

**ICANN
Transcription
Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group
Tuesday, 25 July 2017 at 16:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-nextgen-rds-pdp-25jul17-en.mp3> Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p6h8pfhjw5q/> Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/TmfAw> The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Julie Bisland: Super, thank you. Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone. Welcome to the Next Generation RDS PDP Working Group call on the 25th of July, 2017.

In the interest of time there will be no roll call; attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. If you are only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourself be known now? Okay, thank you. Hearing no names, I would like to remind all to 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 turn it back over to Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Julie. Welcome everyone, to our meeting today. Starting off with any statement of interest updates? If you have one, please raise your hand in Adobe. I don't think we have anybody that's not in Adobe, but if so, please speak up.

All right, so let's jump right into our agenda. Thanks to those of you who completed the poll. We had a little lower response number this time in the

poll. But we still I think obtained some good indications of where people are at with regard to the items that were in the poll.

So let's go ahead and switch the display in Adobe and jump into our slides for today, which have been designed specifically for this meeting. And as you can see, we're going to continue our deliberation beyond the minimum public data set and there are a couple links there if you haven't already looked at those. Last week's poll and the prior week's poll results are there.

There were three questions in the poll, the first relating to registrant name and registrant organization; the second registrant country and the third question, question Number 4 was registrant email address. So we're going to follow up on those, look at the results today. And then after that, hopefully we will take a look and talk about other contact data elements that were broadly supported in the poll a couple meetings ago.

Let's go - if you go now to Slide 2, and you have control, we'll come to Question 2 in the poll, which is the first question in the poll other than asking for your name. And you can see there a couple bullet points defining the registrant in the 2013 RAA. I won't go over that.

But you can see the results, the options that were presented and the results of the poll. There - there's really a pretty close split between Option A and Option D. And the - A is pretty much the status quo and D had a little variation in that based on discussions that we had in our meeting last week.

Now, certainly you're welcome to go back to the poll and look at the comments that were made and if we need to we can post those but for right now we're just going to jump right ahead to some possible key concepts that we could get out of this. And I want to ask Lisa to come in and comment on the results if she would, please.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. This s Lisa Phifer for the record. As we looked at the items that received the greatest support and we should note that in this particular poll question you had the opportunity to indicate more than one response that you agreed with so the total does not add up necessarily to 100%.

As we looked at the two responses and thought about discussion from last week's call, and also looked at a couple of the comments that were supplied along with answers for this, there were comments from a number of people, I think Greg Shatan, Steve Metalitz and Rod Rasmussen all provided comments that suggested that it is not so much the way in which the data is structured or the name of the data element, but the need for an actual semantic definition of these data elements that seems to be missing from the 2013 RAA and would potentially be a requirement on any future RDS policy.

And so that's the genesis of the suggested possible key concept Number 1 here, which is that RDS policy must include a definition for every registration data element, both semantic and syntax. As I said, this was mentioned I think it was Steve Metalitz that raised this on our last call but was also mentioned in several comments and so it seemed to be a key takeaway regardless of how the data might be structured or labeled.

Another key takeaway is that even though the vote seems to be somewhat split between Options A and D, both of those suggest that there is a requirement for at least one element that identifies the domain name registrant to be represented in a - in RDS and to be collected as a mandatory bit of information. And so that's the genesis where the second possible key concept that is listed here.

And we thought rather than focusing our discussion on what data elements are named or exactly how they're split apart, we might actually start by seeing if we have agreement on these key concepts or these concepts reworded and then worry about the actual labeling of the data elements and whether they would be split apart into two separate elements.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa. This is Chuck again. Greg, you have a question?

Greg Aaron: I do, Chuck. This is Greg Aaron. As we continue these deliberations, one of the things that I suggest we be really deliberate and clear about is whether things must be collected and displayed or - because in some cases, some of these fields we're talking about have historically be optional data that you don't have to fill in or provide, like fax number or a reseller name or that kind of thing. And also watch our terminology about should versus must - must versus optional. Those words have meaning.

And so when we do polling we need to be really clear about whether we're saying something is mandatory to collect, mandatory to display or it's optional, etcetera. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Greg, this is Chuck, a follow up question. Did you think that there was any ambiguity in the options for Question Number 2?

Greg Aaron: Let's see. Maybe not Number 2 but I thought there was in some others...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Aaron: ...in the previous polls.

Chuck Gomes: ...when we get to those so that we make sure that there is no ambiguity. So but that's why I wanted to follow up to make sure, so the - pretty clear where there's a must and an option I think in Number 2. So thanks for that and please bring that up when we get to a place where there may be some ambiguity in one of the other questions.

So there are two proposed key concepts, let's look at one at a time. The first one came out of the comments from several of you, as Lisa pointed out. RDS policy must include a definition for every gTLD registration data element

including both a semantic definition and a syntax definition. Is there any opposition to that as a key concept? And thanks for those - like Steve, for example, that supported the comments in there. Marc Anderson, go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. This is Marc Anderson. This isn't an opposition but I just want to, you know, sort of point out that there should be room for organizations that provide RDS output to add their own fields so, you know, I don't think we should try and define the universe of all possible RDS outputs and in fact I kind of think our focus should be on RDS output that is required by policy. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. I don't think anything here restricts organizations from doing things on their own. I think we made it clear before that registrars and registries as well may collect information that's not in the RDS. With regard to optional, I would say for now let's leave the optional ones in there when we get closer to the end on these things I think we can revisit your suggestion that we should only focus on required. But I'd also point out that an optional element could be a required part of the RDS, it just may be blank.

So and I think there was quite a bit of discussion last week that there's some value in some cases of having the organization in cases where an individual is the registrant if that is applicable. So I would say let's not spend a lot of time on whether we're just doing required or not now. Go ahead, Marc.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. Marc again. I don't disagree with anything you said. I guess my concern is that at some point down the road, you know, we aren't in a situation where somebody says oh you can't display Field X because it hasn't been defined by RDS policy. That's just my paranoid fear there.

Chuck Gomes: It's a valid point and we should not do that, I would agree with you. So let's keep that in mind as we get closer to the end and make sure we haven't done that because I don't think that's anyone's intent right now. So...

Stephanie Perrin: Can I jump in here, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Sure, Stephanie, go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Thank you. I'm sorry, I'm on the phone and I'm driving but I just pulled over to make this remark. I'm a little nervous about defining syntax, because I'm not quite sure how rigid our definition of syntax - not to say we shouldn't do it at some point, but to what extent is that going to nail people in different countries down to a type of - let's pick address, for instance, that they're incapable of nailing down in the particular way that we describe. Are we going to take that on or are we just going to borrow work that's been done in other working groups?

