ICANN Transcription
GNSO-Next Generation RDS PDP Working Group
Tuesday, 22 November 2016 at 17:00 IST

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group on Tuesday, 22 November 2016 at 17:00 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 tounderstanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance may also be found at:
https://community.icann.org/x/v4-DAw
The audio is available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-nextgen-rds-pdp-22nov16-en.mp3

Coordinator: The recordings have started. You may now proceed.

Michelle DeSmyter: Great. Thank you,. Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening

to all. Welcome to the GNSO Next Generation RDS PDP Working Group call

on the 22nd of November, 2016.

In the interest of time there will be no roll call as we have quite a few

participants online, attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. So

if you're only on the audio bridge today could you please let yourself be

known now?

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: , I'm on the audio bridge only.

((Crosstalk))

Michelle DeSmyter: Okay, we'll note that. And also a reminder to all participants, please state

your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And please keep your

phones and microphones on mute to avoid any background noise. With this, I'll turn the call back over to Chuck Gomes.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michelle. And thanks, all. And welcome to this call today. Glad to see there's a pretty good turnout on the call because hopefully this session will be one where we can all come together in terms of the approach we're going to test here over the next few weeks and make sure everybody understands it.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: So you can see the agenda on the upper right in the notes section. And the first thing we need to do is to see if there are any updates to statements of interest. Okay, not seeing any hands or not hearing from Lauren, we will go ahead and move on to our main agenda item today, Item 2.

And you can see there are several parts to that. The - what I want to encourage everyone to do, as we're going through the items under agenda Item 2, feel free to ask questions if something is not clear.

In the results of the - from people who have already completed the poll, some people seem to understand it pretty well; some didn't. And it's really important that we're all on the same page on this. So don't hesitate to raise your hand or if you're not in Adobe to speak up and let us know that you need to - you have a question so that at a bare minimum when we finish this call today we'll all be on the same page and have the same understanding about not only what we're doing now but where we're headed in the next few weeks and if we're successful way beyond that. So again please feel free to raise your hand at any time and we'll get you in the queue as soon as it's possible.

That said, I want to turn it over to Susan and, Susan and Lisa and I think Susan is going to start, so if we could bring up the slides. This is going to be a subset of the slides that we used in Hyderabad to make sure everybody

who was not there is on board and even those of us that were there so that we're all clear on that. So, Susan, it's all yours.

Susan Prosser: Thanks, Chuck. And hello all, thank you for joining this morning. Can we go to the - so this is a subset of slides, like Chuck said, that we used in Hyderabad. So it may be review for some of you but since we spent some time on this we thought it would be good to make sure that the whole working group had seen these slides.

So we're in - on Step 12 of the work plan and to deliberate on possible fundamental requirements. Taken us a while but a lot of good thorough work has been done to prepare us for this. So we're going to start with the first pass of deliberating on requirements for the first three charter questions. And so they're listed there. User purposes, who should have access to gTLD registration data and why; data elements, what data should be collected, stores and disclosed; privacy, what steps are needed to protect data and privacy.

So with those three questions in mind, we've devised a plan to review all the possible requirements. So if we could go to the next slide? So what we've decided on is a randomized approach. So right now we're sorting possible requirements for Phase 1 requirements only. And we've randomly ordered the three questions.

And literally, Chuck threw a die on one of the leadership calls, and this is how user purposes came up first, data elements and then privacy so it was completely random. We just assigned numbers to each of those first. He threw the die and that's the way it worked out.

So for the first round, we're going to start with the first randomly selected question and followed by the second and then the third and discussing the subset of those possible requirements.

And we're going to use the prerequisites and dependencies and codes and keywords. So as you all know, we've spent a lot of time looking at the over 700 possible requirements and categorizing them. So we, you know, Lisa has taken - reviewed all of those for dependencies so what depends on each other. Stephanie created codes. And I selected keywords. So we have several batches of data to rely on for our deliberation.

And so then the next round - and we actually went through in Hyderabad and started this process, that's - we followed this approach in Hyderabad and went through multiple possible requirements. I don't think we got through as many as we'd hoped but we spent a good three to four hours really in hard discussion of - with the possible requirements.

So then the next round, the next set of possible requirements we'll look at, we will - we will then start with the data elements. So we're going to rotate. It'll always be random and it'll always be rotated. But to select the first group we started with the alpha order and so we deliberated on a subset of possible requirements that had the code A and then also had no dependencies.

So we were trying to sort of select some that were maybe the easiest to think about and didn't have to look at several possible requirements from other data sets. So we chose a very small narrow data set and looked at the dependencies. We sometimes used the keywords where we can use keywords going forward that are, you know, for subsets that are large or broad so we can break those into smaller sets.

And then the charter sub questions. We're going to map the PRs within each subsets of sub questions posed by the mind map so that we can make sure that we're in agreement and we can be applied to - can be applied to answer the charter questions. I think that was all I had to present. Lisa.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Susan. This is Lisa Phifer for the record. So to expand on what Susan just described, which was the process that we started applying in

Hyderabad, and put it in the context of our entire Phase 1, those of you that were in Hyderabad probably recognize this slide. We did talk through it there. But this lays out the steps in our work plan that get us from where we are now, that is the very beginning of initial deliberation, on possible policy requirements in Phase 1 through the final report in Phase 1. And this does come from our work plan, it's just a graphic representation of it.

The idea in this process, though, is that we build towards formal consensus. So many of us asked about polling at this stage and expressed some discomfort with voting at this stage. And absolutely, as you can see in this diagram and the arrows that are shown at the bottom of this slide, we will not actually take any voting for formal consensus until much later in Phase 1. But we need to work towards that process and build rough consensus - rough informal consensus.

And that's really where we are beginning at the very left hand side of this diagram. As Susan said, we're going to start with the three questions of users purposes, data elements and privacy. And we will continue to rotate those deliberation on some possible requirements in each of those categories in every meeting as we move forward, kicking off with initial deliberation on those categories.

Once we do that, we will then turn our attention to gated access and data accuracy as well as what you probably have seen in the possible requirements list. There is a category for other, that is possible requirements that just don't seem to fit into any of those five questions but still seem to be fundamental.

