new members to the working at any time. This last slide actually gives some information about where the sign-up form is. Working group members are asked to submit a Statement of Interest as well and can join either as a full member or as an observer at any time.

Those who join as a full member can and are expected to participate in weekly conference calls and actively contribute to the work. Observers can watch what the group is doing on its wiki and also on recordings of weekly calls. You are welcome to join as a member and change to an observer, if your time does not allow for participation, and change back at any time.

The request, though, is that anyone who is an observer or joins as a full member later will need to catch up, will need to review what the working group has done so far, because, as you can imagine, there are going to be many very complex and difficult discussions to try to reach

agreement, and it will be important to become familiar with these discussions in order to contribute positively in the midstream of trying to reach agreement.

Thanks, Terri, for posting that sign-up form link.

The second half of that question I think was on how this group could contribute to the effort. Of course, contributing as a direct participant is always very welcome, but there are other ways to contribute as well.

Currently there are two outreach messages that the working group issued in order to seek input. Responding to these two messages would be ways that this group could contribute.

The first outreach message asked for a review of the key input documents that the group has already identified and to identify any additional documents that are considered very important that the group might not know about.

We are trying to make sure that we have at least all of the existing inputs that are highly relevant to our work at the start. There's quite a bit of information, but having it available will make it easier to bring up the relevant information as we move forward.

The second outreach message that has been published by this group asked for input on those possible requirements. Here is what we asked. We did put out a list of possible requirements that have been gathered thus far, but there's no need to go through that entire list of possible requirements and review them or comment on them at this time.

What we we're looking for is if there are additional possible requirements, anything that you're aware of – again, as I mentioned previously, a problem that you see that important to fix as part of this process, a feature of WHOIS that you depend on today that you want to see maintained, or potential new approaches, such as – I think we had two commenters here asking about compliance with data protection laws. All of those would be possible requirements, and having a broad set of perspectives and input on possible requirements will help the working group make sure that its recommendations take into account broad perspectives.

DANIEL FINK: Thank you, Lisa. Very good answers. Thank you, Terri, for your support in the chat.

If there are no further questions, I have one question. You may use icon in the Adobe Connect room or type in the chat. As a technical community, we know that Lisa is an expert in new technologies. We have discussed a lot about the Internet of Things that will enter in very large volumes in a little while.

I would like to know, Lisa, your view as a technical person on which features WHOIS or the new system should take into account with the entry of these new devices very soon. Thank you.

LISA PHIFER: Daniel, that is a difficult question. I would need to give that some thought. However, one observation I can make is that, in the Internet of

Things, every individual thing, if you will, may have an address, but it may not necessarily have a domain name that is associated with WHOIS. So we may need to think about the Internet of Things a little bit differently in order to have suitable contact information to resolve problems or other concerns associated with the Internet of Things.

DANIEL FINK: Thank you, Lisa. Thank you very much. I'd like to ask our friends if there are any questions. We have a few minutes left. Otherwise, we can close this webinar. Does anyone have any questions? Is anyone writing in the chat?

Natalia wrote, "No more questions." Very clear. Well, perfect.

Lisa, thank you very, very much for your excellent presentation, for your clarifications. We learned a lot from you, and I'm sure the knowledge you brought to our region will contribute to our PDPs. We are available if you need us for anything.

Thank you for those participating in the LACRALO community. Thank you very much to the interpreters, and thank you, Terri, for the support.

I'll pass the floor to Terri, who'll talk about the evaluation of our webinar. Thank you all. Good night.

Terri, the floor is yours.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you, Daniel, and thank you, everyone, for joining. If I could just please ask everyone to stay on a few minutes longer as we have six [inaudible] questions for you.

They now appear on the right-hand side of your screen in the Adobe Connect. Question 1: How was the timing of the webinar for you? Please select your response now.

Once again, our evaluation questions now appear in the right-hand side of your screen.

Question 2: How many years of experience do you have in the ICANN community? Please select your response now.

Question 3: How is the technology used for the webinar? The audio, the phone bridge, and the visual. Please select your response now.

Question 4: Did the speaker demonstrate mastery of the topic? Please select your response now.

Question 5: Are you satisfied with the webinar? Please select your response now.

Finally, our last question, and I'll leave this up onscreen so you can type in your response: What topics would you like us to cover for future webinars?

Once again, thank you very much for joining. This does conclude the webinar for today. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines, and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]