Chuck Gomes: I think, Stephanie, this is Chuck...

Stephanie Perrin: Just a question.

Chuck Gomes: ...it's a good point. And I think that we will take that on when we get into implementation depending on what recommendations we make for requirements and policy. So that is very definitely an implementation issue that needs to be taken into consideration. Any other comments on the key concept Number 1?

Okay, so I'm going to make the conclusion that we - that the people on this call, it looks like there's about 28 of us or so, and plus Stephanie's not in Adobe so that makes 29 I think, including some staff members in there, so we have - we're going to conclude that that is a key concept, and we will put that into a poll just to confirm for people on this call to confirm as well as people not on the call.

The second key concept listed on the screen there, and again for people like Stephanie that aren't there, I'll read it, "At least one element identifying the domain name registrant, i.e. registered name holder, must be collected and

included in the RDS.” Are there - is there any discussion on Number 2? And, Andrew, I’m assuming you want to talk about 2. If you’re going back to 1 that’s okay, but go ahead. Not hearing anything, Andrew, you might...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: There we go, I think I heard you.

Andrew Sullivan: ...first, both Scott and I were asking - yes? Is that better?

Chuck Gomes: That’s fine. Nothing now.

Andrew Sullivan: The - both Scott and I were asking in the chat room about what syntax means, I think. And we were trying to understand whether this puts ICANN in the position...

Chuck Gomes: You seem to have dropped there, Andrew. Did you lose audio? Hang on a second while we see what’s happening there.

Julie Bisland: I’ll reach out to Andrew.

Chuck Gomes: So if - Andrew - Scott, if you can jump in and help that would be okay, while Andrew is dealing with the audio. Notice the question that Scott asks and that Andrew followed up with in the chat, “What would happen if an ICANN-described syntax definition disagrees with an IETF-specified protocol syntax definition?” And Andrew replied, “I think that syntax means protocol so I must have the wrong understanding of what is meant.” I wonder, and we’re going back to key concept Number 1 so I wonder if maybe a possible edit would be in order here. And let’s talk about that. And hopefully Andrew will get audio again.

Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: I believe I can reflect what Andrew is trying to raise which is that if the syntax is to be defined for data elements, and Scott had questioned what happens if the syntax is inconsistent with IETF protocols, I believe the point Andrew was trying to make was whether this puts ICANN in the position of defining protocols. And just to share my two cents, I believe currently the definitions refer to IETF RFCs as the source for syntax definitions and presumably that could be something that was done for the syntax definitions in the future as well to ensure consistency. And that might be another proposed key concept. But I think that raising that concern was what Andrew was trying to do.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks, Lisa. That's helpful. Do you think that any - we need to qualify the way this key concept is worded to cover that or is that something we will deal with when we get into implementation?

Lisa Phifer: If you're asking me, Lisa Phifer again, I would say that's - it's the - a possible key concept but syntax definition should be the, you know, greatest extent possible based on IETF definitions or standard definition, something like that. But that's...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Well would it work to just add that qualifier at the end of the key concepts, a syntax definition that is consistent with the applicable protocol?

Lisa Phifer: It's a requirement on the highly defined syntax rather than a requirement on defining - providing definitions for...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Lisa Phifer: ...data elements, but...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Lisa Phifer: ...that would be my rationale for considering it a separate requirement, but either way I think if that's the desire it probably can be addressed straightforward.

Chuck Gomes: Andrew and Scott, do you think it would be helpful to qualify that or to put a separate key concept about the syntax definition? And I'll come back to Volker's statement, I think there's something that needs to be corrected on that in the chat but bear with us while we deal with the syntax definition issue in key concept Number 1.

So I'm just - Kal asked the question of why we'd have to be concerned about syntax. Would somebody like to respond to that? Certainly I think for - it seems to me that syntax users, registrants, need to know the syntax in order to be able to consistently enter data. I'm curious, Kal, why you think that a syntactical definition is not needed, if you could comment on that, that would be helpful.

Kal Feher: Chuck, can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Kal Feher: This is Kal Feher for the record. I was making that observation based on my opinion that we're coming up with a policy that will ultimately inform system builders and registries and whoever bills clients about what sort of data we need to collect, what sort of data we need to display and how we limit people's access to that data. But we're not going to describe how people consume it specifically so I think there's a general expectation that we use RDAP, for example, to communicate with systems. But that's not required as part of this group in my opinion, we don't need to decide what the communication protocols will be and how those communication protocols will share that data.

We'll probably set principles and we'll probably set requirements for those, but the details, I think, should always be left to the technical implementers rather than coming up with strict requirements for those protocols within this group where we're not really concerned or discussing issues of interoperability and operational issues. So I think it's best if we just stick with why we want data, who we allow that data or who we allow to consume that data and then set the basic guidelines for implementers rather than trying to do the implementer's work for themselves or hopefully that makes sense.

Chuck Gomes: No, no that's very helpful, a helpful response. This is Chuck speaking. But before I go to David and Andrew, I want to ask you, though, don't you think, though, that when we get into the - if and when we get into the implementation phase, that we would likely get into the area of syntax.

Now we could end in the implementation - and probably we would hopefully get more technical people and operational people involved in the implementation phase, like you suggest, we could end up allowing some flexibility there. But that still should be defined, should it not, in implementation, not now.

Kal Feher: Yes, there's probably going to be some overlap. And I'm not sure if I'm being overly pedantic about that line. As I said earlier, I think that most of us assume that we'll use RDAP for that - for the communications channel, for example, but I think generally this group - my feeling is that it's better if we stick with why we are collecting the data and setting the guidelines for the implementers first and then we look at interoperability issues within the implementation group when we do fork off. And if there is a shortcoming with the established transport protocols or rather than communication protocols, then at that point we might want to specify syntax to, you know, to meet whatever goals.

And I'm trying to think of why syntax would be important to meet a goal and I can't think of an example at the moment. But if there is a particular goal, a

principle that we need to meet, and that requires us to be specific about the syntax then the implementation you know, offshoot group is probably the place to discuss it. So I wouldn't say absolutely not, but I wouldn't preempt that discussion by including syntax considerations at this stage.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, let me go to David and then we'll take a little meeting poll in terms of what people think about syntax even referring to a syntax definition. So David, go ahead.