And what I mean by fundamental is they apply no matter what system implements the policy. So they could be applied to Whois or they could be applied to a next generation system. But they're fundamental in that they drive us towards answering that fundamental question, you see there as 12e, the fundamental question is do we need a brand new policy framework in

order to support those requirements or can we somehow modify the existing Whois policy framework to satisfy those requirements?

And the end result of that process will get us to our first initial report so we're just now beginning to draft some recommendations that will collect into a draft initial report and of course refine that initial report through further deliberation until this group feels that it's ready to actually be published for public comment. And there will be, as you can see in this slide, at least two public comment periods. That's formal public comment periods.

First to get feedback on that initial report covering the fundamental questions; and then a second after we deliberate on the other areas, those cross cutting areas identified in our charter, things such as coexistence, compliance, system modeling, cost, benefits and risks. And that doesn't mean that we won't talk about any of those charter questions at all as we develop our first initial report, but that the time to really deliberate on those policy requirements will be after our first initial report and incorporated into our second initial report which again, will go out for public comment.

And it's only once we reach that point and once the working group has sort of refined and shaped and honed down the list of possible requirements into a set of draft recommendations that this working group feels there's not necessarily complete consensus but at least rough consensus. It's only at that point that we'll actually do any formal voting per our charter rules in order to finalize the list and publish a Phase 1 report.

Now stepping us back again ,what we'll be doing in today's meeting is the process that Susan described starting with those three charter questions in the randomly selected order. In Hyderabad we started with the users and purposes. Because we agreed to just rotate on those questions, today we'll start with data elements should we get to the initial deliberation. We'll start on data elements, then do privacy and then do users and purposes. We'll

continue to rotate covering at least some possible requirements in each of those categories every time we do initial deliberation.

We did start in Hyderabad with a subset with Code = A and you saw that there was another initial possible requirements list distributed in advance of this meeting. Those include the questions or the possible requirements that we didn't get to in Hyderabad plus a few additional possible requirements with Code = A. And there's no magic about how we selected them, we're simply starting at the top of the list and trying to work our way through it.

As we work through the list, those of you that were in Hyderabad probably noticed that we looked at some possible requirements but we also looked at a couple of very similar and in some cases verbatim duplicate requirements at the same time since it might make sense to actually deliberate or at least begin deliberations on those very tightly related and duplicate requirements at the same time, that will speed up our process through the whole list, which as you can imagine, is going to take us quite some time.

What we did in Hyderabad, though, we certainly didn't finish deliberation. We started it. We captured the results of that initial discussion in our meeting notes, and we used the results of that initial discussion as the basis for creating the poll that we'll talk about further in just a moment.

And just as a reminder of where we are in the entire process, of course we're only in Phase 1 so we're really only looking at requirements for policy. As we get through Phase 1, and establish those policy requirements and go through public comment and then hopefully eventually reach some kind of formal consensus on those requirements for policies, it's only at that point that that final report for Phase 1 will go to the GNSO Council and the Council will decide whether we move onto Phase 2. Phase 2 is where we would actually define the policies, the specific policies to fulfill those requirements.

And those specific policies could apply to a next generation system, or they could apply to the existing Whois system, but we haven't gotten to the point of making a recommendation as to which system they would apply to yet.

With that I'll turn things back to Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I better take myself off mute, okay, sorry about that. So let's now go to the second bullet item under agenda Item 2. And Marika is going to take us through the proposed steps that the leadership team suggested in order to go through this. And we'll talk more about - I'll talk more about that after Marika finishes.

But before we - while that slide is coming up and before Marika starts, I haven't seen any hands, and what Lisa and Susan did was really do a little bit of a review of what we covered in Hyderabad. But certainly if anybody has a question at this point before I turn it to Marika please raise your hand or speak up. Okay. Then let's let Marika go through these next few slides.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Chuck. And this is Marika speaking for the record. And just to note, I was having some issues with my phone line before so if we start - start having difficulty hearing me, please let me know in the chat and I may need to connect to Adobe Connect audio but hopefully for now you can hear me fine.

As noted here I'll briefly cover, you know, what are the proposed steps to progress though this long list of possible requirements. And as several have already pointed out, you know, we're doing this on a trial basis. We're really trying to find a way to make this (unintelligible) and predictable as well for the working group as we progress in our work.

So, you know, as Lisa already pointed out, you know, we started initial deliberations in Hyderabad. There in three hours we covered seven possible

requirements that didn't have any dependencies plus seven that were either similar or appeared to be duplicates of those possible requirements.

As part of that conversation, you know, working group members raised questions, some suggestions were made on how some of those requirements may need to be reworded to really serve as possible requirements or address some of the questions or concerns that were raised. And that output was then as well published and shared of course with the working group.

You know, as you can imagine, if we need, you know, three hours or more to cover just seven or maybe in this case even 14 possible requirements it really will take a very long time for us to work through I think over 1000 possible requirements that we have on the list for the different questions or for the different topics.

So we really should start thinking, you know, what can we do to progress that conversation? How can we make it easier and more streamlined to move forward through the list of items with of course still giving due consideration to, you know, issues and comments that are raised and also moving toward, you know, reaching a consensus or at least rough consensus around what are the possible - or the requirements that the group believe should be part of that future framework.

So one thing that we thought of, maybe there is a way of, through a system of polling, we're able to kind of get input, you know, throughout the process that doesn't necessarily require a call and kind of gather that information to, you know, facilitate then the further discussion.

So as said, you know, we're trying now this approach, you know, we're looking forward to receiving your comments today. And of course, if anyone has any suggestions of other approaches that, you know, would result in indeed moving this work forward in a reasonable timeframe we're of course

very much open to that. Of course, as well any suggestions or modifications that you may have to the current approach that we're trying.

So what does that proposed look like? So it's a six-step process that we're proposing. So starting already with some of what we've done in Hyderabad, the idea would be that first during a call there would be initial exchange of view and deliberations on a set of possible requirements. And Susan and Lisa already spoke about the fact that those randomized and in a randomized order to make sure we cover, you know, the first three topics.

But then based on, you know, that initial conversation and discussion, a poll would be developed a kind of, you know, indicate some of the issues that were raised and basically ask questions on how to move forward in the conversation, which areas, you know, receive the support, which ones do people believe that they need to be modified, and which ones should be deleted or discarded.

