

**ICANN Transcription  
Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group  
Tuesday 04 April 2017 at 1600 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group call on the Tuesday 04 April 2017 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 be found at:

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

The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-nextgen-rds-pdp-04apr17-en.mp3>

Coordinator: Recording has started.

Chuck Gomes: Michelle, did you hear that? I can go ahead and do the intro, Michelle, if you want me to.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you so much, Chuck. Sorry about that. One moment. Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on the 4th of April. In the interest of time there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants online today. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room so if you're on the audio bridge today would you please let yourself be known now?

Mike Hammer: Yes, Mike Hammer.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you. And as a reminder to all participants please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and keep your phones and

microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.  
With this I'll turn the call back over to Chuck Gomes.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michelle. Thanks, Mike, for letting us know you're just on audio. Please feel free to speak up if you want to get in the queue, let us know and I'll get you in as soon as possible. Michele, did you want to say something before I start?

Michele Neylon: Yes, Michele for the record. Two things very quickly, I think this is the RDS PDP Working Group call and not the Subsequent Procedures Working Group call. That's one thing.

Chuck Gomes: That is correct.

Michele Neylon: So just in case half the group decided to - is scratching their head and trying to dial into another line or something. And secondly, hello, everybody. I will be dropping off before the end of the call but I am here for part of it. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. Okay, this is Chuck Gomes. I want to welcome everyone to today's call. We have a pretty full agenda. Does anyone have a statement of interest update? Okay, we'll move on then special welcome to the new members that have joined us in the last few weeks. If you're in Adobe, which is I believe the case for most of you, could you put a - just a green checkmark using Adobe? The - into the Adobe chat? It's an Agree button. If you're new in the last two or three weeks, would you put a green checkmark in the Adobe so that we can especially welcome each of you?

So at least there's a couple of you brand new. You're new enough in the last few weeks. Welcome to both of you. And we do appreciate you joining us. We hope that it's not too hard to catch up to where we're at because we've been going for quite a while. But certainly ask us if we can be of any help.

One of the things I want to point out to everybody is that for the polls that we do almost every week the polls are for members only, not observers. Now, it's really easy to switch from observer to member if you want to so all you need to do is send an email to the secretariat staff, that's [gns0-secs@icann.org](mailto:gns0-secs@icann.org) let them know you want to be switched to a member role instead an observer role. And they'll help you out that and give you some information. Of course you'll have to submit a statement of interest and the GNSO has a nice page on that. So the - just keep that in mind when the polls come out.

The first thing we're going to do today is go over the poll results from the poll that ended Saturday night. So if we could bring those up that would be appreciated. While they're doing that let me say that the - because there were multiple choices and because people have a lot of varying views on the statements of purpose that we've been talking about, the results aren't as definitive as they have been in most of our polls so far. So we'll deal with that accordingly. And talk about that as we get going.

Now everybody has scrolling capability. Sorry, Mike, that you can't see this. But hopefully you are looking at the results online and the results that were sent around or the link to the working group Website.

So the - you may - I'm just adjusting my view a little bit so that I can see everything there. That looks pretty good for me. Everybody should be able to do that on your own depending on your monitor. So you can see there was good participation in this poll so I want to thank everybody for that, all 38 of you that participated, that's the highest number we've had participate in quite a while so thank you for that.

Starting off with - and by the way, I should comment too that the - there was pretty good distribution of the - and this is not on the screen, but there was pretty good distribution of different groups participating in this poll. The only two groups that didn't have anybody participate were the GAC and the ISPs. So a pretty good - all the other groups were represented quite well, in most

cases by at least two people and in some cases by more than that. So I'm glad to see the good distribution of participation.

Now Question 2, and I'm not going to read it to you, you can do that on your own. But the results for Question 2 were mixed but there were a couple trends there that I'd like to call your attention to or a couple areas where the results were converged a little bit, okay? Probably not enough to declare rough consensus. But if you scroll down to the table, well, just below the chart there, you can see the table below the chart has the results there.

And there were a couple areas there that had fewer lack of support opposition. So if you look at Alternative B and Alternative C, C had the least opposition and B, the - B had a little bit more opposition. Both of them had pretty good - if you look up to the - a new thing we added because of the multiple choice answers above that table you can see Choice C, there were 28 people who either listed it as a preference or said they could support it. And for B, there were 24 of those, a few more opposition if you take the difference of those two you can see that C is the strongest there.

And really, in my opinion, and I know some people specifically requested last week that we separate the two items. But in essence, B and C are really saying the same things, B just separates it into two purposes, okay?

So in reviewing the comments, and we did review all of the comments, the - I don't know that it's necessary - you certainly can look through all the comments yourself, but rather than spend a lot more time word-smithing this one, I'm going to make a suggestion and would like you to react to my suggestion, that can include disagreeing with it, suggesting something else.

But rather than continue to word-smith, which I think for the three items we're talking about today, we could probably go on several meetings just trying to word-smith and maybe never get to the point where everybody is happy. So my suggestion is that we record Alternative C as a tentative conclusion but

not declare rough consensus because the results aren't strong enough, I don't think, not that there's any particular measure that we use but just in making a judgment call on that.

In the past what we've declared at least rough consensus after the polls if the results demonstrated that. In this case, let's just note that it - we didn't think that it quite reached what we've been calling rough consensus but there's pretty good agreement and minimal opposition for Choice C. Now, does anybody object or want to comment on that suggestion on my part? Please raise your hand or in Mike's case, speak up.

Okay, so we won't spend a lot more time on that now. And let's go then to Question Number 3, if you'll scroll down a little further. And if you scroll down to the results - feel free to read it if you need to, it's there. Again there were multiple choices here. If you look at the table of results on this one, on Question 3, you can see more diversity in terms of the results. And quite a bit of opposition in every one of the alternatives. Anywhere from 11 to 14 participants didn't support each one of these.

So this is not a, it's hard to make a conclusion on this. But in reading through all the comments, I want to call a couple that are really identical to your attention. If you go down to Comments 5 and 6 you'll see that they're identical. And that's not too surprising because they're people who work together.