David Cake: Well I'm going to agree that we shouldn't be developing, you know, syntax as such, that does seem to be drifting into sort of you know, IETF territories, as Andrew is saying. And we already have very capable protocol in RDAP. What we might be doing is specifying something along the lines of a - like the RDAP profile that already exists, the gTLD directories and other things where we specify existing standards that we feel should be used, where they exist and things like that. I don't think we should be developing them but we may be specifying what they use - there's a lot of interlinked machinery there in terms of which protocols and protocol extensions we might think are appropriate for different things.

So you know, I don't think we need to get too worried about doing it now, and I don't think we should be leaping ahead. But in any case this Phase 2 or probably Phase 3 decisions and at the moment we should be, you know, focusing on requirements. And I don't think we should be requiring you know, our requirements should get anywhere near the level of detail of specifying syntax at this point. So I mean, I generally agree with the idea that we shouldn't be doing it but if it was - if there was to be a good argument presented for doing it, it would have to be at a much later point. And I would not spend too much time on the issue right now. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, David. This is Chuck. So I'm going to make a suggestion to see if this works. Would it be okay at this stage - seems like it would be to me but I want to get confirmation from the group to just take off the end of that key

concept and a syntax definition and just have RDS policy must include a definition of every gTLD registration data element including a semantic definition, and leave it at that for now. Greg, go ahead.

Greg Aaron: Hi, Chuck. This is Greg Aaron. I would decline your proposal. The registry and registrar contracts occasionally specify some tactical requirements that are above what EPP requires and they don't conflict with EPP but they're important for policy reasons. For example, they say that certain things must be done in order to effectively collect the data. I mean, that's the goal and there are also requirements for validation and some other things.

So those are actually policy statements in my opinion, I would suggest we don't have to specify them right now and get into the details because that might slow down our discussion. So I'm on board with that concept. But I would not drop the issue of syntax. I think it should remain there as a placeholder because it's very important. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. This is Chuck. Anybody disagree with Greg's point? Please, put a red X in the Adobe if you disagree with that. And so I think what Greg is suggesting is we leave the key concept as it is right now. And I don't want to spend too much time on this because we're going to have to get into more detail when we get to later phases, and everything, but - and I think we've spent as - enough time on Number 1. Is there any opposition to me declaring at least rough consensus for those on the call for key concept 1 as it's worded now, including the syntax definition in there?

I think there's been good discussion in the chat and so forth so hopefully you've looked at that. I'm not going to go back over that although I do want to go back to one comment that Volker made if I can find it here. Where was that one? Okay, there - we have some red Xs, okay, Andrew, you're first. Are you able to speak now?

Julie Bisland: Andrew still doesn't have audio.

Chuck Gomes: He still doesn't have audio, okay, let's see - so it sounds, Andrew, like if - that we might want to add a key concept that syntax is defined by protocol docs - maybe we just add a key concept - another one that says, "Syntax is defined by protocol documents." So we would leave the syntax definition in there but state that that is defined by protocol documents. I mean, Andrew if you can put a green check if that works or something so that I know that that works, or if you can put something in chat that's alternative to that that would be good.

In the meantime, where'd those red Xs go? You found out that I was going to call on you so you took them off. Marc, did you - you're the next one I saw, you weren't the next red X that was in there. I think it was Kal had red X. Any of you want to talk to that while I - let's go ahead with Marc.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. This is Marc. I put a red X because I mean, the conversation I heard, you know, both the, you know, on audio and in chat seemed to indicate to me, you know, there wasn't broad support for the syntax definition part. And so, you know, based on the 30 or so of us, you know, I don't think we can say that that's a key concept that the majority of us support.

I actually agree with, you know, with the points that Greg Aaron made, you know, I don't think we want to forget about it and, you know, we do want to make sure that it's something we consider or debate. But, you know, I put my red X in there because I just didn't feel to me like we had achieved, you know, consensus enough to call it a key concept. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Anybody else want to talk about that? Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: I'd just like to call your attention to an alternative phrasing of this key concept in chat, which amends the proposed key concept to include by reference to appropriate standards, syntax definition, which it sounds like Andrew and Kal are supportive of that.

- Chuck Gomes: So what would the key concept read like now, Lisa? Can you maybe put that in the notes?
- Lisa Phifer: It's in chat but RDS policy must include a definition for every gTLD registration data element including semantic definition and by reference to appropriate standards of syntax definition.
- Chuck Gomes: Let me pick on a couple people. So, Greg, that sound okay to you since you're one of them that commented on this? And, Marc, did that sound okay to you? You can put a green check if that's okay or if you want to talk you're welcome to speak too. David, is that an old hand? If not, you're welcome to speak.
- Greg Aaron: Chuck, this is Greg. I need to see it on screen before I can agree with it.
- Chuck Gomes: Okay. It won't be in the - on the slides, okay, we're not going to change the slides, so it'll need to be in the notes or in the chat.
- Lisa Phifer: This is Lisa from staff. It's in the chat again as well as at the bottom of the notes pad.
- Chuck Gomes: Okay. I was way up in the chat so let me scroll back down there. Is that okay, Greg?
- Greg Aaron: Well, is an ICANN contract an appropriate standard? I mean, look at the example I gave above, I mean, that's a good standard for that particular example but I don't know if they're good ones for all examples.
- Chuck Gomes: Okay. One of the things I want to - as you can tell, we can spend an hour on every little wording, and if we do that we're never going to get done. Is it significant enough to word-smith this further than what's in the chat at this time that we need to spend time on it? And we always need to be asking that question, otherwise we just proceed so slowly that - so is - does it make a

significant difference? Is there anything that anybody considers significantly wrong? It's not perfect; nothing we're doing is perfect, okay? Is that alternative that Lisa put in the chat there okay for now or is there significant problem with it? And I underline the word "significant" okay?

If we with as many people as we have even only having 30 plus on our call, we can word smith forever, okay, that won't work. We won't get anything done. So does anybody have a significant problem with the wording? And we'll put this in a poll so you'll be able to make some suggestions there too. If not, I'd like to see us move on to Number 2. Lisa, did you want to say something?

Okay, all right, so let's go to Number 2. Any discussion on Number 2, at least one element identify - oh and I think this is the one that Volker commented on earlier. "At least one element identifying the domain name registrant, i.e. registered name holder, must be collected and included in the RDS." And, Volker, I'm not going to scroll up there but I think what you said in the chat, and I know that Steve Metalitz and maybe others responded to that as well, keep in mind that the one element can be the proxy provider. So that this key concept does not eliminate the possibility of using a proxy service.

