

**ICANN Transcription  
Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group  
Tuesday, 25 October 2016 at 1600 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group on the Tuesday, 25 October 2016 at 16:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance may also be found at:

<https://community.icann.org/x/LyS4Aw>

The audio is available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-nextgen-rds-pdp-25oct16-en.mp3>

Coordinator: The recordings are now connected, you may now proceed.

Michelle DeSmyter: Great. Thanks so much. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to all. Welcome to the Next Gen RDS PDP Working Group call on the 25th of October, 2016 at 1600 UTC.

In the interest of time today there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room so if you're only on the audio bridge today would you please let yourself be known now? All right, thank you.

And as a reminder to all participants please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

With this, I will hand the call back over to Chuck Gomes.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Michelle. And welcome everybody, to our last call before our face to face meeting in Hyderabad. You can see the agenda in that Adobe Connect on the right and it appears that everybody is in Adobe Connect.

Now I saw you raise your hand, Stephanie, and I assume you're testing out Adobe. Did we get the problems fixed or do you know yet?

Stephanie Perrin: Hi, Chuck, it's Stephanie. Can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: I can.

Stephanie Perrin: Well let's not get excited. I'm in Toronto on a high-speed connection so at least we know it's not my computer or some bug in my system, we know that whatever is wrong has to do with the slow speed of my country. So I haven't tested it now that they've taken the encryption off, but they thought that was the problem. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thanks, Stephanie. I'm glad to hear that. I'm optimistic that we'll be able to participate with fewer problems going forward. So does anyone have an update to your statement of interest? Okay, not seeing any hands or hearing anyone.

I do want to briefly just call your attention to the agenda. We are going to spend some more time on that statement of purpose, Item Number 2, but we're not going to spend too much time on that today.

We want to provide, we meaning the leadership team, want to provide an update or certainly an update to ICANN 57 but more importantly we want to introduce an approach that we were proposing for deliberation on possible requirements and spend quite a bit of time talking about that today so that when we go into our face-to-face meeting we're all pretty much on the same

page so we can get started in our deliberation as the biggest part of our meeting in Hyderabad. So we'll spend quite a bit of time on that today.

So let's go ahead and get started and let's bring up the statement of purpose. And while that is coming up I want to comment, except for Peter's comments earlier today, I didn't see any feedback on the red line that was distributed last week. So again, with the exception of Peter's comments, I'm going to assume that people are relatively comfortable with the statement of purpose except for the last item, Item Number 5.

And the way I'm going to handle Peter's comments, we're going to first focus on Item 5 at the end of the statement, and then, and he made a comment there as well, and then I will, time permitting we'll go back and look at his comments and we'll see how things go with our other agenda items in that regard.

So just one general comment, and you'll probably hear me emphasizing this and again as we move forward in our working group, in cases, and there will be lots of them, when members are unable to make a working group call or a live meeting, whatever the case may be, it will really help us a lot if you can provide any feedback to the working group list based on actions and issues that were discussed in the working group meeting by the end of that week thereby or certainly very early the next week so they give some time for others to respond, ideally by the end of the next week, so that we can give others a chance to comment on your contributions.

So just throw that out as a guideline going forward. Now I fully understand there will be times when people just aren't able to respond to that quickly, and we're not going to eliminate your input. But if we can make that as a general goal it will help all of us because we have a tremendous amount of deliberation to do and following the guidelines like that will, I think, help us keep moving in a consistent pace without moving too fast.

So we have there the last purpose statement on the screen, the purpose of RDS is to provide an authoritative source of accurate data. Now, just to bring in Peter's addition there, a couple additions, he added -- he replaced promote common and I see promote is not there, so he changed what we see as provide with ensure and then added when it is necessary at the end of the sentence.

Now I'm not always going to do this but I have two concerns about his edits there, before we discuss the statement itself. Number one, if we use the word "ensure" and this relates to -- he does that in some other cases in the statement as well, and I'm sorry he is unable to make the call so he could talk directly. But the problem I have with "ensure" and I think our list discussion and our meeting discussion to date has shown that there are limitations to what an RDS can do.

We want to minimize those but I don't think that however good a job we do in defining requirements and implementing those, if there is a new RDS, I don't think we're ever going to be able to ensure accuracy and availability of all accurate information. So I'm concerned about putting the word "ensure" there.

And then if you add "when it is necessary" at the end, I think we all kind of agree with that, but then we've got to define what's necessary. And I don't think I'm surprising anyone when I say that will be quite a challenge because some people think some data is necessary, and some people think others. So my suggestion, but I'm open to disagreement on this, is that we don't consider the changes that Peter made in Statement Number 5, and after I go to Alex, I want to open it up to discussion of the statement as it is now.

Now I'm not saying we can't make those changes, I'm just throwing out my personal thoughts on the changes he made there. And I'm trying to take into consideration lots of discussion that has occurred with regard to accuracy that we've had over the last few weeks. So Alex, let me turn it to you.

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

Chuck Gomes: I can.

Alex Deacon: Great. So actually I agree with your comment on Peter's update and I wanted to actually give a few thoughts on the state Lisa posted to the list, so if you wanted to wait I'm happy to do that, otherwise I could just jump in.

Chuck Gomes: No, please go ahead. Right timing.

Alex Deacon: So, yes, I did like Lisa's update. I did have one, and maybe I'll just copy it into the chat, I mean, I think promoting the availability of accurate gTLD registration data is a good thing, but I'm not too sure why we wouldn't also want to promote the accuracy. So, I mean, I would suggest that we make a change and change it to a purpose of RDS is to promote the availability and accuracy of gTLD registration data.

And the reason why I think that's important is if we think about kind of what's going to happen in the future with regard to our deliberation, the potential addition of authenticated or gated access and so on, I think that all promotes accuracy. That's been discussed ad nauseam and in the past.

So I would prefer that not only do we promote the availability, which I believe is important, but we also do what we can to promote continued accuracy of registration data. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Alex. This is Chuck again. So notice there is discussion in the chat. There's agreement to what Alex is saying. There's also Jim's comment that he doesn't think the word "promotes" is a good word there. Good discussion, let's keep it going. Let's go to Greg.