So the hope is that that would then give input to the working group as well as the leadership team on how to move the conversation forward on that specific set of possible requirements. Again, then a call would be used to discuss those poll results, and again allowing for further deliberation at a more conceptual level with then staff and the leadership team taking away that feedback from that call and aiming to, you know, for those possible requirements that are identified as, you know, potential consensus requirements, and, you know, working on how to potentially modify or restate those that they would need the overall support of the working group.

And that we're currently thinking is potentially using the wiki space to have that, you know, both the language posted but also in combination with the feedback or input received and then use the wiki tools allowing for commenting for working group members to provide input. You know, the idea behind that is as well if we leave it only to the working group mailing list for one, it will be quite difficult to keep track because we'll be, you know,

discussing and deliberating a set of possible requirements at a time. So for staff it would be difficult as well to track, you know, who's commenting on what.

But also for the overall review by working group members, it's hard then to compile that all into kind of one overview of, you know, what feedback was received and, you know, how that then result in potential changes to that possible requirement. So the idea is that by capturing that all on the wiki page it would be a kind of one place where people can find everything related to that specific requirement and all the input that has been received. And then as well subsequently, you know, where did the working group end up with regards to how, you know, the possible requirement should be worded and receive support or not.

(Unintelligible) of requirements. And (unintelligible) objective of course is to get all these…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Marika, you're breaking up quite a lot right now.

Marika Konings: Okay, I'm going to switch to Adobe Connect audio. Hold on a second.

Chuck Gomes: So while she's switching let me make a comment on the slide that's up there right now. This is Chuck speaking. If you look at those six steps, in the ideal scenario, if this works, and this is (unintelligible), if this works, the quickest that that - those six steps could happen on a given subset - small subset of requirements would be at least three weeks.

Okay, so we'd, in one meeting we would do Step 1, that would be followed with Step 2 and at the next meeting at the soonest you would - we would review the results of the poll and discuss those and then at the soonest, maybe three weeks out, and probably a little bit longer, for that particular

subset, we would be doing a, you know, hopefully coming to a rough consensus on some wording. So the word smithing would happen towards the end of that little cycle.

Now in the process we started in Hyderabad, it's obviously stretching - going to stretch quite a bit over three weeks, but it's our first try. So let me stop there and see if Marika is back.

Marika Konings: I should be back and I'm hoping that the audio through Adobe Connect is a little bit better.

Chuck Gomes: It sounds good. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Excellent. Thank you very much, Chuck. And I think that already actually leads us into the next slide, which tries to display the sequence that Chuck just described because, you know, we're all very conscious of the need to give people enough time to, you know, provide input to the poll but also at the same time of course to provide sufficient time for staff to turn around the poll results and prepare those for working group deliberation and review.

So as Chuck noted, it's kind of an over a three week sequence that the different steps would happen, which builds in a little bit of I think redundancy in the first two weeks but then hopefully gets us in a kind of predictable sequence that will allow people to, you know, start getting used to it. And again, I think - I hope you all have seen as well that, you know, responding to the poll shouldn't take too much time. We're really trying to keep it as succinct as possible to facilitate providing input.

And again, I think we want to emphasize, you know, it's not a vote by, you know, selecting one or the other options you're not expressing a vote, you're just providing input that will be helpful in moving forward in the deliberations. So again, see here the sequence and this is the kind of timeline we're

proposing. Of course, if you have any comments or concerns about that we're more than happy to hear that.

So again as it notes below as well, you know, this is kind of a five-day framework for - five-day timeframe for the steps 2 and 4 the initial poll and further deliberations. And then, you know, there's a more open end towards the latter stages of the work, as Chuck noted as well, where the word smithing and, you know, finalization around the wording of the requirement would take place. And that may be done indeed through the wiki or mailing list and may not necessarily require call time.

So as noted, you know, we're really testing this. We're very glad to see that many of you already responded to the first poll that was launched last week. You find the link here as well. You know, as we know, not everyone may have had a chance or some of you, you know, may have waited until this call to really fully understand the objective of the poll. You know, please provide your input. We'll leave it open until the 25th of November.

Also to note, you know, for those of you that did complete the poll but now may feel that their initial responses may not be aligned with the proposed purpose or objective of the poll and you feel a need to actually, you know, redo it, that's no problem. You know, you just go ahead and fill it out again. You know, we just ask you that you then in that case give a heads up to staff so we can delete your previous response and only record, you know, the last response that you submit.

As we noted then during the working group meetings, today as well as next week meeting, you know, we hope that initial requirements or initial deliberation will (unintelligible) on two or more sets of possible requirements to ramp up the proposed process and get into the cycle, the three week cycle that we've proposed. And then during the meeting on the 6th of December we'll use the first poll results to, you know, continue deliberations on that specific set.

And, you know, as noted as well, you know, then in the meantime we'll also be asking people to provide input on possible wording of draft recommendations so we can get to the stage where we have a rough consensus on those requirements that people believe should be part of the overall framework.

So, Chuck, I think with that I'm handing it back to you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Let me - this is Chuck again. Let me pause and see if there are any questions. Okay. Not seeing any hands or hearing from anyone. Then let's bring up a subset of the poll or I don't know - bring a subset or the whole poll, I forget what we decided yesterday. But let's bring that up and let's talk a little bit about the poll. And after we do that, and entertain questions, we will go to look at some of the preliminary results, okay, and talk about those for a little bit.

Now, what you see in front of you right now, if you're on the first slide of the poll, are - is the introduction to the poll. The easiest question of all is the one in the box down below and that's to enter your name. And this is obviously for working group members.

So - but the - make sure you read the introduction when you do the poll so that we tried to provide some guidance there and basically it says some of the things that Lisa and Marika already went over. We're not trying to pin people down at this point in time. Now one of the comments that came back in some of the early results was that, you know, I can't answer this until I know what the rest of our recommendations are.

Well, we get that. But also how do we get through - for the first five questions up to 1000 requirements, and then answer these things. We have to make some at least early progress to get to that point.

As we've said many times throughout our working group so far, we know we're going to have to come back and revisit things. Something is going to be decided three months from now that changes your view on something you said today or this week. And we get that. Nobody is being locked in. But we have to someway find a way to make progress with the understanding that this whole process will be iterative. You'll see that word and hear it over and over again. We're going to have to backtrack and so forth. We know that and that's going to be possible.