Does that -if that doesn't make sense I'd like you to explain why, Volker. If that makes sense, just let us know either by a green check or speaking up. Okay, thanks, Volker. I appreciate that. And I think that was already clarified before I got to it.

So for Item Number 2, "At least one element identifying the domain name registrant - the registered name holder, must be collected and included in the RDS." Anybody object to that as a key concept? Okay.

So then the last question here is, "Are there any other key concepts that we might want to conclude out of the results from this poll question?" Is that good for now? We're going to have to, you know, eventually when we get into

implementation, dig down a little bit further to deal with things like okay do we have the registrant element and then also an optional organization, we'll have to get into that. We don't necessarily have to resolve that right now. But some of you'll recall the discussion from last week along those lines.

So I'm not seeing any objections, so unless somebody feels differently we're going to conclude that this will be a rough consensus key concept in our meeting today that will be tested in a poll. And for now we'll move on to Question Number 3 in the poll so you may want to scroll down a little bit.

This one's probably the easiest of the three today, or at least it seems that way to me, and I'm often wrong, so we'll see here. So there was pretty strong support, not unanimous by any means, that registrant country must be included in RDS data elements. It must be mandatory to collect for every domain registration.

And going back to Greg's - Greg Aaron's point again, I think - I don't think this is ambiguous, okay, it says it must be mandatory to collect for every domain registration. Anybody opposed to that as a key concept? Okay. Then let's accept that as a rough consensus conclusion and we'll test it in a poll.

And let's go quickly to Question 4. And you can scroll down to Slide 4, as a matter of fact in this case. And again, we had a split although the two options, A and C, really aren't necessarily contradictory with one another. The - and based on the poll results, note that Lisa has listed three possible key concepts.

But before we do that, and Rod, I don't know if you ever - Rod Rasmussen, I don't know if you ever saw staff's request for you to comment on this one. But if you would like to comment here, that would be very welcome right now.

Rod Rasmussen: Are we still on Question 3 or are we on Question 4?

Chuck Gomes: We're on Question 4.

Rod Rasmussen: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: I moved really quickly with 3.

Rod Rasmussen: Yes, okay, sorry. I missed that. This is Rod Rasmussen. So I don't know this is appropriate time to make comments or not. The - we had the discussion on the list about this overall issue around the preferential types of contacts - contact methods, I should say, that can be used. And collecting various ones versus publication of various ones depending upon people's preferences, and then also, you know, thinking about this more along the lines of a modern contact data system rather than the old school kind of we're going to list every possible type of way of contacting somebody and get that all tied to a domain name.

So, you know, I don't know if this is - this really fits well into this current - the current way you're approaching this, Chuck. I think that's more of a meta discussion. I'd rather have something prepared and actually go through that as an entire concept so we can get on the same page. I think what we're going through right now are areas where we - there are some things that have to be done or we have to make a decision about things that we're going to require various contact methodologies to be collected for various types of purposes or various elements are going to have to be collected, for example, there are policy elements in place today that require an email address that works for I think multiple ICANN policies that exist today.

So does that need to be tied to a registrant? Does it need to be tied to some contact that's associated with the domain name? That's the area that actually I think we can do a much better job of exploring. But the concept of do we need an email address that actually works for some contact associated with the domain, that's still a question that has to be answered separately from whether or not it's associated with a particular contact or not. I don't know, is

that what you're trying to get at with this particular - by bringing it up at this particular point? Or I'll pass it back over to you to understand better what you wanted me to talk about here. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, Rod. I think that's accurate. And it is a good time right now because - and notice when you look at - I'm jumping a little bit ahead looking at the key concepts that are there, that are proposed, by the leadership team just for discussion today on this, that some of the key concepts really came out of not only the discussion last week, but comments that were submitted with this particular question.

So we didn't in the call last week necessarily say that email - an email address should be continued to be required. But a lot of the comments from you guys indicated that it would be good if you still - if we still required email. Now I want to - a little side comment, you're right, Rod, that there are lots of policies in place right now that have some sort of a requirement with regard to an email address.

Now, we don't have to be bound by those, if we were to - and I'm not saying we should do this, but if we were to come up with recommendations that didn't require an email address, and again, I'm not suggesting that should be done, then those policies would need to be adjusted accordingly to deal with the new policy. All I'm saying is it's not an impossibility, it might not be something we want to do and that may be where some of you are coming from.

Let's go to Greg.

Greg Aaron: Thank you, Chuck. This is Greg. So from a - I'd like us to think about this one from a purely practical standpoint because whatever we decide have to be practical and implementable. Option A is kind of the concept that there may be different ways to contact somebody electronically. You could use email but

they could also maybe put in a, you know, their Facebook account name or their LinkedIn address or maybe a host of other things.

But email is the one thing that all registrants are going to have. And as Rod says, it's required right now. If you - you have to have an email address for the registrant in order to have UDRP work and so forth, transfers, all these other policies do involve email.

If we go with A there's the possibility that people become much harder to contact and you're also then requiring anyone who wants to contact them to use a potentially obscure means to contact them. We need a baseline method and email is the obvious one. Also you can send an email and that doesn't require somebody to be online like some other methods would be and so on. So from a purely practical standpoint, it's a common thing, it's accepted. I think A allows a lot of complication and not a good idea. I think email is the way to go. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. This is Chuck. Rod - or no, let's go to Lisa next and then we'll go to Rod.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. Lisa Phifer for the record. The derivation of the possible key concepts that are listed below for at minimum the registrant email must be collected and included in the RDS, was kind of based on the sentiment that Greg just voiced but also came through in some of the comments which is that no matter how you structure it, whether you have one structured contact job or whether you have discrete data elements that carry different kinds of addresses, it did seem that several people responding to the poll supported the registrant's email address being sort of that baseline, that always has to be collected and always has to be represented in some way in the RDS.

Setting aside the difference between A and C, which is really sort of how do you model that data? That's it.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Thanks, Lisa. Just a quick - before I go to Rod, just a quick comment on Volker's comment. You're right, Volker, that communication standards change. If we end up recommending that email address still be included, that doesn't prevent it from being adjusted if email no longer works. So I think we can deal with the future even if at the present time, or whatever present means in the future, we do that. But let's go to Rod. Rod, your turn.

