ICANN
Transcription
Next-Gen RDS PDP Working group call
Tuesday, 8 August 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/gnso/gnso-nextgen-rds-pdp-08aug17-en.mp3

AC recording: https://participate.icann.org/p7cfo388w6d/

Attendance is on the wiki agenda page: https://community.icann.org/x/WGfwAw

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page http://gnso.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 8th of August, 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?

Daniel Nanghaka: Daniel here. I'm on the audio bridge but I'll be joining the Adobe Connect in the next 20 minutes. Thank you.

Julie Bisland: All right, thank you. Okay and hearing no further 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 background noise. And with this I'll just turn it back over to Chuck Gomes.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Julie. Welcome, everyone, to our meeting today. Does anyone have a statement of interest update? Margie, go ahead.

Margie Milam: Hi, Chuck. It's Margie Milam. I just wanted to let you guys know I've joined the working group as a member. I am working for Facebook now and a member of the BC.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Margie, and welcome. Anyone else? All right, let's jump right into our agenda, so if we can switch the slides in Adobe, we'll get started. We're continuing on our deliberation of data elements beyond the minimum public data set that we've been working on for a few weeks now. And even though the charter question talks about stored and disclosed, we're really focusing on collection right now so let's keep that in mind as we do this.

Now the first slide that you see on the screen right now are the agreements that we've reached in the last few weeks, and let me very quickly go through those, okay, and keep in mind these are tentative agreements that we've reached at least rough consensus on. All of these can be revisited later if other factors change our thinking but for right now, we've reached pretty good agreement on all of these. Number 25 the registrant country must be included in RDS data elements, it must be mandatory to collect for every domain registration. Number 26, RDS policy must include a definition for every gTLD registration data element including both a semantic definition and by reference to appropriate standards, a syntax definition.

Number 27, at least one element identifying the domain name registrant, that is the registered name holder, must be collected and included in the RDS. Twenty eight, data enabling at least one way to contact the registrant must be collected and included in the RDS. And then Number 29, at a minimum one or more email addresses must be collected for every domain name included in the RDS for contract roles that require an email address for contactability, that's one of the more recent ones you'll recognize hopefully.

Proposed Number 30, still did some polling on that. In addition to email address, data enabling one alternative method of contact must be collected

and included in the RDS, so we'll look at that a little bit more today. Thirty one, at least one element enabling contact must be based on an open standard and not a proprietary communication method. Because these agreements get spread out over several weeks and all of these relate to the data elements beyond the minimum set. We thought it would be good to just refresh everybody's memory of what's happened over the last several weeks.

Going down then, if you scroll down to the next slide or at the bottom of the first slide, I guess it's Page 2 there which is the August 1 poll results, okay, from last week, you can see the results in front of you. I won't go through those because you can read them and even if you're not in Adobe hopefully you have access to them on our wiki.

So the - you can see there's somewhat of a - somewhat of a split between A and C with pretty comparable results, and those aren't really totally mutually exclusive. So what we're going to propose on this one is some compromise language here and we'll discuss that. For resiliency, data enabling alternative or preferred methods of contact should be included in the RDS. Further deliberation to determine whether such elements should be optional or mandatory to collect.

So in other words, those who supported A and B really - the main difference really is whether it should be optional to collect or mandatory to collect and they were almost equal, not quite, in terms of position there. Rather than spend time at this stage debating whether it should be optional or mandatory, the leadership team is suggesting that we recognize that that hasn't been decided but we will deal with that later.

And right now we will suggest a tentative conclusion that data enabling alternative or preferred methods of contact should be included in the RDS. Alan, you're first. Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I've been on vacation and missed a few meetings. What does "data enabling" mean?

Chuck Gomes: That's a good question. Lisa, can you help us on that?

Lisa Phifer: Sure, Chuck. Lisa Phifer for the record. It's a reference to data elements that enable contact with either an alternative or preferred method.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Does that help, Alan?