Greg Aaron: Hi, Chuck. This is Greg. Can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Greg Aaron: Okay. I'm wondering if the word "promote" was put in there to refer to the word "accuracy." Like Jim Galvin, I don't think it applies to availability. I think either we're making it available or it's not, but promote means we're encouraging and I think availability is an absolute. If we're going to show data, we're going to show data. Which data is an open question.

I think promote may have been put in there to talk about accuracy because we have this question of, well, do we expect contact data to always be accurate or not? It's very hard to have it be 100%. Right now the word "promote" in there is just not working for me. It may apply to one thing that not another and I think the original statement is more straightforward. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. So - and this is kind of to you and Jim. This is Chuck speaking. I wonder if it would be better to, I mean, should we remove the availability part? I think we kind of covered that in other purposes. I don't know, we can go back and look at that. And just say a purpose of RDS is to promote accuracy or of gTLD registration data. I mean, would that work for you? And we're going to discuss this more but I'm trying to accommodate what you are suggesting. And Jim's...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Aaron: No, yes this is Greg. No, I actually am not in favor of what you just suggested. I like the original which was a purpose of RDS is to provide an authoritative source. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Authoritative source. I don't think we have that in there before.

Greg Aaron: Yes we did.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Aaron: ...five was originally a purpose of RDS was to provide an authoritative source of accurate data.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And you think that the RDS will be an authoritative source?

Greg Aaron: Well, yes, let's talk about that. In ICANN policy right now it is considered an authoritative source of data. I mean, what happens is...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...authoritative?

Greg Aaron: Well, I'll tell you what I mean. Here's how it works. The data is put into the registry. Some of the data is actually created by the registry like timestamps for example, create dates. Other information is put in by a registrar, for example contact information.

Whois has always been the way that that information is made available to the public. Only registrars can actually get into a registry system. And even then they're not always able to look up all the information about a domain name actually. And a lot of registries if you're a registrar and you don't sponsor a domain name you can't actually see the contact information, even, you just get a thin response.

So Whois has always been the way for everybody else, all consumers of information, to get the information. And it is expected to be an accurate representation of what's in the registry.

In UDRP, for example, it says that the person who is the registrant of the domain name is the person who is listed in Whois. And there are other examples in ICANN policy and also a national law.

So what's in the Whois is supposed to be an accurate representation of what's in the registry. If it's not, the registry is doing something wrong but that's very rare and that's a compliance issue. Everybody expects that what's in Whois is an accurate representation of the data, and that's why it's considered to be authoritative. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: So, Greg, I'm going to ask one more favor of you. This is Chuck. I want you to give us - and let's keep the different alternative on the screen, we don't need to just change them every time. Would you give us what you would recommend as a statement for Number 5 so that we capture that? So we'll...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Aaron: Right now...

Chuck Gomes: ...Greg's alternative.

Greg Aaron: Actually, no, I'm suggesting the original, which is on the screen...

Chuck Gomes: That's fine. Tell us exactly what you - in other words a purpose of RDS is to provide an authoritative source of accurate data. That's your statement, okay?

Greg Aaron: That's right.

Chuck Gomes: Okay good. Thanks. Okay so that's good. Let's go to Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I don't want to be picky, but I just want to raise the point I raised earlier that I think we are in this purpose statement combining going, as I said in the chat, the goals of the actual Whois instrument with the goals of what I would call the RDS broader



system, including the policy and the rules and procedures around providing access.

And, I don't think it's a fine point at all. Like obviously a goal of providing data to the public is that, and the public including all of the special actors including law enforcement, is that there be an instrument that provides as accurate data as possible, and that it is structured so that you follow policy.

But then when we talk technically, as my technical colleagues have pointed out, depending on the new construction and the configuration of the replacement for Whois, assuming that we reach the conclusion that we need one and we don't stick with the (unintelligible) protocol, then it would be authoritative.

But I don't think we can leap to that yet. And the registrars are the authoritative source. They are the ones that have the relationship with the customers. And I need only give you an example of say address. So I was one of those unfortunate people that got cut off in the first round of the accuracy trials after the 2013 RAA, not because I didn't tell them what my address was, not that they didn't know how to reach me, but that their system never updated the Whois file. Right?

So they still have my accurate data, they still are the authoritative source for contacting the registrant, but the Whois is not authoritative. Do you get my distinction here?

Chuck Gomes: So, Stephanie, this is Chuck. A question, would you eliminate the word "authoritative" then in that statement, Number 5?

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, I think I would.

Chuck Gomes: I just wanted to clarify to make sure that I am hearing correctly.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Let's go to Jim.

Stephanie Perrin: That's not to say...

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry, what was that Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: That's not to say...

((Crosstalk))

Stephanie Perrin: ...that you couldn't...

((Crosstalk))

Stephanie Perrin: ...systems that gets past the accurate data depending on how it's sourced.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, Jim.

Jim Galvin: So, thank you, Chuck. Jim Galvin. Thank you, Chuck. Jim Galvin for the transcript. I think responding to Stephanie and some of the conversations that we had here, I believe what I would propose for Number 5, and I wrote this in the chat room down below, okay, is a purpose of RDS is to provide authoritative access to registration data.

So I believe this responds to the issue Stephanie is raising. It's not an authoritative source because the authoritative source of the data, it really is the registrar since they're the ones with direct contact with the registrant, but it is, from a technical sense, it's authoritative access point so you know you're getting the best data that's available.

And the second comment that I would like to make is I really would prefer to see, you know, accurate as a separate thing somewhere. Accuracy is something which really belongs to the issue of collection, not to the issue of display, and not to the issue of storage. So you can't confuse those two things. The RDS itself is not about accuracy, not about the display of accuracy or the storage of it. We somehow need to find a purpose, I'm really thinking it's more like a policy statement than anything. But we need to somehow - this problem of accuracy has got to be tied to collection, not to the rest of this.

And I don't have a suggestion for how to word that yet, but I do think that's an important distinction. And I really do think that's where we need to go. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jim. I'm going to follow up with you so hang in there. Are you suggesting that 5 be broken down into two statements?

Jim Galvin: Yes, I think that that's true. I think that's what we have to do. We have to separate accuracy. We need a statement about accuracy and, yes, he needs to be separate from the RDS because it needs to talk about what gets into the RDS. The RDS itself can't be responsible for accurate data, right? I mean, it just - not its role, that's not its job. It's a way to provide an access point. So, I'm sorry, yes to your question.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: So you're okay, for one of those statements being a purpose of RDS is to provide an authoritative source of accurate data. And you would add another statement that, is that correct?