But I thought it was a suggestion worth talking about today in our meeting, because it's a pretty concise statement. And then - and I'm going to suggest a possible edit in - and the edit is adding the word "possible" as you'll see.

So if you take that, and you can look at either one there, a purpose of RDS is to facilitate possible dissemination of gTLD registration data in accordance with applicable policy. And the reason I suggested that edit is several of the comments expressed concerns about the word "dissemination." And of

course we realized there were concerns last week as well in our call. So that we have - and I suggested that everybody not worry - not assume too much about what dissemination means. But another way of handling that would be to add the word "possible" in this statement.

So it would read, "A purpose of RDS is to facilitate possible dissemination of gTLD registration data in accordance with applicable policy." Now we all know we're going to develop policy later so that's in Phase 2. But I'd just like some comments, first of all, let's - eventually I'll probably ask you to make a commitment one way or the other. But what do you think about that?

Greg Aaron I see, "Possible adds nothing." Well I'd disagree with you, Greg, I think it does. It takes some of the assumption away that some people are thinking well, if you say "dissemination" that means you're going to display it. If you can think of a better word I would of course welcome - I welcome that.

The possible dissemination implies that it may or may not be displayed or disseminated, you know, in whatever way we're talking about. That's why that was added. Jim, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: So thanks, Chuck. Actually I want to agree with Greg. But let me come at it in a somewhat different way. You know, I admit that I did not participate in this poll so my opinion is not reflected in the results that are shown here. But, you know, it's not that I think that dissemination adds nothing. I mean, I sort of agree with that principle. But what concerns me about Alternate C is that it conflates collection with publication.

And I really just have a problem with that. So I really think that to the extent saying, you know, possible dissemination, I mean, that's just - I don't see how that's any Alternate D, actually I'm sorry, it's a fundamental change from Alternate D, okay, because it does conflate collection with publication.

And I think that we need to keep those two things separate. I mean, I guess that's my bias in this process here. So, you know, adding "possible" adds nothing to C2 because I think that C2 is fundamentally different than Alternate D, and I don't agree with Alternate C2. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jim. Somebody else? So at this stage of the game we're basically at a point where data may be displayed, maybe it won't. Data may be displayed publicly, to everybody, or it could end up being displayed via gated access. Those are things we're going to get to later. So keep in mind that we'll have to tweak these things once we make more progress on gated access and public display and things like that. So part of our problem right now in refining the words is that these things are interdependent so we may have to come back and adjust them.

Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. Lisa Phifer for the record. I just wanted to call your attention to several people on chat supporting Greg's sentiment, which is really to say that either the RDS, the purpose of the RDS is to display some data, disseminate some data. It doesn't say which data elements would be disseminated, that would be defined during policy.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again, Lisa. So help me understand the point you're making.

Lisa Phifer: The point is that the - the purpose of the RDS is not to possibly display something or possibly disseminate something, the RDS...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Oh I see. I see what the concern is. Thanks. That's helpful. And I was looking at possible in quite a different sense. I was kind of leaving the door open for display or not. And I got you. Okay so those that - now I understand. I was

reading something else into that or I was thinking something else when I suggested the word.

So would it be better to say a purpose of RDS is to facilitate dissemination of gTLD registration data in accordance with applicable policy as suggested here? Jim, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: So thanks, Chuck. Jim Galvin for the record. I mean, if I understand the comments that are going on in the chat, you know, I would phrase it this way. An RDS by definition, just by its mere existence, may or may not display data. So, you know, that's not the point that we're trying to make. I think the point that we're trying to make is very clearly stated in Alternate D, which is that it is the place where you will find the data.

As a separate and active point of engagement, we need to discuss what data will be displayed and under what circumstances, so I really just think that, you know, we're not adding anything with this Alternate C2 talking about dissemination is a - is a separate - is a separate step, there's going to be policy that talks about that. And I think it's implied by the existence of the RDS that there will be some publication of that data. We just need to state that it is the source of that. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jim. This is Chuck. I'm going to come back to you right now. So here's your chance to participate in the survey, we won't change the results, but did you say Alternate D as in dog?

Jim Galvin: Yes I did. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, I wasn't sure it was B or D. So you would support Alternative D there? Thank you. Okay, let's let Greg Shatan talk.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. This is Greg Shatan for the record. I'm sympathetic to the - those who support Alternate D. But I think it's more based on the fact that we need



to parse things out. You know, think of this in a sense like a workflow. First data will be collected, then the data will be stored, then the data will be disseminated or the data will be in - the alternate will be a source even if it's not disseminated.

So I think we're - by talking about dissemination and being a source in the same purpose statement, we're kind of blending two purposes. And it's probably better to talk about them separately. But I don't think either purpose - I would support both purposes. And saying that that is going to be some policy decision I'm not - I'm a little confused on the difference between purpose and policy. I think these purposes are policy. And so there's not going to be some later policy somehow that is not in service of an earlier purpose, I presume.

So I think we need both purpose statements, one about it acting as an authoritative source and one about dissemination or access as well both being purposes. But I agree that they should be lumped into one purpose statement. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: And, Greg, just to - this is Chuck. Just to follow up - sorry about the echoes. Greg, if you could mute just for a second and then I'm going to come back right to you so you'll have to unmute. The - so what are the two different statements that you're referring to? And I'll mute

Greg Shatan: One is the statement that a purpose of RDS is to provide an authoritative source of information about etcetera. And the other is that RDS - a purpose of RDS is to facilitate dissemination of that same information. So there's, in a sense, two verbs I guess, or two statements. One is acting as an authoritative source and the other one is facilitating dissemination. So I would split those two so that they're not - they're both in the same statement or that we somehow assume one is subsumed into the other. I think we need to be as discrete, ETE discrete as possible in mapping this out so that it really is kind of a point by point flow of purposes. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. That answers my question. Let's go to Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I actually agree with Greg there, although I raised my hand to discuss some of the chat that's going on there. I think this - and I apologize for going around and around in circles on the word "disseminate" because I know I talked about it last week. The word "disseminate" most people construe as push out, publish. I think a better way of expressing how we are going to provide access to the data is to say "provide access" because once you start using a word like "disseminate" instead of "provide access" - you can still provide access by publishing.