One of the things that has resulted in the long history of efforts to work on Whois is people have become very suspicious of one another, of staff, of working group leadership, of - you know where all the suspicions are coming from. And they're not without validity, okay? But I want to encourage all of you to try to put the suspicion aside as much as you can.

We always need a level of that to keep things on target and to keep things balanced, but if we're overly suspicious it's going to be very hard to make progress. You're never going to find me or any of the leadership team asking you to compromise on your principles and so forth. We don't want you do that. But we also know that all of us have competing views and in some cases we're going to bump heads over that. And we need to bump heads over that.

But at the same time, we need to be able to listen to the other points of view and try and find some common ground. Now what this survey is designed to do, assuming it works, is to help without using all of our meeting times to find some of that common ground. And so please approach the survey in that sense.

If you scroll down to Page 2 of the survey on your screen, and each of you I believe has the scrolling capability, you see the very first item, very first possible requirement that we started deliberation on in Hyderabad, okay?

Now all I want to do - I don't want to look at content right now of the item, but I would like you to focus on the choices that are given for that first item.

One of them is delete as a possible requirement. And treat as input to the statement of purpose. One of the things, for those that were in Hyderabad or that listened to the recording or participated remotely, one of the things you will recall is that we wondered whether this really was a requirement statement or more of a purpose statement.

And so that's why that option was put there. So to illustrate how this survey was created, it wasn't the leadership team trying to impose their views on the whole working group but rather we tried to take from what came out of the discussion in Hyderabad, to create some options that seemed consistent with the discussion that occurred there.

And we're not going to get that perfect, okay, but hopefully it's close enough following the discussion that it can help move us forward a little bit. You can see the second option, retain for further deliberation to help shape specific policy requirements and so on there. And then of course you can add - there's a space for you to add another thing there.

If you go down to 2.2 then, you will see that it says "Please indicate your level of support for the following draft recommendations derived from initial working group deliberations." So again, taking the discussion that we had on this requirement in Hyderabad, we came up with three options and there's a third Other category.

Because it was pointed out by several in Hyderabad, that, you know, this covers an awful lot. So what if we broke it down into three smaller pieces? Now those three smaller pieces could become a part of the purpose statement if we went with the first choice on 2.1, rather than being requirements because they probably don't look too much like requirements.

And so that's what we did here. Again, all of this derived from the feedback that those who participated in the Hyderabad meeting provided.

Now, if you go down - and again always - feel free to raise your hand at any time if I lose you or if you have a question or a comment. Now going down to 3, which you can see is requirement - users and purposes requirement 1- - I mean, DO1-RO2, and again I don't want to focus on the content, but you can see the choice - and notice in there we grouped a couple similar requirements, this is what - I think it was Lisa was talking about earlier - in order to increase our efficiencies we tried - and Lisa did the bulk of the work here I believe - tried to find requirements that were very similar so that we may be able to - once we reach any kind of resolution on 01-RO2, hopefully we can knock off the two similar ones in a lot of cases.

Now, you can see that under 3.1 the choices are very similar to what you saw in 2.1 except that it doesn't suggest moving it to a purpose statement rather than a requirement. So you have the choice just delete it, further deliberate or something else.

Now, and then if you scroll down a little bit to 3.2, again we picked up some options that came out of the discussion in that. And give you a chance to weigh in on that. Now, I'm trying to see - I take it, Lisa, or Marika, that this doesn't show the choices that they have for each of those. Does - is there a slide here that shows those choices? I wanted to talk about the choices. What we…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Lisa.

Lisa Phifer: Chuck, if you look underneath the question 3.2, level of support pull down choices are listed there.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay. Hold on a second. So you're on 3.2?

Lisa Phifer: Correct.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Lisa Phifer: It's after each question dot 2.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay there we go.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: So you can see down there it says level of support, pull down choices. So again to make it easy and quick, we gave some pull down choices. One of them you could support it as-is. So you'll have a pull down box. One of them - my support with some refinement. A third one is could not support in any form. And then no opinion. Okay?

Now I want to pause there and because some people had questions. Some people commented, and this is just - I just looked at the responses to the first 14 that responded. So that's a very small sample. But one of - one person said the choices aren't clear. Another person said they were very clear. That's expected in a group of our size.

But what I want to make sure right now is that those four choices are clear to everybody, at least those on the call. So if somebody is not clear about what those choices are, what they mean or need explanation there, please raise your hand now so that we can talk about that further. Hopefully you can see the underlying intent. We're not asking you to lock yourselves in now, but if we get a lot of could support as-is, and nobody suggests refinement or nobody could not support it, you know, we're home free on those. We won't get very many of those. I hope we get a few.

But, if we - and then if we get a lot of my support with refinement, we know we need to do some word smithing and that's what we're going to do - try and do on the wiki and so forth once we do that. So again, I'm not seeing any hands come up. Do those options not make sense to anybody? If you haven't taken the survey and you're going to, you think you'll be able to use those?

Okay. Now, I don't think I need to go over the survey any further unless there's a part of it - you can scroll through yourself - it covers the questions that we covered that we started deliberating on in Hyderabad. And then if you go down to Item 8, you can see the requirement for - that last requirement was a little more complicated one. And we know that. But keep in mind that's what's in our possible requirements document right now.

And several of you commented that some of these aren't worded very well. We know that. Okay? It was a ton of work just pulling these things out of all the resource documents that we used. So we know that a lot of them aren't worded well. That goes without saying.

If they have elements that are useful though, we'll pull those out of there and we'll eventually fix the wording. So please keep that in mind in here. Don't expect the possible requirements to be worded perfectly. That may never happen. Okay?

So but if you can respond to the survey, and some of you thought you needed to go back and do a lot of research. Well, if you do, fine, if you have to do that every time we do a survey your task is going to be huge. Try to the best of your ability to respond to the questions as is without having to do a lot of research realizing that you're not locking yourselves in yet. No problem with doing more research if you can, but your time will be really excessive in terms of what you need. Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. I just wanted to respond, you know, to the question about, you know, using the questionnaire or the experience of

going through it. And I found to my experience was I felt like it was far too granular and random. My ultimate experience was that I kind of felt like I couldn't see the forest for the trees.