Jim Galvin: No, I would drop accurate from the statement that you just read.

Chuck Gomes: So a purpose of RDS is to provide an authoritative source of data.

Jim Galvin: And authoritative, well, I changed the word to access, you'll see it highlighted there. But that was the proposal that I made is to provide authoritative access to registration data.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And the second statement would be?

Jim Galvin: And I'm a little fuzzy on the second statement. We somehow have to associate the authority with accuracy, with collection. Don't have a suggestion for that at the moment.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so one of the key elements of this particular statement of purpose was accuracy. And right now we have, if we go your route we have nothing about accuracy, which I suspect there are one or two people that may be concerned about that. So see if you can come up with something there. In the meantime let's go to Greg. Is that an old hand, Stephanie?

Greg Aaron: Thank you, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Greg.

Greg Aaron: Okay, thank you, Chuck. We can do to think of - I hear a thread in the discussion that assumes that registration data is really just contact information. And I'd like us to kind of get out of that mode of thinking a little bit because a lot of the information we're talking about isn't contact information.

My point is that what's in the registry is authoritative. It may come from a registrar but what's in the registry is what goes as far as legal purposes. And if a registrar fails to update information in the registry, that's a separate issue.

One of the reasons some people may tend to think about the registrar so much is because dotCom and dotNet have been thin for so many years and that represent a lot of domain names. But in the future, all registries, including

dotCom and dotNet will be thick. All that information will be held in the registry; registrars will no longer be the only place holding contact information.

And one of the reasons that a PDP decided that domains should all be thick, all information should be held in a registry, is so that it is authoritative; that you no longer have these situations where the registry says one thing and the registrar says another.

This data that was not synced properly and so forth, that problem was important enough that we went through a PDP to get rid of that problem. So that's a little bit of history. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Greg. Let's go to Alex.

Alex Deacon: Thanks, Chuck. It's Alex for the record. So I just wanted to go back to the comments made by Jim. So I agree with Jim that the topic of accuracy is associated with the collection. And I like his suggestion regarding availability. But I would suggest that we do have a separate purpose around accuracy, and I posted it in the chat, but basically a purpose of RDS is to promote the accuracy of gTLD registration data. I think it's important that we capture, you know, the future improved RDS will indeed promote accuracy. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Alex. Alan, it's your turn.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Greg said a lot of what I was going to say. By definition, the registry, by the new definition, the registry is the authoritative source. How it gets the information is not our concern today and therefore the information that it needs to - that it populates the RDS with is, by definition, authoritative.

On the issue of accuracy, I really don't care a lot. The concept of the opposite that the purpose of the RDS is to provide inaccurate data, I don't think anyone is proposing. The data in the RDS, by definition, I think is as accurate

as it can be. We are not certifying the accuracy. So adding the word to say it is providing accurate data, and that is the intent because all we're doing is giving an intent here, I don't think hurts. I don't think it puts the responsibility on the RDS for ensuring the accuracy, but it's a reasonable adjective to describe the data. And I don't think it hurts.

So I don't think we're going to come to closure where everyone is satisfied here, because we're looking at information - we're looking at a definition which can have some superfluous words and accuracy may well be a superfluous word but I don't think it hurts. It doesn't imply that the RDS is ensuring the accuracy. I think it's a reasonable description and I can certainly live with it. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Alan. Now, and I'm going to Stephanie and then I'm going to try and bring this to a close so that we can talk about our approach to deliberation in Hyderabad. Let Stephanie, you get the last shot before I do a little polling.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. Fab just put in the chat that by showing authoritative data you are ensuring the promotion of the most accurate data. Okay, maybe what we need to do is define what we mean by accurate. If somebody has stolen my identity and put my data accurately into the Whois, working to his registration, rather, then the registrar that he is using holds the authoritative data as to who registered that domain.

And then it gets passed on through secure methods to the registry and that is now authoritative because it's exactly the same data. And I leave it to you geeks to tell me how well it's been transferred and what the margin of error is there. But is it accurate? Is it true data? Maybe we need to introduce the word "true" because it may be accurate about who registered it but it might, you know, for instance (unintelligible) all the time people putting the accurate address for Facebook into the registration, but that doesn't mean that it is

actually Facebook that registered it. So this is one of the reasons why I hate to use the word “accurate.”

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Stephanie. So now I'm going to make a couple suggestions, and I'm going to get ready to put Red Xs or green checkmarks in the Adobe please. I'm going to suggest that we look at the first possible alternative there, make that Number 5, where it says, “A purpose of RDS is to provide authoritative access to registration data.” Okay, does everybody with me? It highlighted there on the screen, thank you for doing that.

Does anybody oppose that statement of purpose? Please put a red X in the Adobe. And I'll pause just a little bit for that. And you can put green checkmarks, too, but I especially want to find out if anybody objects to that statement. Jeff, would you please tell us why you object?

Geoffrey Noakes: To me, it's the authoritative access. To meet these seem to be different things, so if one of the purposes was to provide gated access, I would be fine with that. I don't understand what the adjective “authoritative” in front of “access” means here.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thank you. Keep in mind we're going to get to the gated issue when we start looking at requirements. In fact we have to - it's one of our first five questions has to do with gated access. So we can't assume right now that gated - that is to provide gated access. We may very well have requirements for that. If there is a new RDS I suspect that's highly likely but I don't think we can assume it yet.

I don't really want to belabor the authoritative word. I think reliable or, I'm not sure what that is, but so anybody else disagree. Oh Marc, go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. This is Marc Anderson. I have the same reasons for disagreeing. You know, certainly we've talked about authoritative a lot. I understand what authoritative means, but this particular wording confuses

me. I don't quite know what we mean by provide authoritative access. So certainly we've talked about authoritative and, you know, I understand the nuances there. But authoritative access is confusing to me on what we are actually trying to convey.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: So let me ask another - this is Chuck - let me ask another question. And please clear your Xs. I did see yours too Stephanie, so I'm not ignoring you. But is there any problem with that statement, anybody object if we remove the word "authoritative" and just say a purpose of RDS is to provide access to registration data. Put your red X. I was sure we could find somebody that would. So, Greg, and Jim, you've probably already major case, but go ahead. Be brief please. Keep it within a minute. Greg, go ahead.