Obviously we're going to go for what is cheap wherever it's in combination with applicable law and publishing is cheap. But as Greg said, the two thoughts are different. To be the authoritative source, to set up a system that creates an authoritative source for the data is one thing. And that's a job for the RDS. And then providing access is another job and how we do that has to be set by policy obviously.

But I'm still constantly wanting a footnote on disseminate because so many people, even though I'm sure the OED has multiple meanings for disseminate, there is a tendency in the vernacular to think it means publish. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stephanie. Now we're going to - this is Chuck again - we're going to hold that thought on provide access as well as Greg's two different statements. We're going to come back to that because those are constructive suggestions.

What I'd like to do before we come back to those, and maybe combine then, is ask if there's anybody who opposed Alternative D to share why you opposed it. That would be helpful. And then we'll come back. And maybe you opposed

it for the reasons that Stephanie and Greg are talking about right now or that Jim and others have said with regard to this.

So what's the - why did you oppose it if you opposed it? Or whether you responded to the poll or not, if you have some concerns about D, the way it's worded right now, I'd love to hear from you.

Okay. Maybe your concerns have already been addressed or maybe the alternatives are that have been suggested seem to solve the problems. Let's go to Michele, see what he has to say.

Michele Neylon: Well I thought I'd give your voice a break, Chuck. Michele for the record. I have huge issues with the term "disseminate." Disseminate is an active verb. If I'm disseminating something, I'm actively going out and spreading it around, I'm not sitting back and just letting people come and get it. I mean, Whois does not disseminate anything. I mean, I'm thinking like viruses disseminate things maybe but I don't see how, you know, I just don't see how that as a purpose could just work.

So the RDS would have to allow access to something, give people the ability to access something, make access available, provide access. I really, really don't care what way that is kind of word-smithed. But disseminate, please, no. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. This is Chuck again. All right, so let's do this, it seems to me we have a suggestion on the table, and I'm going to combine Stephanie's suggestion with it. So Greg has proposed that we have two statements. One that says a purpose is to be an authoritative source of registration data. The second one is that - is to provide access to registration data. Okay, I used Stephanie's suggestion there, and totally got rid of the word "disseminate."

Lots of good comments on the word "disseminate" and so how do those two options sound? Any concerns about those - breaking this down into those two

statements, with roughly the wording that I shared that really came from Stephanie and Greg, I hope? So anybody have objections to further pursuing those two purpose statements? Anybody on this call have opposition to either of those or both? Marc Anderson, your turn.

Marc Anderson: Hey, Chuck. Marc Anderson. This isn't - it's not opposition, I guess, concern with the word "authoritative." I would - if we're going to use the word "authoritative" I would say we'd have to make sure that everybody agrees on the definition of authoritative. And so I'm - be willing to bet that not everybody on this call thinks the same thing when we're saying authoritative. So that would sort of be my caveat with that statement. You know, we'd need to have a common understanding of what is meant by authoritative in that statement. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: So we could put - thanks, Marc. This is Chuck. We could put a footnote saying that we will eventually have to agree on what authoritative means? We don't necessarily have to do that right now, it might be actually easier to do a little bit later in the process. Because I think you're right, we'll have trouble - we could spend a lot of time and maybe still not agree right now, and it may even be hard later on. But okay, that's a good suggestion.

Is there anybody on this call that objects to exploring - okay, Tim O'Brien, I see a red X there. Do you object to the direction we're going right now? Oh, okay, thanks. Appreciate that. Sorry to put you on the spot but I wanted to make sure I wasn't missing something. So the plan then would be to take those two separate statements and do a poll this week on those two to see whether people - and we'll do them separately, we'll do each one separately I think unless somebody thinks of a better way.

And give you a chance to say, you know, I can support this or I can't and here's why and my comments. Ok? So we can - we will say that there are no objections to exploring these further and we will do that in a poll this week. And I see Michele is typing so if you want to be faster you could speak.

Michele Neylon: Sorry, speak for what? Sorry, what? It's Michele. I was actually responding to something completely unrelated to what you were talking about.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: In terms of the entire thing around authoritative data, Andrew and I did discuss this at some length, I mean, just there is a problem with the term "authoritative" in terms of how well people understand it. And I'm not sure - I'm not sure how we can really address that unless we define it some way. Maybe that would help. But I don't have a problem with not everybody understanding the term but as long as we actually clearly define the term then that actually solves part of the problem I think.

Chuck Gomes: So, Michele, this is Chuck. Do you think we should stop and define it - try to define it now or is it okay to defer that to later? As long as we note that it needs to be defined.

Michele Neylon: Lisa is saying in the chat...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Lisa is saying in the chat that it was an action item to working group members to volunteer to define it. The problem I have with punting that is it makes any conversation that uses the term "authoritative" very, very painful because it's going to invariably end up with a dispute around what people understand authoritative to be. Now I know Andrew is going to disagree with me on that and that's okay. I'm just - I just don't know how you can have a conversation using a term if nobody understand what the term means and everybody disagrees about it, but that's just me. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Michele, thanks. I may come back to you. This is Chuck. Stephanie, your turn.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie for the record. I'd just like to recall my experience when I was on the EWG coming in there innocent of technology. And I'm sure I slowed us down for quite some time trying to understand what folks meant authoritative. But it's really important to understand that if you're trying to work out how to actually build a system. And I think I share Michele's concern that - and I put my hand up here to represent those who are not actually in the business of running systems, and therefore have a less informed view on this or who are coming from a different area of expertise, that doesn't mean the same in privacy talk.

I think we're not going to be following, and then are going to feel strange when we define it further down the road. And I do understand punting is logical and we're going to spend one hell of a lot of time on it, but I do think it risks the buy in later in the process. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stephanie. This is Chuck. Andrew, your turn.