And that, you know, trying to see how any of these - it also felt very decontextualized and made it difficult to respond. You know, for instance a question that refers to purposes but is not about purposes, but refers to purposes could be answered very differently depending upon how we decide what is a permissible purpose. And, you know, I just - and I felt that the level of support pull down choices were kind of mismatched. They weren't really - didn't really feel like they were along a spectrum or at least they were too big, you know, gaps, you know, basically as-is and could not support in any form are at opposite ends and there's only one thing in the middle, might support with refinement.

Typically I look at might as being a fairly low possibility like I might lose 30 pounds by Copenhagen, but if you look at me in Copenhagen it's not going to happen, okay? So might is - might support with refinement is a really would support, could support, should there be some other choice in between? And what are we talking about in terms of refinement? Is it refinement in terms of word smithing or is it the concept?

So, you know, maybe I'm over thinking this. And I did answer this to the best of my ability and put in some comments, you know, with regard to that, you know, these comments here. But I felt like it was just, you know, kind of frustrating. I feel like we've gone too far down toward particularities. And I feel like there are, you know, still relatively broad concepts about which we have differences and that this has kind of whizzed right past that down to some fairly - down to minutiae.

And I know you said you're not going to hold us to this in a sense, but it seems like if we had a better overall sense of where we stood then the answers to these might be clearer or that, you know, conversely we spend

more time talking about the differences in our overall positions rather than going down to, you know, looking at 700 little pickup sticks that we, you know, might be better off. But, you know, there's no perfect way to do this, I understand.

But that's just my overall reaction to this and wondering what we'll get out of it in the end with regard to the bigger picture. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Greg. This is Chuck again. And that's exactly the feedback we want, okay. Now you know me pretty well so this won't surprise you because I'm going to come back for some suggestions, okay, from you so you can be thinking while I'm talking.

So is, you know, there may be a better way than going requirement by requirement. Now we've tried to combine similar things and do prerequisites and things like that. What I hear you saying is maybe we should be looking at some key concepts where we have differences and talking about those and then going back and evaluating the possible - the long possible requirements list based on what rough consensus we might achieve on those concepts. Am I hearing you right on that first, Greg, let me ask you that?

Greg Shatan: Yes, Chuck. Greg Shatan again. Yes, and just to reflect, though, in my day job when I'm trying to get, you know, agreement between two different sides on a transaction, I'll start out with a key issues list rather than, you know, negotiating, you know, particularly linguistic points or word smithing or going to a 60-page document. You know, if you can get the key concepts resolved the documents almost write themselves. Almost. Devil is in the details of course.

But once you kind of have prime concepts dealt with or principles then when you go down to the next level you're kind of on firmer footing. So, you know, it seems to me that we need to - I understand we've done this massive data dig for all of these requirements, but it seems to me the key principles are - there

are probably far fewer than 700 and, you know, maybe we'll be able to look at them in a better context if we have if not agreement on the key principles, at least definitionally what the key principles are and the positions on them. I feel like that is almost tantalizingly close given, you know, we have been talking about this for a while and this is not the first rodeo. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Greg. Chuck again. And I'm going to get to Lisa in just a second. But I want to call your attention, if you haven't looked at it, to the discussion going on in the chat. The - one suggestion made was we use the EWG document to talk about the - what Greg is talking about, the key concepts. One of our concerns as a leadership team, you'll recall early on this working group that there were a lot of people that were afraid we'd rely too much on the EWG document. So that's why we've been kind of cautious on that.

We would have to talk about that and make sure the working group is comfortable with that approach. I'm not opposed to that myself, personally, but we do need to be together as a working group. So that would be the - certainly, as you recognize, and as those in the chat recognize, one of the things we'd have to do is figure out how we come up with the key concepts to grapple with first. And that's probably doable. So let me stop there and let Lisa jump in.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. I initially - this is Lisa Phifer for the record. I initially raised my hand just to point out some questions that were being asked in the chat about why are we starting with such granular possible draft recommendations? And I just wanted to explain where they came from and the thinking behind them so that we can consider whether there's a different approach that's better.

The draft recommendations were actually things that were suggested in Hyderabad not necessarily worded exactly this way, but when we began the initial deliberation on these questions in Hyderabad, it was pointed out that each of the statements, the possible requirements that we were dealing with,

were multifaceted, that you could read them different ways depending on what part of the sentence you were looking at.

And so we took away sort of a direction to unravel those possible requirements into their component pieces so that we could test our thinking about those individual pieces. That doesn't stop the working group from then, you know, reassembling that back into draft recommendation that's multipart. But it was intended to be a way for us to look at those components and to sort of winnow out what people didn't agree with, things that people very much agreed with and then as it was pointed out, the category in the middle, might support with refinement, is really broad.

And that's intentional because the - our thinking here was that we would focus on the draft recommendations that fell in that category so we could really work those further and figure out what concepts in there were supported and what confusion there might lie or what differences of opinion might lie in that middle ground. So that was the thinking behind it. And I'll stop there saying I would like to say that the - this is not at all set in stone, it's just a first stab and how we could move forward. But just wanted to share the thinking behind how we got to those draft recommendations that you see in the poll.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa. This is Chuck again. So I'm mulling things over in my head. One of the challenges that we as a leadership team had when we were trying to figure - come up with some ideas for tackling this huge list of requirements, is that I think - at least me, and I may be the guilty party here, I was focusing on this list of 1000 requirements and how do we get through it, so I guess making an assumption that we need to do that granularly and that may be a false assumption, and I'm open to changing that assumption. So I want to make that clear. L0et me go to Greg.

Greg Shatan: Greg Shatan again. Just thinking briefly about how I tried to answer this, as I looked at each of these questions I tried to kind of relate it back to my

personal positional value set as to what I would like to see happen and also what I would be kind of willing to live with in terms of the overall RDS. And I'd much rather try to answer questions about the overall value set or, you know, the higher level principles than try to, you know, look at little pinheads and try to figure out how they - and whether they fit into my value set.

It's just a very odd way of trying to get at the bigger question. And I think as we get down the list and we find, you know, highly redundant ones, I understand you've tried to group them, but as we get more and more redundant it's just going to feel more and more like an exercise in, you know, building a castle - a sand castle by looking at the grains. And I think we need to, you know, look at what the overall shapes are that, you know, people want and grapple with those. I know, you know, to some extent we have been doing that, but I feel like we've kind of gone all the way to the other end of the spectrum.