Rod Rasmussen: Thanks, Chuck. Rod Rasmussen. So the - so I would like to separate two things here, or separate - I guess separate the concept that we need an email address from we need an email address for the registrant to - we need an email address for a domain name. And I think that's important because you can have a role that satisfies the various needs you might need an email address for that's being handled not necessarily by the registrant.

So - and the example I'm thinking here - or the couple examples I'm thinking here of, I have a - I want to register a domain name, I don't even have email, right? But I have my service provider can handle that for me or my lawyer can provide that for me, or what have you. I can designate a contact role that has an email address so I am contactable through that method, whatever it is. And that satisfies the purposes I would need that contact for.

Now if I'm - if we go to this concept of a contact entity by itself can fulfill multiple roles but I'm a registrant I don't have anybody to fill those other roles, well then if I have the requirement that I have to have an email address for some contact, and I don't provide any other contact well then my registered contact needs to have an email address, if people follow what I'm talking about there.

So basically you need - in my opinion you need an email address for the domain name but it doesn't necessarily have to be supplied by the registrant necessarily if you define other roles that can handle the purposes for which you would need to contact somebody via email. Hopefully that makes sense. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: It does, Rod, at least to me. This is Chuck. And it comes back to the key concept we already accepted today that we need good semantical definitions of what these things mean. So if we call it registrant email address, it would probably be helpful once we get to the definition stage to point out that that could be a service provider's email address as long as that functions as a good contact email address for the registrant.

So I think your point is well taken there. And I hope I - that I made sense and was consistent with what you're saying. Greg, you put your hand down so I guess maybe your point was covered. Marc, go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. It's Marc. You know, I think Greg and Rod made a lot of really good points. You know, I talked last week a little bit about the contactability, you know, and for me I think that's really the key. You know, are you able to contact, you know, somebody when you have a purpose to do so.

You know, if at the end of the day, you know, we've, you know, we've achieved contactability then we've, you know, we've sort of met our goals. You know, if we have a bunch of policy decisions that we've made and, you know, you can't contact somebody for a purpose then, you know, we haven't addressed our goals. But sort of, you know, the thing that's in the back of my head is the fax field, which has been mentioned a couple time.

I just don't want us to get into a situation where we're defining a bunch of required fields and, you know, we're collecting fax and, you know, at some point down the road we're going why the heck do we need the fax field anymore? You know, and so, you know, it may be a little pie in the sky to, you know, to want an ultimately flexible system, but you know, I do want to make sure we're not going down a road where we're, you know, shoe-stringing us into something that, you know, limits us in the future. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. This is Chuck. So let's look now at the three key concepts. And I think it's kind of helpful to go through all three of them. We can discuss them individually but let's look at all three. And for the sake of anybody that may still be on the phone, and it looks like Stephanie could still be on the phone only, so let me read those three. In fact, let me ask Lisa to read the three key concepts, would you do that, Lisa?

Lisa Phifer: Sure. Lisa Phifer for the record. So the first key concept and that actually reflects much of what Marc just said is, "Data enabling at least one way to contact the registrant must be collected and included in the RDS." Chuck, did you want to deal with them separately?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, do all three please.

Lisa Phifer: Okay. The second is, "At minimum, the registrant's email address must be collected and included in the RDS." And then the third "Is the data enabling one alternative or preferred method of contact may be optionally collected and included in the RDS."

And I note from the discussion we've already had that there may be some concerns about including the word "registrant" in these key concepts for example, data enabling at least (unintelligible) a contact someone about the domain name must be collected and included in the RDS. Might be an alternative, it's not clear that the contact is necessarily the registrant in all purposes.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa. This is Chuck again. So any discussion about this set of - they kind of go together, they don't have to, like for example, we wouldn't have to have key concept Number 6, we don't have to have Number 5. But really what we did in coming up with these, and Lisa was a major contributor here in her analysis of the results of the poll was we were really trying to be responsive to comments that several of you made on this item in the poll and also - of course we didn't know what you were going to say today but they

also seem to be quite consistent with comments that have been made today in our meeting.

So does anybody have any concerns about any one of these three key concepts? We can go through them one by one but let's just find out first of all, at a high level, are there any of these three that anybody has concern about? Please raise your hand and let us know what it is. Marc.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. This is Marc again. You know, for the first one, I think as Lisa pointed out, you know, it's sort of, you know, the point I've made today, you know, today and last week that, you know, I think one way to contact the registrant, you know, is a requirement so I'm obviously supportive of 4.

You know, I'm not convinced on 5 though. You know, I think people have made some good points that email address is just the most practical and, you know, I'm, you know, I'm appreciative of those points. But I'm not sure that, you know, registrant's email address, you know, must be collected; I think there are other, you know, viable ways that you could have a domain name registration and not have an email address. So I'm not convince on 5, I'm not going to say I'm opposed to it either but I'm not convinced that it's a must.

And on the sixth one, I'd say, you know, data enabling one alternative, you know, it says "may also be optionally collected," you know, I can't imagine why I'd, you know, argue against a key concept that was, you know, "may" and "optionally" in it. You know, it seems a little weak for a key concept to say something may optionally be collected. You know, I think we should maybe consider our conversation on do we have, you know, is it a requirement that there be one primary way to contact somebody and also that a registrant provide an alternative method?

So I'm not sure that you want to have a key concept that there may be an optional way to contact somebody. I think we should discuss is it necessary

for RDS to have a primary method of contact and also an alternative method of contact. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. And while we continue the discussion be thinking about how you might word Number 6 in a way that might work better for you. And I'll come back to you and see if you have an alternative wording. With regard to the requirement to still have an email address, as stated in 5, my question for you, and anybody else that would like to respond to it, is removing that as a requirement worth the - I'll use the word hassle - not a very good one, but hassle of adjusting all of the policies that require an email address now for generic top level domain - second level domains and so on? Is it worth that hassle?

And I think that's kind of what I heard Greg saying, just from a practical point of view, it might be best to just leave email address for now, make sure everyone has one, and it avoids some complications with other policies and so forth.

In the meantime, with something like 6, you can allow for other types of contacts that people may prefer. So maybe you can respond to that, Marc, first.

Marc Anderson: Yes, Marc again. Yes, I'll jump into that again, I mean, I would say just because we're not requiring it in our policy, doesn't mean we're, you know, telling other policies they can't require it. You know, if there's another policy that requires you to collect the email address, then you have to collect that email address to satisfy that policy. I was not at all suggesting we revisit other policies, I was just saying in this policy is it really necessary that we require the email field. And I would say a pro of that is if in the future other policies change then they're not having a conversation going well, we have to revisit the RDS policy too.