Andrew Harris: Hi there. Thanks. So the reason I said in the chat I thought we could punt was that I believe in Copenhagen that we were in agreement that the problem we were stumbling over was the particular word and not the concept. That is, the concept that we all seemed to be in agreement about was that we wanted the real data from the source that actually was supposed to have it and not some other source.

And the contract was with the old Whois system when Whois first got distributed and you had hard coded in your Whois client a bunch of Whois places that you were supposed to query. And if you queried the first one, and that was the former registrar, then you got old data and it was wrong. And this is, in fact, why we ended up with the thick Whois system and all kinds of stuff

because of a stupid brain death in the Whois system, you know, back in the late 90s and early 00s.

So what we're trying to do is we're trying to make - we're trying to get the data that is in the repository for real, not some stale data, not something that's in some cache that is already outdated, not something that we learn from somebody out on the street or something that's been passed around because it was printed out three years ago but the real data in the - what I say is the authoritative source but I don't care if we call it another word.

And my impression in Copenhagen was that we were all in agreement that this was the concept that we wanted, and our problem was we were struggling with the word. So I don't care if we work on the definition now or don't. My impression was we were in agreement on what concept we were trying to work on and we didn't actually need to struggle with the particular word that we were going to use. You know, we could call it Bob's flying monkey if want and that would be fine with me, it's just that we want, you know, we want to be referring to the same thing. And I think that was the point that we were trying to make.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Andrew. This is Chuck again. David, your turn.

David Cake: Hi. I just wanted to point out that the word "authoritative" is actually used quite a lot in - some of the protocols and standards we use here. And so within the RFCs and things and has a specific definition and is used in a lot of the documents we would be referring to. So either we use authoritative to mean pretty much exactly the same thing it's used in the documents, which would be one way to sort of settle on a definition, or we avoid using it because it will correspond with something that is precisely defined in those documents.

Just as an example, for example, RFC 7484 is titled Finding the Authoritative Registration Data Service, RDAP, so that's an example where the term,

“authoritative” is used quite specifically within a protocol that almost certainly will make up - we will use within the RDS.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, David.

David Cake: So if we're going to use that word we either use it exactly the right way or differently or make it very clear that we're not using the term the same way. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. This is Chuck again. So it seems clear to me that we need to define authoritative now, not later. And somebody mentioned getting a few volunteers to do that. So I'm going to ask for a few volunteers right now that would be willing to work together. I don't think we need to, you know, you'd need to have calls. You can do that if you want. But just if we can get two, three, four people who would be willing to work with one another this week and by the end of the week try and come back with a proposal for a definition.

If you're willing to volunteer for that, put a green checkmark in the Adobe or again, if you're not in Adobe, speak up. So I've got Andrew, and David, I'm looking - scrolling around on this, and Mike Palage, okay. Anybody want to join them? Three's fine, I don't have any problem with the three of them working on this. So, guys, I'll let you take the lead and if you could get something back to us on the list by the end of the week that would be helpful so thank you very much.

And, Mike, you had raised your hand. I assume you were volunteering, but if you want to speak you can now.

Mike Palage: Yes, sure. And the reason I think nailing down this authoritative concept is really important is it's been an ongoing legal issue and if you look there's actually a reconsideration request that was just filed with ICANN dealing with the authoritative Whois and whether it's from the Registry, Registrar or whether it's from a third party service provide that's involved in a litigation



right now. And this is just something that I've been dealing with for over 18 years and, you know, I really think we need to nail down this definition because it really potentially impedes our future success. That's my opinion for what it's worth.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Mike. Appreciate that. And appreciate you volunteering along with David and Andrew. Now, let's come back to the possible poll for this week. There's a couple ways we can approach it. We can just wait until we agree on a definition and then poll the two suggestions for purposes that Greg suggested with Stephanie's modification. Or we could poll the two purposes without the word "authoritative" and maybe add that later. Is there an inclination one way or the other. Anybody - is it better to wait until we define authoritative or just leave authoritative out of the two statements of purpose? Any thoughts on that? Somebody else's opinion?

The reason for going ahead and doing a poll would be to continue to try and make a little bit of progress every week, which we are even though we haven't defined authoritative yet. We at least have recognized that we need to. I'm just pausing while I look to see what Lisa is going to type.

Okay so let's wait then. I asked for another opinion, I got it. Let's respect that. And we won't poll on those two things, but we will capture them so that we'll come back to them once we agree. And obviously the whole working group will have a chance to deliberate on the definition of authoritative. Okay?

All right, enough on Question 3, let's go to Question 4. And if you'll scroll down to the results there, for me the table is probably the easiest way, although notice again if I can get my screen to quit jumping around here so much, so for Question 4, again, the results are spread out a lot. The - this one has to do with accuracy again.

And you can look at the comments. There were a lot of good comments. The - but it comes down to one option being whether we should even include this

purpose. Keeping in mind, that accuracy is a topic we're going to have to cover when we get to Question 5 in this first part of Phase 1 that we're in. So maybe - one option here is just to put this statement of purpose aside and maybe come back to it after we talk about accuracy.

And what are some of your thoughts on that? I mean, is the best option here, if you look at the results, you can see there's, you know, quite a bit of opposition for every one of the four options ranging from 8 to 13 people objecting to the statements that are there. The comments also expressed concerns about the word "accuracy" in there.

The strongest support was for Alternatives A and C but those still had quite a bit of opposition. So we can continue grappling with this or we could just put it aside for now and not put it into our document as a possible purpose. Of course we can always add it back in but later. Thoughts on that? Any reaction to the suggestion - and by the way, some of the comments suggested just removing it. If you look - I'm just looking at Comment 5 right now.

Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: I'll just note that there were 22 people in support of either A or B, I believe it was, which really gives kind of a strong direction that that variation of the requirement - or excuse me - variation of the statement of purpose, you know, with or without the footnote was favored by, what, that's about 2/3 of the people that participated. Five people suggested deleting it entirely. If deleting it entirely had been an option maybe we would have gotten a different breakdown. But it does seem like we're getting more support towards the including this statement with or without the footnote.