So it's really trying to hang back onto those value sets rather than trying to guess whether this kind of, you know, fits in and, you know, in trying to create a puzzle that looks like my value set. That's - I'd much rather, you know, be able to go directly to the question of what is it that I want rather than whether any of these particular phrased things fit into what I want. And/or would be willing to live with given our consensus process. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Greg. Again, much appreciated. This is Chuck. So let me ask everybody on the call a fairly direct question. And I'll be on the negative sense first, does anybody disagree with the kind of approach that Greg is advocating? And don't worry about the details yet, some of those have to be worked out. But is there anybody that has concerns about this approach, please put a red X in the Adobe or speak up if you're not in Adobe. So I'm not - so far I'm not seeing anybody disagreeing with this approach. So…

Lisa Phifer: Chuck, could you maybe recap what this approach is?

Chuck Gomes: Looking - and probably should let Greg do it but I'll take a stab first of all. As I
                   understand it, instead of going through the requirements one by one like
                   we're doing, or like we're starting to do, identify the key concepts that - and
                   try to reach rough consensus on those and then go back and apply those to
                   the specific requirements. Did I - Greg, did I get that close?

Greg Shatan: I think that's basically it. I think that we don't necessarily have to apply them
                   to the particular requirements as much as the particular requirements will kind
                   of fall into place as we have those bigger picture discussions.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks. So I'm not seeing any disagreement with that approach. Okay.
                   The - so the next question then is okay how do we identify those fundamental
                   concepts or key concepts that we would talk about? Now it's already been
                   suggested, and several people support using the EWG report. My question
                   for those of you on the - that were involved in the EWG, do you think - and
                   this would include Lisa of course, and I'll call on her next.

                   Could - will the EWG report work effectively to identify those key concepts?
                   And I'd like some, you know, the opinion of several people who were on the
                   EWG. And then I'm going to come back to the rest of you and I'm going to
                   ask you is there going to be a problem with some of you if we use the EWG
                   as the starting point for that? Now let me remind everybody that the Board in
                   their request for this PDP said that's where we should start. So we would
                   certainly be following the Board directions.

                   But, so the first question though is, for those of you in the - that participated in
                   the EWG, do you believe that the EWG report would be a good way to start in
                   identifying these underlying issues to discuss first? And I'll let you raise your
                   hands for those of you that were in the EWG. And I see a check - and green
                   checkmark is good too. Thanks, Rod, for that. If somebody wants to speak
                   raise your hand. And Fabricio, thank you. Greg…

Stephanie Perrin: Can I jump in here? It's Stephanie.

Chuck Gomes: Absolutely, Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: And I do apologize, I'm only on the phone so I can't really - it's tough
                  following. Naturally, since I'm the author of the dissenting report on the EWG,
                  I'm going to be the one who doesn't think we should start with the EWG. And
                  my reasons for this are the following. There was never really adequate
                  comment on the EWG in its final form. The Buenos Aires draft that was
                  commented on was not resembling the last one sufficiently that people could
                  get a good grip on it And so the EWG has a kind of a mature concept of what
                  we were building and a lot of the material is wrapped around that and that is
                  not-- in my view-- explicit enough in the report.

                  So, and I realize it's a hard report to write. So, I don't mean this as criticism of
                  the authors of the report, but I believe that it will insert a bias. So, obviously
                  it's got a lot of good material in it. And if you can figure out how to address
                  that bias that would be fine. But to cruise ahead and take it as our root
                  document, well it means some of us who have problems with it are going to
                  have to raise those issues sort of single-handedly as we go along because it
                  hasn't had the benefit of I would say thorough analysis. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Stephanie. I'm going to come back to you right now and before I go to
                  Lisa and (Michela). This is Chuck. Note that what I intended to ask was not
                  that we accept the conclusions or recommendations of the EWG report but
                  rather use it as a source to identify the issues that we need to grapple with.
                  Which is I think what you're saying still needs to be done. It would be up to us
                  as a working group once we identify the issues to deliberate on those issues
                  ourselves and come to- try to reach some rough consensus on those issues.

                  So, I'm not- would the- and by the way, it doesn't mean that the EWG report
                  has to be the sole source of the issues, but it would give us a starting point.
                  Does that make sense to you, Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, as I say there was a lot of work that went into the EWG report. I'm sympathetic to my colleagues who don't want throw all that year and a half out the window. However, you know, be prepared to examine the bias is all I'm saying.

Chuck Gomes: And that's all I'm saying.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, so I think we're on the same page.

Man: Pull something out of the EWG report doesn't mean we accept it as gospel. So, it is going to be incumbent upon us to deliberate on that. So, I point that out and let me go now to Lisa.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck Lisa Phifer for the record. I am experiencing a big feeling of déjà vu because when the EWG published its report right at the very end, we took the, I forget the number 138 principles I think it was, in the EWG report and we rolled them up into an eight or ten-page executive summary. When that was delivered to the board, the board and the GNSO Council formed the EPWG to try to figure out the back out. Well what were the key issues that the EWG report identified? And that's what we saw in the process framework which then became the basis of the issue report for this working group.

So, going through that process once, identifying what they key concepts were, they became the charter questions for this working group. We have charter questions and sub questions and I'm curious if what people want to come up with as far as, you know, the key concepts that they want to agree on before further deliberation, if those are different than the charter questions and sub questions. And if so how?

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Lisa and hopefully Greg and anybody that wants to can respond to that question that Lisa posed. (Mcgaly) you're next.

(Mcgaly):   Thanks Chuck. (Mcgaly) for the record. Sorry, I'm disagreeing of course with Stephanie which hurts and me and pains me to do but I have to disagree with her. She's wrong. She's wrong. The EWG took about 18 months of my life and that of other people who were involved in this. It may not be a perfect document, but kind of ignoring and throwing the work that was, the substantial work and effort that went into it would be ridiculous. If somebody's going to give me back the 18 months, then fine but that's not going to happen.