Yes, I would not advocate for changing other policies, that wasn't my position, I was just saying I don't think we - I don't think it's a must for our policy. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thank you, Marc. And have you come up with some alternative wording for Number 6? Probably not since I've been focusing on you. But if you do have...

Marc Anderson: No, this is Marc...

((Crosstalk))

Marc Anderson: I can jump in again on that one. And I would suggest it more as maybe a poll question or a discussion topic than a consensus point is, you know, sort of a discussion topic, you know, should we require, you know, an alternative contact method in addition to a primary contact method? You know, I was sort of suggesting that as a discussion point. Thanks, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And we kind of had this in this poll so you're suggesting polling again maybe more specifically. Let me just ask that question right now. How many think that it makes sense to provide an alternative contact method to email? And it could - that could be - there could be variations of that, in other words, email doesn't have to be the primary. There are actually several questions maybe that come out of this. Should there be a primary contact method that someone has to select is one way it could be worded.

So maybe some - two or three poll questions along those lines would be beneficial. How many think that having an alternative contact method besides email makes sense in this day and age? Just put a green checkmark in there. Or if you think that it would be a bad idea, put a red X.

Greg Aaron: Chuck, this is Greg. Are you suggesting as an alternate means or as - the single means?

Chuck Gomes: Well, it could be either way, Greg, that's why I wasn't more specific because we have to agree on some other things before we can decide that. The...

Greg Aaron: So your question is the same as A, in other words? You've got to be more specific here.

Chuck Gomes: Well I don't know that I can be because it depends whether we would require a primary element. Okay? I understand the desire for specificity but there are several variables that come into play here. I'm seeing lots of - or quite a few - several green checks. Ayden, you had a red X in there, can you explain why you would be opposed to - for someone to have an alternate contact? Do you have audio, Ayden? We're not hearing anything if you're trying. Your red X - maybe your red X has gone away. Regardless if you'd like to comment you're welcome to.

All right, let's go to - put your hand up if you do want to come in. Greg, you - and I suspect that you've already made your comment that we need to be more specific. If you have something else to add, feel free.

Greg Aaron: Another way to phrase the question is, "Do you support an additional optional contact means, other than email?" I don't mind that idea at all. But it can't, in my opinion, replace the email.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, that's good. Thanks. Sam, would you like to comment? What is it that you're - are you opposed to - well let me ask you, first of all, since Greg just gave us kind of a better wording than what I did, how do you feel about the way Greg worded it?

Sam Lanfranco: Can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Sam Lanfranco: Am I - okay. Yes, I like Greg, I just think we need something that is required that is asynchronous and it goes somewhere and you can tag it so you know that it got there whether it goes to a privacy proxy email address or something, something that has the features of email, somebody comes up with something new and better, fine, but many of the other social media means are - they obstruct (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Sam. So...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...Andrew, you're up. Do you have audio now?

Andrew Sullivan: Well let's find out. Do I have audio?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Andrew Sullivan: All right. So the concern that I have here is I don't think I fully understand this question. Are we asking do we require at least one contact method whether it be email, something, or are we asking whether we want to require email and then there are contact methods that are also permitted?

Chuck Gomes: So I think it's both. But let's - to deal with your question, let's go back to 4, okay, key concept 4. Data enabling at least one way to contact the registrant must be collected and included in the RDS. Is there anybody that disagrees with that? And you can remove your green X - or your green checkmarks now too please.

So is there anybody - raise your hand and tell us why if you disagree with key concept 4, which is data enabling at least one way to contact the registrant must be collected and included in the RDS. Anybody that disagrees with that? Okay and I should look at the chat too. Okay. Thanks for putting that in

there, Lisa, in the chat. Okay, so we'll accept that one as a rough consensus key concept.

Now, I'm starting but I'm open to discussion on this, to think that maybe a little more polling along the lines of what Greg suggested and others have suggested and dealing with Andrew's question, might be beneficial with regard to questions like should there be a preferred contact method that is required of everyone. Should there - should there be an alternative. Let's not try and refine the wording now, but, Andrew, go ahead.

Andrew Sullivan: So I'm perfectly in confidence with the idea of more polling but I would just - I want to highlight something that I've tried to talk a little bit in the chat and that is historically all of the contact methods that we were talking about in (unintelligible) were based on public standards, right, they're either telephone systems or email addresses.

And then we're going to expand that, I'm just concerned that we make sure that we somehow carve out a requirement that at least one of them be some public standard, because otherwise we have the potential of nailing everybody to a bunch of proprietary communication methodologies you know, for which we cannot assume everybody in the world actually has access to that communication technology. And I think that that's - that would be problematic.

Chuck Gomes: So let me make a suggestion before I jump over to Rod. This is Chuck again. Maybe - what if we were to add that - essentially what you just said, as a key concept, would anybody disagree with that? That at least one contact method has to be standards based? Would anybody object to that as a - throw it again as a key concept. We'll test it in a poll but if not, we'll include that, okay, because that's a really good point that Andrew just made. And...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...an essential one. Go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Chuck, can I jump in? It's Stephanie.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, Stephanie...

((Crosstalk))

Stephanie Perrin: I actually pulled over to talk about a different point, but the - it speaks to my concern about let's say everybody moves to Skype, but there are many countries where you can't use Skype, therefore that particular method isn't going to help you contact the individual if you're in one of those countries and the problem let's say they're taking over everybody's websites in your country, know what I mean?

And that speaks to what I wanted to talk about was what is our harm that we're trying to combat here and do we have a measure of the quality of the data that we're collecting? And I think the answer that I've already reached the conclusion on is, no we don't, we don't have really good quality measures for the data that is in the current RDS, which makes referring back to it somewhat odd.

But if the registrar absolutely can say that on a scale of 1-5 this customer is contactable, then I don't really see that we need a whole lot of optional elements to be contacted and put in the RDS. So if you have an accredited registrar that says yes, yes, I give this customer a 5 because she's had - she's renewed her domains for the last 15 years and I see no signs of it stopping and I can get her on address, and the address of her credit card and blah, blah, blah, then why would we collect that in the RDS? Because if the purpose of the alternate contact is to stop abusive behavior coming from a Website or whatever, then why are we fussing so much? In other words, what problem are we trying to solve? Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: So here's one problem, somebody doesn't use email; they prefer to use a text message to communicate. That would be a solution to that problem, to provide an alternative way assuming that it's at least one contact method is standards-based like Andrew said. That's what comes to mind for me. Let's let Rod jump in because he's had his hand up for a while. Go ahead, Rod.