Chuck Gomes: So, thanks, Lisa. This is Chuck. So one thing we could do is we could poll on Alternative A, because you're right, A and C are pretty similar except for the footnote. We could poll on A versus just deleting the requirement entirely. Is that an option or should we do A, C and delete? Thoughts? If we can get a

little direction from people on the call that'll help us maybe make a better poll question. Marc, go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Hey, Chuck. Marc Anderson. I feel like I think I liked your suggestion to table this until we get to the accuracy discussion. I think you made a good point about that. And I feel like whatever - if we were to try and tackle this question now as part of the purpose we would just end up revisiting it when we get to the accuracy conversation anyway. You know, so it - you know, it feels like it be more efficient use of time to table this until we get to the accuracy conversation. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. Chuck again. Jim, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: Jim Galvin for the record. And thanks, Chuck. I guess I'll agree. My bias is towards what Marc said, let's just set this aside for now. I mean, I'll add as a comment to the discussion here it's not at all clear to me, you know, how an RDS, an active participant in - anything to do with accuracy. Accuracy, you know, is an evaluation of your content. It might be a part of the collection process where you're going to check the data, but I just - it's not at all clear to me how an RDS overall is an active participant in accuracy. That's something you do outside of it all.

So maybe the best thing to do is to defer the conversation so that we can cover it later for now. Alternatively, I would also support doing the poll on deleting this purpose altogether, but I suspect that it's a bit of a contentious issue and we're probably best deferring it for now. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thanks, Jim. Chuck again. Mike Hammer, accuracy is important because it's part of our charter, if nothing else. I think a lot of people have made points even in recent weeks, too, that it is important for other reasons. But it certainly is the fifth - asked in the fifth question in our charter so it's important because it's part of our charter. I think it's probably important for other reasons too. But we'll get to that later.

So notice, Jim, that Vicky doesn't understand accuracy being outside of the RDS. Maybe you can jump back in, Jim, and clarify a little bit what your thinking is there?

Jim Galvin: So just quickly, Russ - not Russ, I'm sorry, Chuck. What I mean is that it's something that you have to - you have to do to the data. The RDS itself doesn't do anything with respect to accuracy. I mean, I appreciate that you need access in order to check the data or you need to check it on the way in from collection. But why would the RDS itself participate directly in accuracy? So it's not clear to me why the RDS is an active facilitator, an active participant in the accuracy issue.

Having said that, I absolutely agree that we have to answer the question of accuracy. And we do want to define some policy with respect to it and some active engagement somewhere that, you know, responds to the accuracy requirements that the ICANN community is imposing on itself with respect to registration data. But I'm drawing kind of a fairly fine distinction here in the RDS being an active participant in facilitating accuracy. I don't know if that helps or not but maybe if we defer the conversation we can spend more time going over that point if it's more helpful or still confusing. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jim. Chuck again. Let's go to Rod.

Rod Rasmussen: Thanks, Chuck. Rod Rasmussen here. Yes, and I think deferring this is fine. I just want to put a stakeholder - or a stake in the ground here. We don't need to put a stakeholder in the ground, that sounds ominous.

Chuck Gomes: Which one?

Rod Rasmussen: Yes. Yes.

Chuck Gomes: You don't need to answer that.

Rod Rasmussen: But the - but, yes, I think there are some important things that can be done with an RDS approach to tackle accuracy, not necessarily in the way people are thinking about it from the perspective of having people, you know, identify and be, you know, up to date necessarily from a - this kind of, you know, purpose of being able to figure out where any particular individual associated with a domain name is. Rather accuracy when it comes to - if I'm managing a large portfolio of domain names, I would like to make it really easy to do that.

So - and there's a lot of that covered in the EWG report. So I don't want to throw the accuracy point out but I think it's better to talk about it when we get that context there so we can see what we're talking about from that perspective in particular. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Rod. Chuck again. Alex, your turn. And by the way, I appreciate your comments earlier in the chat, but go ahead.

Alex Deacon: Hi, thanks Chuck. It's Alex Deacon. Yes, so to Jim's point, I think, you know, RDS may not be an active participant in ensuring accuracy. But it may actually improve accuracy. If you remember, there's been discussions in the past, and this may have been in my involvement with the PPSAI work, but, you know, people have asserted that, you know, the fact that there's so much inaccurate data in the current Whois system is because of the fact that personal information is in fact published and made available worldwide kind of indiscriminately.

And that results in people putting in fake or inaccurate information so they could protect their privacy. So I suppose it could follow that in a world of a new RDS system, where privacy is protected and information is not disseminated indiscriminately, to use a word from earlier, that it could actually result in more accurate data because people are not afraid of having their privacy affected or they're not worried about getting unsolicited email and spam and the like.

So I think really RDS is not an active participant in the accuracy, but you could argue that RDS indirectly will improve accuracy. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Alex. Chuck again. Greg Shatan, your turn. I hope all of you are watching the chat, there's lots of good stuff in there. Go ahead, Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. I'm just riding gain on my microphone, so to speak, so I don't echo when you talk. So I think one important thing is to - if I'm reading the question correctly or the alternatives correctly, we're talking about a purpose of RDS policy, which is slightly different than the purpose of the RDS itself.

You know, a database can just as easily contain inaccurate data as accurate data. So I agree that the database itself has no way maybe there are other, you know, things that can be attached to it, could be very layman like in my terms, because I am a layman, attached to it to deal with accuracy and various protocols that can deal with accuracy but the database itself doesn't, you know, distinguish between, you know, accurate and inaccurate data, it's garbage in, garbage out.

But RDS policy, the policy that we're here to establish, you know, does deal very much with accuracy and not just because it's in our charter. It's in our charter for a reason, and the fact of the matter is that those who - I don't understand those who are in praise of inaccurate data. And I'm sure that there isn't really that position.

But in any case I think clearly, you know, the purpose of this to contain good data, good data should be accurate data I think. And we can punt on this if we want but we're only going to see it later so I'm not sure why this isn't the time to deal with this. We're going to be iterating anyway so punting on an iteration just leaves us with two kicks or whatever, the next time around.  
Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Greg. And I can tell you went on mute really fast since I'm not echoing. One of the people - the first comment in this one, notice the commenter - I won't mention her name - but pointed out, why are we talking about RDS, the purpose of RDS policy? I thought that's a good question. I'm not sure why the word "policy" got in there or if it's significant. But that is an interesting point.