I don't think anybody's asking for anybody to adopt the EWG's final report in its entirety, but there's a lot of the stuff that we seem to be looking at again here was covered in depth during the EWG. And not just during the EWG, we also covered elsewhere as well. So, I think some of the topics have been discussed to death over the years, thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you (Mcgaly). This is Chuck. Greg you're next.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. This is Greg Shatan again. I wish I could answer the question that was closed bout the charter versus EWG versus what we're trying to do here. I have to go back and give that a little more thought. But I think it is important to distinguish between the conclusions of the EWG and the concept. I'm not saying we shouldn't agree with the conclusions as well, but you know, conceptually what we're looking at here it's- should capture kind of the intent of the capture is the universe of the open issues. That's great if there are issues that really got somehow swept under the rug and weren't reflected even as issues. You know, then you know, conceivably, you know, those could be brought to the table as well so that we, you know, if that's something referred to as bias. You know, the idea is not to kind of deal entirely in preconceptions. So, there should be some way to use that, you know, appropriately. And if there are, things that weren't, you know, brought to the fore then bringing them in, you know, as a, you know, in a supple as, to supplement what was there.

So, apologies to all of those who were involved in the EWG. I'm not having the déjà vu. This is my first time for being here. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Greg. This is Chuck. So back to Lisa's question. Can I ask you?

Stephanie Perrin: Can I jump in here Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Just one second Stephanie. Let me finish my thought. But you're next. So, what- as Lisa stated, the charter questions that came out of the framework from that was developed from the EWG report, if I understood Lisa correctly basically sets out the key concepts that need to be deal with. How would- Greg how would- could you give me an example of a concept that we could deliberate on that's different from the charter questions? And while you're thinking about that, let me let Stephanie go. By the way, those of you that have your green checkmarks up, you can- somebody. Is that you Stephanie? We couldn't understand a word you said.

Stephanie Perrin: No, that wasn't me. I don't know what happened. I actually muted again when it started. I was actually going to respond to what Lisa said and of all people Lisa would know the EWG report and this whole process in some depth because she's- depth because she's the one plowing through it all. Far bit it for me to disagree with Greg and by the way I don't think (Mcgaly)'s proven how I'm wrong yet. Because I think I'm basically agreeing but we can use the EWG as a place to start as long as we recognize the bias in it, so I don't know what the problem is. I'm not throwing that work out.

The problem with taking high level statements and starting there is that the devil lies in the details. And we ran into this even with the EWG. I mean it's all very well to say wonderful things about privacy, but if at the end of the day you are providing people a consent box, an out, then the whole thing is undermined by that. So, I- at the risk of, you know, taking the grain of sands and building the sandcastle, it's really more like building a building one brick at a time, you know?

I think that while we need a broad structure, we could spend another two years just going around the basic principles again and again and again. And our recent exercise on discussing the purpose was such an exercise. I think it was useful ultimately, but it was getting a tad repetitive. I don't want to spend another five years discussing how good privacy is and then having to wait until the last minute to veto what it actually gets interpreted in practice in the finer threads of the policy. I think we got to get down to the brass tacks sooner rather than later.

And I'm no process person so, I'm going to be the one sort of rushing to fine detail and cobbling it together later and I know that offends process people. But I think we got to get there. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Stephanie. Anybody else want to jump in? Greg have you- do you have an example of a concept as you were proposing that is different from the charter questions?

Greg Shatan: This is Greg)again, I don't off the top of my head that was kind of an attempt to say that if there was something that got left out of the EWG list of issues that, you know, this is a way to bring it in. If that is the, the bias issue rather that's being referred to. You know, rather than we're talking about kind of outcome bias or purported bias then that's a different question. But just saying if one of the problems that some people see with using the EWG is that it's a closed list then, you know, we don't need to treat it as a closed list. But maybe it is the universal list.

In terms of process, I agree we need to get down to the details, but I feel like we need to get there step wise rather than kind of shooting all the way down there and then trying to build our way back up. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Greg. So, I'm going to ask for some of you to perform some action items between now and our meeting next week. And before I do that, let me let Susan jump in.

Susan Prosser: Thanks Chuck. So, I was thinking, you know, watching the chat and some of the agreement that EWG may be a good starting point. Could we take the FSAC report that, I'm not sure who put the link in there, but the FSAC on the EWG report definitely asks some really good questions that I think we should incorporate into our review. So, could we maybe take the EWG report and those FSAC questions and sort of start there. You know, incorporate- look at the report as we do the deliberation and answer those FSAC questions at the same time. You know, make sure they're incorporated into our deliberation.

So, we would at least be addressing those questions which, you know, they all made sense to me personally at least. And then obviously other people would bring in questions as we go along. But at least the EWG would act as a roadmap. And we wouldn't have to deal with just the pile of bricks as Greg or someone said. I mean would there be more of a consensus within the group to sort of marry those two reports and start there?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. Good question Susan. I guess I might qualify it a little bit. Should we just start with the FSAC report? And try and deliberate on their questions. I haven't looked at it in a while but I do recall it- I think it did identify the fundamental issues that we have to come to terms with. And …

Stephanie Perrin: If I could jump in. It's Stephanie again. I think that's a terrific suggestion. The FSAC did do a very thorough critique in my view and it's one of the few and that would help me deal with my perception of bias. And what I mean by bias is we very soon answered the question that we needed to build a new RDS and we started building, you know. And we're not at that stage in this discussion so that's the bias I'm referring to.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, and thanks Stephanie. That's a helpful comment. With regard to bias, let me make a general comment and this isn't directed at Stephanie or the EWG or anything else. Just about every document that we have as a resource has its own bias, okay? So, it's our job as a working group to filter through the biases and to come to recommendations that we can support with a strong consensus as possible in that regard. So, keep that in mind as a principle.

There, you know, it may be- even the FSAC has their own biases. Now it's a bias we probably all have towards security and that's good, but keep that in mind. It's our job- everything we look at is going to have biases. It's our job to filter through those and to make the best recommendations we can. But let's not- I don't think anybody's advocating throwing information out because it has biases. That's a naïve approach because most of these documents have good information and ideas and issues that we need to consider. So, just a general comment there. Lisa go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks Chuck. I just want to make sure and some of this has been discussed in chat at this point, but the FSAC61 was actually published after the EWG's initial report which was the EWG's first four months of work. Much thinking, evolution of thinking occurred between June of that year and June of the following year. So, there will be quite a bit of reading between the lines if you start with the FSAC61 as well as the EWG's final report because what we don't have, I believe, and maybe FSAC members can correct me, but what we don't have is any FSAC response to the EWG's final report and the concepts that were laid out there.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. Any of the FSAC members want to jump in and share a comment? Greg good, thanks.