Greg Aaron: I've put two alternate wordings in the chat that I think would fix the problem.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I'm sorry, managing this and trying to keep things moving I'm having a terrible time. I'm not fast enough to keep up with the chat so let me find your - go down and find your wordings in the chat here. Access to authoritative registration data, is that what your alternative is?

Greg Aaron: There's a lot of background noise there. I have one - there's that one or just go back to the original, provide an authoritative source of data. The problem is you're putting authoritative to modify the word "access" so I've proposed two alternatives that solve that problem.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so I'm going to make a command decision here and we're not going to finish this now. If we have more time in the call we'll come back to it. Nor if we don't finish it on this call, are we going to continue this in Hyderabad. The leadership team talked about this this week. We don't think this, you know, working on his statement - notice how we keep going back and forth and so forth and it's very hard to get agreement. We don't think that's the best use



for a public meeting. So if necessary we will pick this up on the list and continue it after our meeting in Hyderabad.

We don't think that, I mean, it'd be nice to finish this today but we party spent more time than the leadership team decided to cover on this because it's really critical that we go to the approach for deliberation so that we can effectively start the deliberation process as the main part of our meeting in Hyderabad. So thank you for the input grade it'll all be captured and sent around to the list.

As far as Peter's contributions, will also deal with those later, again if we have more time on this call, we'll come back to these things but for right now at least we have a good idea of where the differences of opinion are. So let's move on.

And could we bring up the slides with regard to the approach that the leadership team is suggesting for starting deliberation in Hyderabad? Now while that's coming up let me remind everyone that several months ago we spent quite a bit of time talking about okay, where do we start deliberating? We've got hundreds of possible requirements, how do we tackle those in a meaningful way and how do we reach consensus and so forth?

And so much of what you're going to see when it comes up here will be, is an effort to try and accommodate the different things that were suggested in the working group several months ago, so we haven't focused on that in quite a while, but we do need to have a common understanding of how we're going to get started on deliberation in Hyderabad.

Now one of the things we will do in Hyderabad is we will do -- there will be a brief update of what we've accomplished and, I set brief and I mean that, we're not going to repeat a lot of stuff but for the sake of any new people that maybe there that aren't part of the working group we will give a brief overview of what we've accomplished, and we will then also give a brief overview of

where we're going next, okay. And we'll talk about how the working group will reach consensus and there will be some slides for that.

So you have in front of you now a slide, and by the way this will be a slide in the presentation that's setting the stage, as you can see it'll be Slide 7 of the deck that will be used to provide an introduction to the audience in Hyderabad. So notice it has a list of the work plan tasks that we have to do and deliberation is Task 12.

Now let me point out, as I think all of you know that we haven't finished Step 10 yet, but we've made really good progress there, and there's some work going on behind the scenes right now to help us finish final requirements lists. Again with the qualification that it probably won't be final until we get way down the road because there will always be the ability to add new requirements as we see they are needed.

But Step 12 is deliberate on possible fundamental requirements. And there are three areas, we decided as a working group several months ago, that we were going to focus on first out of the first five questions. And that's users and purposes, data elements and privacy are the three areas that we are going to focus on.

Let's go to the next slide. Okay, and again this is - I probably don't need to discuss this. There are the five - first five questions in our charter, okay. And covering those, and possible requirements for those, is intended to establish a foundation for us to answer that key question there. Is a new policy framework and a next-generation system needed to address these requirements?

Okay, let's go to the Slide 9. Remember we had a mind map, now this is a very small subset of that mind map to make it more readable on a slide. But there again you see the five - first five questions there, and what are the

fundamental requirements for an RDS, okay? So and the mind map itself, as you recall, has tons of more information.

Let's go to Slide 10. And 10 then starts adding more information there. And so and again it's probably hard to read but you can see those three areas, Question 1, Question 4 and Question 5 so users, purposes question, data elements, and privacy are the three areas. And I'm not going to go through the questions that we have to answer as part of our charter and our tasks for those three. But that's what we need to deliberate on first.

And notice the color coding, so charter questions are in kind of a light orange; sub questions underneath those are in gray; and then in blue, sub sub questions, we only show one of those on the slide, will probably have lots more; and then in the dark orange are examples of topics that may be considered in Phases 2 and 3, realizing that we're in Phase 1 right now.

Let's go to Slide 11. Okay, now here we're now getting into the meat of what the leadership team he is proposing in terms of a way to start deliberations. And don't worry about the fact that this example talks about data elements, one of the three categories were going to deliberate on first. We'll get to that in terms of where we start, whether we start on data elements, privacy or users and purposes.

And as many of you will recall, the intense debate we had on where that should start with something, many saying privacy and many same users and purposes. And I don't recall whether anybody suggested data elements or not.

So in the grid there you have just a little sample of our possible requirements document, which keep in mind, have hundreds of possible requirements. So the - and the coding, hopefully everybody remembers this, if you don't it'll be helpful for you as well, but certainly for visitors in our working group meeting,

this will be helpful. And that will be explained briefly in the meeting so people understand the requirements that we are working with.

Now a really important point is that, and notice there is a Phase column, we're going to be focusing on Phase 1 first so that's not going to be any - a differentiator in our deliberations during Phase 1. But then we have two columns, C and K, where quite a bit of work has been done by several people. I think Stephanie did the first crack on the codes, the C. And K is keywords and several people worked on that, Susan and Lisa did a lot of work on that, others contributed to that to.

Now the purpose of the codes and the keywords is not to limit our deliberation in any way at all, rather it is to help us organize our work so we can find similarities, of requirements. We can use keywords may be to see all of them that have maybe similar keywords. So those are not intended to be restrictive in terms of our deliberation but rather to help us manage our work through the requirements effectively.

As all of you can guess, and we talked about this several months ago, if we were to take one requirement at a time and deliberate just going through the list, it would take us forever to make very much progress. At the same time, there are lots of connections between the requirements and there are dependencies.

So that prerequisite dependency column is also very important so that we can cover things that are prerequisites and then follow that with items that are dependencies. So hopefully everybody understands that those three columns, the prerequisites and dependencies, the codes and the keywords, are designed to help us attack this huge task we have in an effective manner.

Let's go to the next slide please. Okay and what the leadership team is proposing as a start for deliberation and Hyderabad is what you see on the

slide. So this flight is really key to what we are proposing and what we'd like to discuss today.