So I'm hearing quite a few people who are suggesting table this until we get to accuracy. That's probably a safer thing to do than just deleting it. Although we could still come back to it even if we deleted it technically. So the - should we, you know, just table it? Somebody suggested that we should poll that and see. Please, understand that we're not minimizing accuracy if we do that. We are going to get to accuracy. Accuracy is the - is part of our charter, okay? So don't misread whatever we decide to do on this as not thinking accuracy is important.

So, Lisa, go ahead and jump in.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. Lisa Phifer for the record. I need some clarity on what tabling it would mean at this point. Would we choose Alternative A and live with that? Would we leave the text as-is? Would we delete it for now? And an expedient way forward might be to do a show of hands on who wants to actually delete it at this stage.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So let's do a raise - not a raise - let's not us the raids of hands, let's do a green checkmark, if you agree that we should delete this requirement for now. And you can put a red X like Vicky did if you don't think we should delete - definitely don't think we should delete it now. So it's mixed, okay.

So we're back pretty much to where we were. There's a big mix of results. So - and I think doing a poll isn't going to help us based on the results in Adobe just going out with a poll probably isn't going to change that, we're still going

to have a mix of results. Let me throw out a suggestion to try to bring closure on this for now. We're not going to close it indefinitely.

What if we went with A, Alternative A for now, noting that there's clearly not rough consensus on this, but that we revisit it after we discuss accuracy as part of Question Number 5? Is that a reasonable approach? And I'm totally open to other suggestions for how we proceed on this. So if you want to raise your hand and suggest something totally different you're very welcome to do so. But we're obviously not going to close this one today, probably not in the next few meetings. But what does - is that an option?

I picked A because I think it's helpful to have the footnote there to remind people that we're going to focus on accuracy later. So anybody - okay, if you would clear your Xs and green checks now so that I can ask another question. And see people's response. Okay, got most of them. Justin and was it Vicky, if you could - okay, Vicky got hers. Okay. Thanks, Vicky. And Justin, thank you.

All right, so is - if you're opposed - I want to raise your hand this time - if you're opposed to just recording Alternative A in our document that we're capturing all this with a clear notation that it is - we did - there is divergence on this one, okay, not consensus, but that we will revisit it after we've started dealing with accuracy. Question Number 5 in our charter. Anybody opposed to that just raise your hand please. And I'm having you raise your hand because I'm going to call on you to speak. Warning.

Okay, oh there's a hand good, good. Okay, Marc, go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Chuck, Marc Anderson for the record. I guess I'm confused why we would put a purpose that we don't have clear agreement on as the placeholder? Why don't we just put an actual placeholder and say, you know, the role of accuracy in the RDS purpose will be, you know, revisited when we discuss, you know, accuracy per Question 5? I mean, you know, I think part of the



reason why you're having trouble getting consensus here is you're including options people aren't completely comfortable with. We're going to do - if we're going to do a placeholder, let's do an actual placeholder. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. Chuck again. The reason I did that was because we had such a mix of results in terms of tabling it. So and in essence what you're saying the same thing as tabling it. I'm comfortable either way. I mean, we can put - is tabling it different than putting a placeholder in there? I don't know. I don't see any difference. But if that's helpful, I'm fine with that. We just need - I don't think we want to lose this one, but maybe I didn't word it clearly.

Is there anybody - raise your hand if you're opposed to doing what Marc suggested and just putting a placeholder in for this one. That's, in essence, I think, what we were doing by putting Alternative A there and revisiting it later. But what - is that better instead of saying tabling it to say putting a placeholder in there for it? Anybody opposed to that?

That was kind of what the footnote said but nobody is opposed to that. Okay, let's go that route. That's fine. Okay, I think then that that brings us to the next agenda item which is the agenda item Number 3. So if we could bring up the subset of the work plan that we're going to talk about today?

While that's happening, let me remind everybody that last week in our meeting, the leadership team suggested that we try and set some target dates in our work plan for a first initial - for starting to work on a first initial report. And so we as the eldership team made a start at that this week. And so what you're going to see is what we did so far. And hang on a second and you'll get a chance to be able to adjust your screen in a minute, let them get it up.

So what you're going to see is what we as a leadership team have done to the work plan. And you're just going to see part of our overall work plan, okay? And I need to reduce my size a little bit here. There we go. Okay.

Now, so if you look at this right here, and by the way, this is still a work in progress. We didn't have enough time and we met yesterday and we came up with some - a few dates, potential target dates, but there's still some more work that staff's going to do this week and following up on this. But here's where we're at right now. We've been on Step 12A for many weeks now.

And you can see that we actually started Step 12A on the 25th of October last year. On users and purposes, we started that on the 13th of December. On privacy and data protection we started that on the 14th of February. We've been spending a lot of time on that since then. We haven't specifically gotten to data elements yet. But we're hoping to start that next week. Okay?

And again, for those that are new, everything we're doing is being done in an iterative fashion in the sense that we're going to be going back and forth and there are lots of interdependencies. So don't assume that because we start working on data elements that we're done with users and purposes or privacy.

So by necessity we're going to have to go back and forth as we make progress, we'll find out there are other things that need to be fixed and so forth. Now, for Step 12B, which is moving from thin data into thick data, okay, we tentatively suggesting - we the leadership team - starting that -targeting getting to thick data by the 2nd of May, which is about a month from now, ok? And we may or may not achieve that but we're trying to get things going and making more progress.

And then if you scroll down on that to Step 12 - or excuse me, 13A, 13A is starting the preparation of the first initial report. And the goal we kind of put in front of you last week in the meeting was the 28th of October, or in other words, the Abu Dhabi meeting in the fall. So trying to be ready to start preparing that report. Understanding that as we go we're kind of preparing the first initial report in a sense although not formally.