Rod Rasmussen: Thanks, Chuck. This is Rod Rasmussen. I actually originally put my hand up to agree strongly with Andrew on the need for a standards-based contact. And, you know, email is one that is baked in the process, I know somebody brought up their transfer policy or UDRP policy, there's a whole bunch of stuff so getting - eliminating that is problematic for a domain name, and again I'll refer back to my - not original but my prior comments around we need it for a domain for these purposes and those purposes may be transfers, UDRP, other things, right? So as long as one of the contacts can - that has an email address to satisfy those roles, we're good, in my opinion.

Now, as to what Stephanie just brought on, I think it's important, you know, I go through this example on a daily basis, I was just thinking through this, my kids don't use email, they don't use phone either, they love text and they, you know, they have a Facebook account. My contractor who I can't get a hold of at all via email, but he has an email address, I will, you know, I will call him and say look at your email to see this thing, right? So I've got all these people that I have - I may or may not be able to get them on email but - in fact I usually can but they aren't looking at it, right? And they prefer to get a ping via SMS or a lot of people these days they only pay attention to Facebook.

And that - in 10 years that could be a completely different service, so we don't want to, you know, lock us into something. But you certainly - if you want to have responsiveness, and you want - and so from the requestor or the person reaching out they want to have - make sure that the person getting it might actually see it and the person receiving that actually wants to get it then this alternative methodology of contact is really important concept to be able to support.

And again, I refer back to look at your address book today and how you contact people, and that will often be a different method for each person you're trying to get a hold of. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Rod. Now I'm going to give a little assignment to all of you who are interested in doing it. We're going to create - the leadership team is going to create a poll in the next few hours, okay? And there seems to be some at least supporting the idea that we poll - we ask some questions that get down into a little more specific with regard to 5 and 6, okay.

What I'd like to propose - I'm giving you an opportunity - you don't always have this but to suggest some wording of questions to poll on. Okay? If you will - if any of you want to suggest some questions for us to poll on, to dig down a little bit deeper and more specifically for 5 and 6 here, if you'll do that in the next 30 minutes, in other words, 20 minutes after our meeting ends, assuming we end on time, which I'll try to do, the - you have that opportunity. Otherwise, we will try to capture what we heard and come up with the questions on our own. But this is an opportunity for each of you to have some input on that.

Just send it to the working group list, okay? In the next 30 minutes, so that's about 20 minutes after our scheduled meeting ending time. Now what I want to do, I want to move ahead, okay, so if you'll scroll down to the next page, and let's take a look at these other contacts - contact categories, admin contact, technical contact, registrar abuse contact, privacy proxy contact.

Now we're looking back at poll results two polls okay, on the screen, and you can see there was pretty strong support, remember what that support column is, is a sum of two points for strongly agree, one for agree, minus one for neutral, and minus two for disagree. And - or excuse me, nothing for neutral, two - minus two for strongly disagree and minus one for disagree, that's what

that total means for those that weren't on the call last week or didn't listen to the recording.

So there was pretty strong support for all of these things. Now the first three we've already been covering, okay, so start with 16 there, and in fact we've already been dealing with that one as well so you really start with 25 and down there. And I don't know if we're going to need to go through all of these in a lot of detail, there's already been some comments on technical contact on our list over the last few weeks that have been pretty good. There are people that use it, there are people that think it's not necessary anymore. But let's just real quickly get some thoughts going on admin contact.

Now we're not going to dig down into what admin contact details would be included at this point. But is the admin contact whatever elements that includes, should that be included in the RDS? What do you think? Marc.

Marc Anderson: Hey, Chuck, it's Marc again. I'd really like us to, you know, to get into the concept of roles. And you know, I think on the next page, jumping ahead to 6, you talk about are these contact types and then in brackets you say roles needed. You know, I think, you know, I don't like having a required set of predefined contact types that may or may not be applicable to every registration.

Which is why I think the roles concept, and I think that was, you know, you know, a pretty key part of the EWG recommendations, I think the roles concept is really good and worth us considering because, you know, if I'm registering a domain on my own, I might be the registrant admin, tech contact, you know, I might be all of those things. On the other hand, I may have a technical provider that's doing the tech contact role and so I might want to have a different person doing that role.

So I like the roles concept, you know, I think it's something we should you know, we should delve into a little bit more, you know, in this working group

as, you know, as, you know, as a path forward here, you know, rather than saying admin, tech, billing are all required contacts, you know, I think we should look at, you know, what are the roles and you know, allow registrants the flexibility of specifying who to contact in the case of those particular roles. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: So, Marc, I guess everybody may want to scroll down to Slide 6 because it lists the four types of contacts there. I've always thought that any of those could be roles, what's different now in what you're suggesting?

Marc Anderson: Well, they are roles but in sort of today's, you know, in sort of today's implementation you know, you're required to provide a separate, you know, registrant admin technical contact even if the same person is providing, you know, is performing all those roles. And the EWG recommended many different potential roles, the one that's popping in my head right now is legal, you have a legal contact, who do you contact, right?

Chuck Gomes: By the way, we kept that one and the business contact separate just for today's meeting, okay, we're going to get to that, so that's right.

Marc Anderson: Yes, so I just think the, you know, the EWG's approach to that is a lot more flexible. You know, I think it's a better implementation. You know, I think, you know, frustration with the existing model is some people, you know, go to register a domain name and they enter the same information four times, you know, this, you know, the EWG roles approach, you know, if you're doing the entire registration yourself and you're the only person to contact for every role, then I think it's easier to - easier to do that. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. Rod.

Rod Rasmussen: Rod Rasmussen here. And I - thank you, Marc, first off, that's exactly the point I was going to make. So two things, one is the main is separate from contacts, you only need one actual contact for a domain and that contact can

serve all the roles, you could - then it comes down to defining roles and what you may or may not want to have available as roles that you'd split out. So if you only provide one contact you assume all the roles. If you want to subdivide, and this gets into the question of an admin contact that I want to talk to specifically, then you could do so.

The reason for having an admin contact, I believe, versus a registrant or a technical contact, which is the other places you may try and lump those kinds of administrative duties to, is the following. A, I may, as a company, unless the go to corporate registration, want to register my name to my corporate entity and make sure that that is locked in to me as the - to me, legal entity, me as the corporation, the corporation you know, basically owns, controls, whatever, that domain name.