Greg Aaron: Hi Chuck this is Greg Aaron. I was one of the co-authors of FSAC61. In general, we did not feel- my recollection is that we did not feel that the final EWG report was significantly different enough to change our recommendations. What we felt was that the EWG report was not strong on

explaining the issues and tended to skip to solutions rather than giving the community a good understanding of what all the issues were. Such as what is the purpose of data- of registration data and what are the justifications for limiting it in various situations? That's why we, you know, really getting at those issues is why we have this group today.

And that's why sometimes I feel that the EWG report needs to be-recommendations need to be combined- or discussions need to be combined with the WHOIS review team report. Which I think did a better job of explaining what the issues are. Didn't necessarily come up with solutions, but it did a better job of explaining what the issues are. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Greg. Much appreciated. So, this is Chuck. You've just thrown in another source document that might be a place to start with what Greg Shatan is talking about or suggesting. And that is the WHOIS review team report, the first one and is there anybody on the call or that is opposed to at least taking a serious look at FSAC61 and the WHOIS review team report as possible documents to identify the issues that Greg Shatan was talking about? Would you please put a red X in the Adobe or Speak Up if you're not in Adobe. If you would be opposed to- as a next step we're not going to finalize it right now. But taking a looking at those two documents as a possible way of identifying the issues and possibly coming to a maybe a modification to our approach and trying to deliberate on this long list of requirements. Anybody opposed to that? So, I'm not just sticking my neck out. Okay, Susan go ahead.

Susan Prosser: So, having been a member of the WHOIS review team and the EWG, you know, we were tasked with different reviews basically. We were very limited in the WHOIS review team on what we could look at and you know, we were limited by the affirmation of commitments and the description there. And so, I would just caution that the WHOIS review team report-- even though I think we did a decent job of that-- we, you know, there was a lot of issues that the team decided were off the table because it did not fit within our remits. So,

there was months of discussion of what we could talk about and what we couldn't talk about.

So, you know, I felt like the WHOIS review team report was constrained and so, I would just want to make sure that, you know, the working group understands that we couldn't address certain things and that we wouldn't be limited by the WHOIS review team report.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Susan. Do you think though- this is Chuck. Do you think though that the WHOIS review team report would be a good source for identifying the issues? Whether it was in scope for the review team or not.

Susan Prosser: Well I mean that's just my point. If it wasn't in scope, it's not in the report. So, to me there would have been issues that would have been added to the report. Don't ask me what those are right now because that was definitely years ago and lots of WHOIS work since then. But I'm just saying that I feel like the WHOIS review team report was very limited and we had a narrow scope and we stuck to it because that's that the team decided was our mission.

I don't think it's bad to look at it, but I sort of feel like now we're walking down a path of oh, let's look at all the documents. Oh, we did that and we pulled out possible requirements but now we don't want to look at all those thousand possible requirements. It's really the chicken and the egg and as a working group, we're going to have to make a decision on how to move forward.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Susan. This is Chuck. So, we're just about out of time. So, here's how I'm going to wrap it up. I'd like to ask staff to just provide quick links to the working group lists for the three reports we've talked about today. And most of you have them already, but just to make it as easy as possible, certainly the FSAC61, the WHOIS review team report and the EWG report. Now, especially the EWG report I know is really long. So, I'm not- I'm going to ask everybody in the working group to please take a quick skim of all three

with a particular focus in mind. Try and pull out of there the issues that Greg Shatan was talking about and see if- and share those with the list before next meeting.

Obviously, the leadership team is going to have to meet and discuss what happened today and so forth as a team. It shouldn't just be my decisions, not by any means. And we will do that. And I apologize if I haven't kept up with the chat very well. I've been trying to listen very closely what everybody is saying and sometimes not keeping up with everything that's been written. So, everybody's assignment is to take a look at those. Looking for higher level issues that if we deliberate on those it might make it easier to deliberate on the individual requirements in our long list of a thousand.

So, now with regard to the pole that's out there. What I'd like- and please don't assume by what I'm going to ask that we're going to use that approach, okay? But I would like to ask everyone that hasn't taken a crack at the pole by Friday of this week, which is the 25th, okay? And the reason I'm doing that is two-fold. Not because I think that's the way to go, but I actually think when we- when and if we do get to a point where need to start refining some stuff, this particular approach might help us do it a little bit faster. And so, having a good test on the first seven requirements may be useful information for us. Plus, for those who haven't experienced the pole, it will give you a first-hand view of the approach. And the approach may not be the best one right now. I'm willing to accept that and the leadership team will look at that as objectively and open as we can.

But so, there's two tasks for everyone, okay? If you haven't done the pole, do it by Friday. If you- and then if everyone would take a look at those three documents that the links will be sent around. We can- and in particular Greg Shatan, since you did make a constructive suggestion for a change of approach, it's going to be really important to see your feedback on what we've talked about with regard to those three documents in terms of if you

can put some meat around the bones of what you were suggesting. That would be very helpful. And Lisa you're up.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks Chuck. Lisa Phifer for the record. It occurs to me that way back this spring when we had sub teams pulling out input documents and summarizing that we already created summaries of these three documents that have been suggested here EWG report, FSAC61 and the WHOIS review team. In addition to circulating the links to those documents, we can circulate the summaries that were previously created by this working group.

The other thing that we have is we have possible requirements that were poled from those three documents. And if you wish, we can circulate just those subsets for people to get a sense of if you drilled deeper beyond the summary, what does that document actually contain?

Chuck Gomes: Excellent idea Lisa. Please do that in both cases there. So, our time is up. I don't view this as wasted time at all. In fact, we got a long ways to go and if we can come up with a best possible approach going forward, I'm all for that. So, thanks Greg Shatan for raising the issue. Thanks for the good discussion. Please do what you can between now and our next meeting a week from now. It will be at the same time and same day so next Tuesday at this same time. And we'll try and bring some things together.

But in the meantime, please send your thoughts to the lists so that we don't have to do all of our discussion in the short 90 minutes that we have next week. Is there anything else that we need to cover today before I adjourn? Okay, thanks everybody. I'll be talking to you on the list.

Woman: Thanks all.

Coordinator: Thank you. This does conclude today's call.

END