So that's where we're at so far in terms of revising the work plan. And we have - there are lots of tentative target dates to fill in in between those. But if you have any questions, concerns, comments, on what we're doing there, I'll open it up for those right now. And while you're thinking about that if you go down to the last page here, you'll see a very skimpy outline of all of our steps in the work plan if you want to see where these things fit in and so forth and where we're going. Although there's less detail in the last few steps than there will be later.

So any questions or comments on this? Any objections to trying to set these targets to work towards and motivate us to steadily make progress? Okay, that takes - if there are no questions or comments on that, let's go to Agenda Item 4. And let's - let me ask Andrew and Rod a question. I'm sure you're okay with posting the Annex D of the EWG final report, that's just a one-pager.

But are you guys - are both of you guys okay with posting the document that staff prepared where she integrated Andrew's approach to looking at purposes of data elements with Rod's suggestion that we integrate some stuff from the EWG report on purpose of data elements? Is it okay to post that document? Any objection to that? Okay, thanks, Andrew. I see that. Rod, are you okay if we post that integrated document as well?

I know you guys haven't had time to talk about that together, only reason why I'm asking that. And Rod's typing so - oh it's there. Yes, I didn't scroll down to look Rod. It's there. Okay. Anyway thank you very much, both of you.

All right, so let's bring up the approach document integrated with the - well, yes, go ahead and bring that up, Lisa, whatever you're bringing up is fine. Okay, now several weeks ago Andrew posted an approach for proceeding with purposes for data elements. And he suggested, I think, in fact let me be quiet and let Andrew share what his intent was, and basically a brief overview

of what he suggested. And all of you have the ability to scroll down, realizing that some of what's been put in there is from the EWG report and not - was not in Andrew's message. Go ahead, Andrew.

Andrew Harris: Okay, thanks. So the - I had in mind, you know, the EWG report when we were in Copenhagen and we listened to privacy commissioners. And I thought, you know, okay, well we (unintelligible) about the thin Whois stuff. And it was - I was a little concerned that maybe people hadn't seen the way the EWG thing expressed this. So I thought that this was a sort of way station along the way to what's in the EWG report that just sort of showed, okay, well suppose that we worked through the thin elements from a thin thing that I used a domain name that may be familiar to some there.

And I took that from the Registry side and I just, you know, ran through - ran through the elements and sent that in an email. And I hoped that it would - it would give us a kind of worst example of how we might approach these things. I wasn't saying that my answers were right or anything it was just a way of sort of talking to the reasoning. And I think it's completely consistent with what's on the EWG report. It just seemed to me to be like a sort of worked out example. And it seemed, you know, painfully detailed. But I thought that it might inspire us to try to get some examples out.

Because I had this feeling in Copenhagen that some of the discussion was running at a level of abstraction that was maybe hurting us. But, you know, if we saw a concrete worked example that it might help. So that was really the only idea. I don't know if it's been useful but that was, you know, the way that I like to work is try something and if that doesn't work or it's not useful or whatever then we try something else but at least we, you know, we sort of rule out some possibilities.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Andrew. I appreciate that. And, Rod, you commented I think week before last about how the EWG work on data elements and

purposes tied in very closely to this. Let me let you describe what you were suggesting.

Rod Rasmussen: Sorry, my iPhone is putting up a little alert in front me because I'm doing some work. So, yes, so we spent a lot of time on this in trying to make sure that every data element that we looked at as being one is either being used or was being proposed to be used in a potential RDS was tied to actual purposes that we'd gone through and started with when we did our work as the EWG. We started with purposes. And so, you know, we put together this rather, you know, fairly complex and - I wouldn't call it complex, just complete matrix.

Obviously it's not going to be completely exhaustive because there may be other purposes that may be tied to data elements. But we're pretty exhaustive as far as what potential data elements there might be in an RDS system. With - trying to address exactly this issue, which is, you know, why - if you're going to collect and/or provide access to, we'll get rid of disseminate, data element, what, you know, why are you doing that, right? What are - what purposes does that tie to?

So we could go through that exercise and find any data elements that didn't make sense because there was no real actual purpose defined for them that would track back to the purpose for an RDS in the first place. And there was an iterative process and sometimes data being - looking at what data elements are collected, you know, helped you remember what purposes may have been provided initially for them, you know, in some past time for their collection in the first place.

So that provides kind of I think the link that you need to get from the higher level purpose statements that we've been working with to the actual kind of nitty-gritty detail that you need. And we heard from the data commissioners, you have to actually have specific, you know, really well-constructed purposes for collecting various bits of data.

And, you know, dealing with them in all the various methods or things you do, you know, how long you keep it, who gets to see it and why and all those kinds of things. So you need something to bridge the - kind of the higher level stuff to the actual details of whatever you're doing.

And so since we already had that table, you know, nicely put together there, I thought that would be a good way of, you know, cutting to the chase, as it were instead of, you know, revisiting all that work that's already been done by the EWG but by other working groups looking at this stuff, is let's take that as an - and take a look, A, at kind of what's in there as far as purposes go and B, fleshing those out a bit as - so that we can address those issues and really have a good concise yet description enough statement of purpose as to be able to, you know, either decide it's in or out as far as something that you would do from a policy perspective.

So obviously we got that - that's several steps down the line but we put together a good matrix now that will make the work in the future go a lot faster. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Rod. And so staff is now going to bring up Annex D of the EWG report. It's just a one-pager. So I wanted you to see what Rod was referring to there and how it relates to purposes and data elements. And so it is now up there. Again, adjust your screen so that you can read it. And just to glance it, we're not going to go through it in detail right now. But you can see what he was referring to for each of the data elements starting with domain name.

(Unintelligible) report shows that, you know, the domain name (unintelligible) for domain name elements. So our hope next week, after we talk about authoritative data from our sub team of three that is going to come back with some suggestions, would be to (unintelligible) that Andrew repeated at the beginning of his message one by one and talk about purposes for those. And we'll use the EWG report and their purposes as a starting point. Doesn't

mean we have to accept all those as-is. We may, and that's okay, because they put a lot of work into that and by a lot of good people.