First of all, sort the possible requirements for Phase 1 requirements only. That's an easy one. And you know we have a spreadsheet on the version of the possible requirements document and so we can sort by phases, and we're going to focus on Phase 1 requirements only. That's easy.

Number 2, the suggestion is to randomly order the three questions, user purposes, data elements and privacy, ones you saw in an earlier slide. So whatever one comes out randomly to be first, if it's data elements we'll start with data elements. If privacy is second, that'll be the second one. And then users and purposes assuming that the results of the random process.

Then we'll rotate that so that the data elements would come first and then - excuse me, privacy would come first and then users and purposes and data elements. We'll rotate it like that so that we don't always favor one rather than the other. And obviously the purpose of that is to get past the idea that we were unable as a working group to come to agreement where we should start.

Now, the word "iterative" is really important because when we're looking at users and purposes, we may find that we need to go to data elements and privacy requirements at the same time. That they need to be done together. So we will move back and forth try to do that in a meaningful and helpful way so that we have an organized approach. But keep in mind that word "iterative" is very important.

Step 3, so for the first round we'll start with whatever the selected question is for the first one and go on. And that's the, you know, we'll keep rotating those using prerequisites, dependencies, codes and keywords, to select subsets of requirements for deliberation. So that'll hopefully fall out as we're working in them. We will use those codes and keywords and prerequisites to help us

find related requirements that we should be discussing at the same time or right after or before.

Step 4 then we'll rotate the order of the questions so that - and keep that rotation going. So let's go to Slide 13. So how do we select subsets? So our suggestion is that the codes be used to select subsets for deliberation. Now, at the - at the end of the possible requirements document there's a list of all the codes starting with A, AA, AB, and going all the way to - let's see if I've got it here - I think it goes to MD. Okay.

And they're defined there. We're not going to look at those today. But our suggestion is to start with Code A, all the requirements that involve Code A. and then we continue with subsets for other codes in alphabetical order or as determined during deliberation. In other words, what we're saying, and I'm going to give you a chance for questions in just a minute, there'll probably be lots, we'll go in alphabetical order, A, AA, AB, AC, AD, B and so on unless we decide in our deliberations that we need to vary that a little bit.

And hopefully our discussions and accomplishments at that point will guide us in that direction. So we're not going to be locked into alphabetical order but we'll use that as long as it works for us and then adjust accordingly. We discussed some other ways of doing it but it gets so complicated and becomes so subjective that we're recommending this approach.

Now, notice it says there, "Further filtering may help organize deliberation on each subset." So again, we can use the dependencies, the keywords and the charter questions to help us consider sub questions or sub requirements on a given one. So we will do that as we go forward.

Now let me stop there. And I hopefully haven't lost everybody. But open it up for questions in terms of, first of all, understanding the process and then we can talk about - after that let's talk about suggestions, comments, alternatives or whatever. Keeping in mind that we need to, today, pretty much finalize our

approach so that we have - and the leadership team will do some work on finessing everything. We have a special leadership call this coming Thursday, to do that. But based on feedback we get today.

So first of all, what questions do you have about the suggested approach? I know it's a lot to throw at you all at once, but we're really trying to be ready for Hyderabad and make that a meeting - take full advantage of the face to face, again understanding that not all of you will be there face to face and that it will be terrible hours for many of you who are participating remotely. But this will be our first crack at deliberation. Stephanie, you're first.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks, Chuck. Stephanie Perrin for the record. Number 1, I would say so far we've - it's almost a year and it seems pretty clear that no matter how we try to go at something it's going to be kind of iterative. Look at the (unintelligible) on purpose and that was kind of an anecdotal, gee, why don't we craft a business requirement style purpose before we keep going and look at how much energy went into it.

So I think we just have to begin. And I hope you're not too wedded to process because I think if something becomes important and interesting and we all get at it with the right goodwill like we have with the purpose clause, I don't think that should be dismissed as being outside the process. So that's point Number 1.

And point Number 2 is, I think we need some time to go over these to see if there's anything that leaps out at us particularly because Point Number 3 is, it's the week before departure for those of us going to Hyderabad and the numbers of my groups that are on the call are down to like I think it's me and Patrick. So I think we're missing a lot of people and they may have views. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Stephanie. So you expressed I think exactly where the leadership team is and that is we need to get started. We're not going to be rigid about it.

But let's get started. And let's adjust as we go. And that's what's intended here. Okay? Certainly everybody can look at this. We don't really have time to make major adjustments before the Hyderabad meeting because, as you suggested, people will be traveling.

And our meeting is the first day except for the Work Stream 2 work that's going on the day before, it's the first official day of the meetings. And so certainly comments are welcome on the process and so forth. But we don't have time to do much tweaking because come Thursday November 3, at nine o'clock in the morning IST, we need to start and we're going to jump right into deliberation after a very brief introduction. So the plan is to start here. And like you said, let's get started and then we'll refine it as we go.

Lisa.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. This is Lisa for the record. Lisa Phifer. I thought it would be useful to share with you all as the leadership team talked about what - where to start, how to pick a subset to start with, we actually tried a number of different approaches and honestly just picking a subset and trying to use it will be very helpful for everyone to think about how well this approach works, what kind of tweaks we might need to make to it in order to make deliberations more efficient going forward. But we just have to pick a subset and start.

What I did notice is when we picked a subset based on the codes, and of course we started with Code A, Vicky Scheckler noted in the chat area that there are duplicates in the list and the coding actually does help pull out what some of those duplicates are so that if we start with a subset based on codes we'll actually see that several of the requirements are very similar if not verbatim duplicates and we'll have them in the same subset.

The challenge is that some of those subsets are still pretty large. And so if you look at any particular subset, and you take you the possible requirements



that don't seem to have any other dependencies, that is they're sort of the core possible requirements, that gives you a couple of the possible requirements in a larger subset to start with.

You still may end up with a pretty large subset, and if you use the keywords in conjunction you can actually break that into smaller subsets of tightly related possible requirements. So it did seem to me, as I looked at the possible subsets that might come out of this, it did seem like a way to break what is a very large task into smaller bite size pieces but recognizing, as Stephanie said, when you start deliberating on these possible requirements you'll find that you want to follow with thread and this process shouldn't stop us from following a thread to possible requirements that would be relevant to that thread.