However, I have a department where a person who's responsible for administering the domain, it is not the company, it is an actual role or a person that is the administrator of things, whatever those things may be, they may be technical things, but that administrative person may not want to deal with technical issues or they may be some sort of technical person that handles things like is the DNS properly configured, is the email working, etcetera, etcetera.

And that would be a technical contact, because there's kind of administrative role which is separate from an ownership slash control perspective, that is important to have for at least some classifications of domain registrant. And I want to separate those two concepts, and that's why I would want to have this admin concept. However, that is just a role, and can be again, separate that out from the domain itself, it is a role for the domain that can be attached to a particular contact object. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Rod. So my question, as we come to the end here, is how can we best grapple with these contact types or contact roles? Should we use the EWG approach and deliberate on them that way? Does anybody have any

suggestions about how best to do this? And we could add the other two new ones, legal and business contacts, that are in the EWG report as well, which we have targeted for later, but that could come at the same time. Greg, go ahead.

Greg Aaron: This is Greg Aaron. The traditional contact types have been around since the dawn of time. And I think one of the things that happened over time is people lost sight of what they were originally meant to do. For example, the registrant is the so called owner of record, but it's always - it was implied for a lot of the time that the registrant was also a legal contact because the registrant is legally responsible for the domain.

And I think one of the things that the EWG tried to do is go back and say these were the meanings of these contacts. What I also think the EWG did was multiply the types of contacts unnecessarily perhaps, trying to slice things too fine when maybe what we need to do is simply define when we say admin contact, this is what it's for, this is what it means when we say registrant contact, this is what it is for and this is what it means.

So we should look at the past assumptions and then decide whether new ones make sense and there might also be an opportunity to explain to people going forward when you designate an admin contact, this is what it's for and this is how it should be used, that kind of thing. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Hey, quick question, Greg. This is Chuck. If you're looking at Slide 6, are you relatively comfortable with the potential responsibilities listed for the four contacts there?

Greg Aaron: Well it's interesting, well we don't have registrant there.

Chuck Gomes: Right, we've already covered registrant.

Greg Aaron: And, no, actually, I'm not. The admin contact was actually in a lot of ways about domain administration, which is not handled under that definition. And then you have to decide whether the admin actually subsumes the abuse function or the technical does. So, I don't think those are there yet.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. This is Chuck. So in - as we wrap this up, I'm thinking that maybe we should do what Marc said and talk about the roles - approach this from a role standpoint, it may or may not be a separate contact. Does that make sense or does somebody have a different suggestion in terms of how to approach these various types of contact needs? And sorry, I'm not keeping up with chat very well. So there's some support for the roles concept. Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. Lisa Phifer for the record. Yes, I see a number of people supporting the idea of discussing what roles might be necessary regardless of how they might be mapped then to contact data. I also see some support in chat a little less than that, regarding potential re's of contact information and what the requirements might be around that. So those seem to be two somewhat orthogonal lines of discussion.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, well we are out of time. Greg, is that an old hand? If not, you can speak. Thanks, okay. All right, and Lisa, did you want to add something there?

Lisa Phifer: No, old hand.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. All right, so we have reached the end of our time. Remember, if you would like to suggest some wording for some follow up poll questions regarding alternate contact and primary contact, anything along those lines, please do it in the next 20 minutes or so and then we - the leadership team will take that input. And just do it on the main list, okay?

Let's - we have some action items, somebody from staff want to go over the action items?

Lisa Phifer: Sure, Chuck. There's the action item that you just mentioned, which is working group members can suggest alternative wording for key concepts 5 and 6. Those the key concepts 5 and 6, we discussed today and listed in this slide deck. By 1800 UTC, do that on list for inclusion in this week's poll and the staff will include those as possible options in this week's poll.

Staff also has the option - or option - the action to develop other poll questions to test support for the alternative definition, we came up for poll Question 2 regarding RDS policy must include a definition for every gTLD registration data element including both a semantic definition and by reference to appropriate standards as syntax definition. That will be tested - support will be tested for that in the poll.

And we will record the working agreement on registrant country. And in this week's poll we will also include the key concept that was largely supported in this week's call for Question 4, which is the data enabling at least one way to contact the registrant must be collected and included in the RDS. So those are the items you'll find in this week's poll.

Chuck Gomes: And I think there's one more, I threw in based on Andrew's suggestion that a key concept - and we can change that if we want - about the - at least one contact method needs to be standards-based.

Lisa Phifer: Yes. Got it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. All right, and I'm sure there's a better way to word it than I just did, but all right, anything else? Okay, so we'll have a poll out hopefully end of the day today, certainly first thing tomorrow. And try and respond. They should be - we'll try to design them so they're pretty easy to respond to and it's probably

easier if you participated in the meeting but for those who didn't hopefully they'll listen to the recording, look at the transcript and so forth.

So is there anything else we need to talk about today before I adjourn? Okay and thanks for the input on our roles approach and other approach for approaching these other contact types. We'll do our best to incorporate that in our next meeting.

And our next meeting will be a week from today on August the 1st at the same time, so look forward to everything - and as far as discussion on the list this week, anything related to what we discussed in this meeting or in the polls including how to approach the additional types of roles is open for discussion this week. So thanks, everybody, the - and let me just check one more thing here. The - so all of us have homework with regard to discussing the three questions on Slide 6 on list, okay. Lisa, why don't you quickly explain what that is? Are you there, Lisa?

Lisa Phifer: Sure. Yes, apologies, just catching up. So I think the homework then is for the roles that are listed on Slide 6, at the moment do not think of these as discrete contacts or data elements, but looking at the roles on Slide 6, discuss the three questions that you see at the top of Slide 6, which are these roles really needed? How do the roles differ from each other? And there's a third question, how might they be different from the registrant.

Chuck Gomes: So for the sake of facilitating list discussion, let's send out - and I'm going to add an action item there, let's send out those three questions that is - and encourage people to discuss those on the list between now and our next meeting related to those four contact types, okay? All right, sorry to go over again, in the next 20 minutes or so if you want to suggest some poll questions for key concepts 5 and 6 from Question 4, in this week's - last week's poll, please do so. In the meantime have a good rest of the day and rest of the week. Thanks, everybody. Meeting adjourned and the recording can stop.

Julie Bisland: Thanks so much, everybody. Today's meeting is adjourned. Operator, could you please stop the recording? Have a great day, all.

END