So we will start there and start looking - and that's why we suggested starting on data elements next week and looking at purposes for each of those. Theo, it's your turn.

Theo Geurts: Thank you, Chuck. And this is Theo for the record. So I've only got one question if we are going to the purpose of the thin Whois, where is the sanity check, so to speak, I mean, if we are looking - if I'm looking at the purposes right now it all makes sense and it all looks nice.

But where is the check where we go like okay, this is all nice to have, but in a - when it comes to the perspective when it comes to the EU GDPR, to name something, where is the sanity check that tells us like, okay, this is all nice to have, but this is not a requirement or a purpose that actually has the backing of a legal requirement compared to all the privacy laws out there. I mean, it's really nice to have a creation date in the RDS, but from a privacy point of view I don't see why anybody needs to know that. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Theo. This is Chuck. Well, we're going to have to try and reach a fairly strong consensus position on whether things are needed or not. So we're going to have to do the sanity check, I think, as we continue our work. Now keep in mind, that we're not done with privacy and in particular the European regulation that's scheduled to take effect next week. We have some written answers that are pending from the experts that were with us in Copenhagen.

And so that's going to be part of our sanity check, not the only part, but so, I mean, you're absolutely right, we have to do a sanity check. But we can only do so much at once. We, today, focused on some three possible purpose statements. Everything we do is going to have to be sanity checked with other areas like privacy and varying privacy legislation around the world.

Let's go to Tim.

Tim O'Brien: Hello, all. My concern is this topic that just got up - got brought up in regards to privacy. The name and the address and contact information is the same information that is logged the city for why you buy a (unintelligible) or you buy a house that you're born, etcetera. So say that this information because now I have a Website is covered under privacy laws, is - confounds me at this point that we're even bringing this into the conversation.

Chuck Gomes: Tim, this is Chuck. Let me clarify please. Bringing what into the conversation? I didn't quite follow you. The privacy regulations?

Tim O'Brien: Regards, yes how - in regards to privacy encompassing contact information for a Website, both for administrative and the owner (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: If I'm understanding you, first, this is Chuck, first of all, in certain countries in the world, there are regulations that affect the people who live in that region. In some cases the regulations affect people who are just doing business with people in that area and so forth. So registries and registrars as well as registrants, have to obey laws, as you know, I'm not telling you anything new.

And they may not be the same laws that you and I have to follow. But as a working group because gTLDs are global, we have to take those into consideration. So I'm not sure, though, I am - am I understanding your concern? And answering your question? Go ahead and respond.

Tim O'Brien: So (unintelligible) in that conversation (unintelligible) the data fields that are in the current Whois (unintelligible) applicable privacy laws (unintelligible) data point (unintelligible) potentially being a little over heavy-handed in locking this down and preventing individuals from (unintelligible) the work that they normally do leveraging data that's in Whois.



Chuck Gomes: Well, again, (unintelligible) okay. You see we targeted that for about a month out to start talking about the thick Whois data elements. But the plan is to look at all of the data elements, thin and thick with regard to this. And we're going to evaluate, you know, evaluate them with regard to varying privacy and data protection laws around the world, with regard to intellectual property needs, with regard to law enforcement needs. So we've got a huge task in front of us. I hope I addressed a little bit, not confident that I did. But let me go to Andrew.

Andrew Harris: Thanks. Just on this question of the sanity check, part of the reason that I laid out - laid things out the way I did rather than following the pattern of the EWG was because I was anticipating that very question and I thought that if we went at each data element independently like one at a time, then we would see, you know, oh I see this one is related to the specific purpose this way. Because quite clearly what we heard in the session that we had in Copenhagen was that, you know, you need a specific purpose for each thing that you collect. And then the question is, you know, whether it's allowed anyway.

And so the example of the create a date, you know, whether that is, you know, whether that is privacy appropriate or not, the point is there is a specific reason, and I listed it in the mail, for why that element is one of the things that you need because it tells you something for debugging. Now you might say debugging, you know, the tradeoff isn't there, but that's the reason.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Andrew. And I see that we're over time. So Stephanie, be brief, please.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks. Chuck, I just wanted - Stephanie Perrin for the record. I just wanted to respond to Tim's question. Data protection authorities are well aware of the requirements at least in Europe under the consumer protection law to provide a contact point for those conducting electronic commerce within the European community. But that doesn't mean that that data (unintelligible) and

this is not (unintelligible). So I think that they understand (unintelligible) if an (unintelligible) put their data up, that would be an acceptable exception under data protection law. It does not mean that data goes up because it's required under consumer protection law. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stephanie. And we're out of time. I apologize for going over. But, let me ask one of the staff (unintelligible) confirm our action items. I don't think we have any decision points for a poll this week, am I correct on that? One of you want to respond?

Lisa Phifer: Chuck, this is Lisa Phifer. We do have one decision point on the Question 1 from the poll.

Chuck Gomes: Oh right, okay.

Lisa Phifer: Right, which we'll reflect in the working document. On the third question from the poll, we have two alternatives to poll on this week. That was splitting the purpose into two separate statements.

Chuck Gomes: But I thought we decided to hold that off until we define authoritative.

Lisa Phifer: Authoritative, correct. So that's an action for a poll but not a poll this week. The group of volunteers have an action to come up with a working definition of authoritative after which we poll. So there will be no poll this week, you're correct. There's the action to the group of volunteers to go off and do their work.

And then there's a general action not yet noted in the notes pod but a general action to all working group members to prepare for our continued discussion on purpose of data elements next week by reviewing this section of the EWG report, the matrix, which is now under meeting materials page, and any other related information, for example, if you look at the working draft where we've been capturing all our key concept deliberation results, Section 3 is the

section that covers this charter question and some of the material that we've been discussing.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Lisa. Our next meeting is the same time as this a week from now. So we'll look forward to talking with all of you then. And of course participate in the list as things are on there in preparation for that meeting. Is there anything else that we need to cover before I adjourn? Okay, great turn out today, good participation. A little more progress I think, so thanks to everyone. Have a good rest of the week. And we'll talk to you next week. Meeting adjourned and the recording can stop.

END