So I hope that's helpful.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa. This is Chuck. Any other questions or comments? Okay. I don't know if everybody's just too confused or too much at once but that went a lot faster than I thought it would so and I think Slide 13 was the last one, right? Oh there is a 14. Okay sorry about that. So the - here's an example using the data possible requirements with Code A included.

So here is - and I won't read through this, you can look at that. But this is an example of what would happen with the data possible requirements having Code A. And notice at the bottom there's a nice little summary. The number of possible requirements with Code A, which is the goals of the system, for users, purposes there's 63; for data there's 39; for privacy there was four.

And then number of possible requirements with Code AA, which is transparency, there were 19 for user purpose, data had 10 and privacy had one. And don't be bothered by the number of possible requirements for each one. It would be totally faulty to conclude that based on the number of possible requirements shown at the bottom there that privacy is going to be

slighted. That would be false reasoning. And so please don't assume that, okay?

And also realizing that we can add requirements as we go. So are there any more slides after this one?

Lisa Phifer: No, Chuck. This is the end of the subset.

Chuck Gomes: Okay this is good. I should have been more prepared on the number that we - I should have looked at my presentation, which I have a copy of here. So anyway, any more questions or comments? If not, we will - and by the way, going forward now, in our meetings, we're going to be in deliberation. Now we're not going to, in a given meeting, whether it be a teleconference or an in-person meeting, finalize a requirement in a given meeting because we know that we'll only have a subset of people participating.

So there will - we will do some going back we'll give people a chance to talk on the list and our first round through, and we'll explain this to the full audience in Hyderabad, we're not going to have consensus votes in the requirements and this is information that we covered months ago in this working group, so many probably have forgotten it.

The plan isn't the first time through to take consensus calls on each of the requirements. We will eventually get to that point after we've had public comments and so forth on the proposed requirements. But our first pass through we will try to reach rough consensus if possible on requirements without taking consensus calls. And so keep that in mind as we're doing this.

Any other questions or comments? Okay. Let's go back to the purpose statement. We can bring that up again.

And we'll continue the discussion that I cut short a little bit ago. There's been a ton of comments in the chat. I confess I haven't been able to keep up with

all of them, but let's see if we can make a little more progress on possible - purposes 5 and 6. And I think I saw a comment of using the word - let's see - "authorized" instead of "authoritative." Stephanie, I guess it was Geoff's comment, authorized, not authoritative.

So if we look at the statement - the first alternative there, "A purpose of RDS is to provide authorized access to registration data." Let's see where we're at on that. Are there other suggested edits to that sentence before we can see if we have rough consensus on that?

And, Geoff, I think that - I appreciate your contribution there because I think that kind of dealt with the first comments you made today, which were helpful. Okay, I'm not seeing any hands as far as additional edits. I better look at chat. I don't see anything new in chat. Oh, I better scroll down. No wonder I'm not seeing anything new, I'm not scrolled down.

Okay, so Greg, go ahead.

Greg Aaron: Number 2 above talks about authorized access. So I - you keep putting words into 5 and it's not getting us anywhere, Chuck. Just go back to authoritative source of data.

Chuck Gomes: Okay does that also duplicate or no? So Number 2 says a purpose of RDS is to provide information about domain contacts, domain names, name servers for gTLDs based on approved policy. And we didn't finalize that based on approved policy yet, but does this - does that then say something different then Number 2? And that's to you first, Greg.

Greg Aaron: Authorized access is based upon policy. So I think it's duplicative.

Chuck Gomes: So which one would you prefer?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...or this one?

Greg Aaron: I don't like Number 5 as you've put it. I thought authoritative source was the way to go.

Chuck Gomes: And it's not clear that we're going to come to agreement on full consensus on that. What do others think with regard to comparing Number 2 again I'll read Number 2 since it's not on the screen, it says, "The purpose of RDS is to provide information about domain contacts, domain names and name servers for gTLDs," in brackets, "based on approved policy."

Does this statement, a purpose of RDS is to provide whatever adjective we use, gTLD registration data, is one better than the other? Are they really just duplicates? Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Again not seeing 2 but I think the only difference is 2 leaves out the word "authoritative" which I think is in fact relevant because it is the place we want people to go to get data if they need data. And that's what authoritative means. And Number 2 specifies some of the types of data without - presumably without being restricted to just those types of data. So it simply enhances, it enlarges on the term - simple term data in 5. So I think if we add in "authoritative" and I believe that is an important issue, then 5 is redundant and we don't need it.

Chuck Gomes: So you would add the word "authoritative" to Number 2?

Alan Greenberg: That's correct because I believe that is the purpose. It is where we want people to go to get data and clearly it's not the place we want people to go to get false incorrect data, it's the authoritative place for data.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks, Alan. This is Chuck. Jim, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: Yes, Jim Galvin for the record. I agree with Alan. I think that the distinction I would make between 2 and 5 is currently written is 2 speaks about the information that's available and 5 speaks about the (unintelligible) that information. These two purposes could easily be combined as, you know, as Alan was suggesting like, we have 5 up here on the screen, instead of saying data you could just substitute, you know, domain contacts, domain names and name servers for gTLDs from Item 2.

And then you would have a - you would have both statements combined into one and you could similarly just back-fill Item 2 by saying that it's to provide an authoritative source of - insert that into Number 2. So one's about content, one's about access and they could be combined. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jim. Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin for the record. I just want to quibble about Alan saying this is where we want people to go to get data. This is definitely where I want people to go to get contact data, but it's not where I want people to go necessarily (to) data. So they will be able to see my proxy registration, if they really need my real address they're going to have to go to the proxy service provider to get the real address.

Again, I'm quibbling but I think we have to be very careful with the words that we use so that we're not making any policy leaps. Similarly, if law enforcement wants more detailed and useful information clearly they'll have to go to the registrar to get it.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Stephanie. Alan, your turn.

Alan Greenberg: Nobody is claiming, I don't believe, that it is the authoritative source of all possible information related to a domain name. It is the authoritative source of the data elements that we will store in it to be decided. And with whatever access restrictions are applicable to them. If a domain name is done through

a proxy registration, the contact information is the proxy provider. Even the registrar doesn't have the more detailed information, only the proxy provider has it.

So it is not the source of all possible wisdom associated with a domain name, it's the source of - the authoritative source of the data elements that we decide to put in there with whatever data restrictions and access restrictions are associated with them.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Alan. So, Alan, let me ask you a question. This is Chuck. Are you okay with the change made to Number 2 that's on the screen right now?

Alan Greenberg: Purpose of RDS to provide authoritative source of information about domain names, about, I'm not sure that that is the definitive list because we haven't decided on what the elements are. And so there may be something else I would prefer at this purpose statement to say - to use those as examples, not necessarily the definitive list.

But other than that...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Other than that I am quite fine with it.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, notice the footnote with domain contacts.

Alan Greenberg: Well I don't see any footnote but that's...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Well, you're not seeing it on the screen but there is a footnote that explain what we meant by domain contacts and that was left to be - you can see it now.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I just don't know in my mind if there are anything that fall under the category of something other than those three.

Chuck Gomes: That'll fall out in our requirements.

Alan Greenberg: Exactly, which is why the purpose should be somewhat more generic, for example, as, you know, among, you know, potentially among others. There's a thousand ways we can state it. I don't want to find afterwards that we have some other element that we really need to store in the DNS - in the RDS rather, and we didn't list it in the purpose and therefore we're going to suddenly be, you know, not allowed to put it in because it wasn't in the purpose that we decided on.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, we get that point.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: So for example - does the for example...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: That's fine.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Okay, now I don't see any other hands. Everybody focus on Number 2 with the two edits made. And I'm going to ask again, if there are any - anyone who disagrees with that statement of purpose. Please put a red X in the Adobe. And as you know, I'm going to ask you to explain. Okay. And what does a dash mean? I got to look at that. Oh he stepped away. Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I got it. I had - I don't see that one very often, I forgot. Okay let's go back down to Number 5 or 6 of wherever we're at, okay, on the screen. So now we're back to the accuracy issue. How do we cover accuracy? This would be Number 5 now since we combined 2 and 5. So a purpose of RDS is to promote the accuracy of gTLD registration data. Let's talk about that. Raise your hand if you'd like to comment on that.

Alan, you're first.

Alan Greenberg: I can see an RDS provider being given the chore of striving for accuracy. I'm not sure how the database itself promotes accuracy. Certainly the processes associated with populating the database should ensure or strive for or something about accuracy.

Chuck Gomes: So let me put a - this is Chuck - let me put a challenge out to those of you who want a statement on accuracy in the purpose statement. Keeping in mind that one of the first five questions deals with accuracy so we're not dependent on the purpose statement covering accuracy. We already have one of the 11 questions, and one of the first five in fact, that will address accuracy. But for those of you who would like to see some - a purpose related to accuracy I'm challenging you to respond to Alan's point, which I think is a valid one, that the RDS itself probably doesn't promote accuracy, at least that seems reasonable to me.

Can somebody who wants a purpose statement regarding accuracy, help us find the solution here? And, Greg, you're first.

Greg Aaron: Thank you, Chuck. This is Greg Aaron. I think maybe we have an issue with the terminology we're using here. When I hear the term RDS it means registration data - or system - and that means a technical system. But this is a draft registration data and directory service statement of purpose. So when we see the term RDS are we talking about a technical system or are we



talking about an ecosystem that includes policies and a system for implementing those policies?

I think that's maybe where we're getting hung up because we're talking about a system encouraging accuracy. When accuracy checks are kind of done in an offline fashion, registrars for example, have steps they take to look at accuracy. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: So, Greg, let me ask you a side question here. We've talked about this a little bit in the past but maybe not enough. Should we be using RDDS instead of RDS? What's your thought on that?

Greg Aaron: RDDS is director system or director service. And it does...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...director service, right?

Greg Aaron: Yes, that to me conveys that we're talking about a technical system, a successor to Whois, for example. What we're talking - I think what we're really talking about is we want the data - those who are interested in accuracy appearing in the statement are interested in the data being accurate to some extent. Later we'll have to figure out how we define accuracy and to what extent we may expect it.

So - and I see how people can say the system itself doesn't promote accuracy, I would say that it allows people to look at the data and figure out whether it might be accurate or not, and that's one of the ways I use it. So let's get at whether we want the data to be accurate and whether the system makes that possible or not. And I'm tending to think that the system - the technical system itself is more for displaying the information rather than making it accurate.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Okay, Jim.

Jim Galvin: Thank you. Jim Galvin for the record. Let me jump right off of Greg's last sentence and agree with it and just add one thing. You know, the purpose of the system is to, you know, store data and make (unintelligible), you know, so that it can be displayed so provide access to it. The problem that I have with accuracy is not that I disagree with accuracy, I don't think any one of us would, you know, fail to support the idea that there should be accurate data available.

I just don't - I'm having trouble trying to figure out how that's a purpose of this RDS itself that accurate data has to be there, because the component of accuracy, the characteristic of accuracy in my mind just it has to be at the point of collection. If you're going to do it in the RDS, whether it's a data system or a directory service, that's an after the fact kind of step.

So I think that, you know, if there was a contribution to be made by this group we have a question to respond to with respect to accuracy, I would think that we would want to come to a conclusion that there need to be requirements on the data that is submitted to the RDS but the RDS itself should assume to be accurate and authoritative, as we were kind of having that discussion before, and it simply, you know, it promises to hold the data in the same form in which it was provided and to make that available appropriately both in a technical sense and in a policy sense.

But I don't see how it can have any purpose with respect to accuracy because I don't know it does that. That's an after the fact responsibility. As Greg was alluding to there in the end of what he was talking about, accuracy is something that happens at the point of entry. It doesn't happen in the system after that in terms of an implementation and in terms of a policy. So that's - I'm just having trouble and struggling with how to characterize that as the purpose of the RDS which in no way, you know, reflects what I believe about accurate data. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jim. We have quite a few people in the queue so try and keep the comments brief. Alan, you're next.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I'm going to reverse my last statement. I find it fascinating that we are almost using the S in RDS interchangeably as service and system and they are two very different things. The system implies, in my mind, the database. Services implies includes the policy. So if indeed it means services, and that's what it means in the title of our working group, I just checked, then it does include the policy and the purpose of the registration data service is to provide accurate data. That I believe is correct.

It is not a purpose of the system, the database. So I think we need to make sure we're talking about the same word and Jim used the term "system" or "service" and I don't think they're interchangeable, certainly not in my mind. Thank you very much.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. Somebody needs to go on mute. Thanks. Stephanie. Stephanie, are you on mute? Okay, not hearing you. All right, we'll come back to Stephanie. Alex.

Alex Deacon: Yes, thank you, Chuck. This is Alex. So again I just want to kind of repeat what I said earlier. I agree, again, with Jim that accuracy happens at the point of collection, however if a future RDS better manages the data collected, then this would indeed, I assert, promote or encourage or (unintelligible) improve the accuracy of the data. And I think this is an important purpose for us to include. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: So you're supportive of what we have on the screen for Number 5?

Alex Deacon: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Rod, your turn. Rod, are you on mute? It doesn't look like it, at least not showing on mute in Adobe. But we're not hearing you. Okay. Greg, your turn. And then I'll come back to Stephanie and Rod.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. It's Greg Shatan for the record. I, you know, listening to this I think, you know, we're trying to see, you know, how narrow this whole thing we're looking at is, but I, you know, intend to see us, you know, at the broader end of the stick that we are looking at policy and not merely, you know, at a, you know, the technical aspects of a database and, you know, really we're, you know, policies are about what goes into the database.

And so, you know, therefore I think that, you know, Number 5 is relevant and important, you know, clearly this is - while, you know, nobody is arguing against inaccurate data per se, it does seem like there's some resistance to promoting accuracy. I'm not quite sure that promote is the best verb of all time, but until we can come up with a better one I'm not going to quibble. And not having come up with a better one I'm happy to leave it there. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. Stephanie, let's give you a shot again, see if we can hear you.

Stephanie Perrin: Hi, can you hear me now?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Stephanie Perrin: Hello?

Chuck Gomes: Welcome back.

Stephanie Perrin: Wonderful. Okay, Stephanie Perrin for the record. I'm just typing it in the chat what I was going to propose (unintelligible) to promote the accuracy of gTLD - a purpose of RDS policy is to promote the accuracy. And in terms of the word "promote" instead of having me want to add to the extent feasible to every single statement about accuracy, I think promote is a lot better than some of

the other suggestions we've had like ensure. Like nobody can - we can't put ensure because we can't load that on the registrars. But we can promote accuracy to the extent feasible. Thanks. In the policy.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thank you Stephanie. Rod, let's give you a shot this time see if we can hear you.

Rod Rasmussen: Can you hear me this time?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, you sound like you're...

((Crosstalk))

Rod Rasmussen: Can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: ...but we can hear you.

Rod Rasmussen: Okay. Sorry about that. Yes, I was just going to point out that - and I've commented on this in the list a week or two ago around the concept of the RDS being able to assist with accuracy around the concept of a one-time update to contact information that would translate to other domain name registrations or roles for domain name registrations as we pointed out in the EWG report.

So the system itself can actually create a far more accurate picture of data out there by allowing far easier updates that carry through to other domain registrations. So in that respect the system actually can do this if we choose to add that as part of it. I'd also echo the thought on that we're talking about database versus applications on the database, kind of from an engineering perspective, so you've got policy plus storage of the data is kind of the analogies there.

So, you might want to think of it that way, but the system as a whole, not just the system as in the software, in general should be promoting accuracy or whatever the word is we're going to use. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Rod. So one comment from me before we wrap this up for the day, the title of this section, this last section of the document, is specific purposes for registration data and registration directory services. So I don't think it's giving a purpose of RDS policy works in my mind. We're going to have to develop policy that satisfied these purposes, but that doesn't seem to fit to the category that it's in, although the statement itself with policy in there may be an accurate statement.

So I'm going to suggest we - and it's in brackets right now so as a last thing here what I want to do is take a quick survey using Adobe again, forget the word policy right now, or if you like the word policy we can add it in later, but a purpose of RDS is to promote the accuracy of gTLD registration data, put a green checkmark in if you're - if you support that. Put a red X if you think it should be deleted or changed. And I'll just take a quick view of - get a sense and we'll finish it up on the list.

So a few red Xs, quite a few greens, quite a few people haven't made up their mind or don't care too much about this. I don't mean that in an unkind way. You just may be okay either way. So okay so that gives us a sense of where we're at. So here's how we're going to - we will staff will put out a new version of this later today. And we'd like everybody to comment on it. Let's see if we can't try and finalize it on the list.

If we have to come back to it in our meeting after Hyderabad we will do that. But I think all of us at least that are on the call and those that listen to it later on, or look at the transcript and so forth, will be able to I think we're close enough that we're in pretty good shape going into Hyderabad. Any questions or comments on that?

We're a little bit over time so please keep them brief. Stephanie, is that an old hand or is that a new hand?

Stephanie Perrin: No, that's a new hand, Chuck. Stephanie Perrin...

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: ...for the record. I don't have a proxy from the registrar, but I would just like to point out there's practically no registrars on today that I'm aware of, at least not the noisy ones like Michele and Volker and I'm betting they would have disagreed with having this in there.

Chuck Gomes: Sorry about that. I had to go on mute for a minute. Yes, it would be good to - and Michele, who's on our leadership team is unable to be with us because of a conflict I think was in Paris today, so but we'll hopefully get some contributions from them on the list.

So we're over time. I - so I need to wrap it up. Our next meeting is in Hyderabad but there will be remote participation and won't be the greatest hours for - depending on what part of the world you're in but hopefully those that can attend in person will participate remotely because we're now finally getting to deliberation and I think we'll learn a lot from our first steps at that and thanks, everybody, for all of the contributions today. We made some pretty good progress. I was pleased with the progress.

So, Lisa, your hand is up. Go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. Lisa Phifer for the record. I'd just like to encourage everybody to dig out that mind map and take a look at it before you get to Hyderabad. We'll circulate the slides that we went over today so that you can think about the process that we'll use for pulling out subsets for deliberation and we'll also pull out the first subsets as the starting point for that

deliberation and circulate them. So that's all your homework on the flight to Hyderabad.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa. And again are you - you probably are intending to do this but let's circulate the mind map again just so people find it - you can find it on the wiki but just to make it easy for people to do that let's do that too. All right, thanks all. Sorry for going a little over. Look forward to seeing many of you in Hyderabad. Have safe travels for those of you that are traveling. And have a good rest of the week. The meeting is adjourned.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you. This concludes today's meeting. The meeting has been adjourned. Operator, please stop the recordings and disconnect remaining lines. Everyone have a great remainder of your day.

END