Alan Greenberg: It's a dandy definition but it's not intuitively obvious at all. We may want to change wording when we go - as we go forward, thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And if you have a suggestion there, Alan, even today feel free to make it, we'd appreciate that. Stephanie, you're next.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks, Chuck. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I just wonder if we could clarify, Andrew raised very interesting points in the list just prior to the meeting about this whole definition of RDS or DDS and I think there's some confusing because if we are talking about RDS as the display mechanism, i.e., the replacement for Whois, then we're also talking about disclosure. And that makes a big difference in terms of how you interpret these things. In other words, if the question is should two methods of contact be displayed in the Whois, that's a different question than should an additional one be collected if you follow me.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: I just want a little…

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead. Stephanie, go ahead and finish, I'm sorry to interrupt.

Stephanie Perrin: I just - no, no it's fine. I just wonder if we could clarify what we're talking about? Is it being disclosed? Is it being required to be collected? And only available in a tiered access system, etcetera, etcetera. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Stephanie. And thanks for the discussion that was initiated by Michele just prior to our - start of our meeting. And I saw that Marc, I think also responded in that thread. But I have - myself haven't had time to look at those because I was getting ready - making sure I was on the call on time and so forth. So I suggest that we hold an action on that for either on the list or a future meeting after more discussions happen on the list after all - and after all of us have had a chance to participate in that discussion and read what's gone on.

If somebody - if any of you dislike that approach and want to deal with it now we can try but I think it'll be more time consuming if we try and deal with it right now. Are there any objections to dealing with that in the coming week and maybe next meeting?

Okay, if not then at the same time, understanding that we will be responsive to the issues that are being discussed right now with regard to RDS and RDDS. Are there any objections to accepting the key concept that is on the screen on Page 2 as a rough consensus conclusion at this stage of our work? Okay, and again action - an action item or probably our first action item out of this meeting other than capturing this key concept will be to follow up on the discussion on RDS and RDDS so thanks, Michele, for starting the discussion, Andrew and Marc and probably others by now who have already entered into the dialogue on that.

Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Chuck. Michele for the record. Just briefly, first off, sorry for not kicking that off sooner, but I was up to my eyeballs in various different things and then I decided to take the Irish Bank holiday weekend as an actual

holiday and not spend my entire time sending work-related emails so only got around to doing it today.

We've already had a couple of people responding to what I put there so I would recommend that other members of the group have a read over both what I posted and what others have posted in reply. And if there's anything that's unclear to please ask because I think we, you know, there's definitely some interesting discussion to be had there. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. And so that brings us to another - and this is Chuck speaking - that brings us to another action item. This will be an action item for all members to follow the discussion that Michele initiated shortly before this meeting and enter into the discussion so that by the time we get to our meeting next week hopefully we will have made some progress in terms of that. First of all in understanding the issues but secondly maybe in terms of refining some of our language in the key concepts and other things that we've concluded to date so that's an action item for everyone.

Okay, I think we can move on. Sorry, I should glance at the chat. Anyway if somebody saw something in there that I should bring up please let me know because I'm behind on the chat. So going then to the next page of the slides that are on the screen, Page 3, which is the - which shows the results for Question 3, and we're going to - we'll pause for a little bit so that you can see the results, if you haven't already looked at those. But what we're going to do is we're going to discuss the results for Question 3 and Question 4 together. Okay, but let's just pause a minute and let people who maybe have not looked at the results very closely, let - yet to look at those for Question 3.

You can see that fairly significant support for C and F in particular. Although there were others - other opinions on that one. Scrolling down then to Question 4, and you have scrolling capability so you can move back and forth between Question 3 and Question 4, so feel free to do that as you need to. You can see the results here, and again we'll pause a little bit so that those

who haven't looked at these much yet have an opportunity to do a quick review of them as we get ready to discuss the results.

And see the highlighted options that got the most support, and notice - people could select - I think everyone is aware of this - you could select more than one option and that's why the percentages don't add up to 100%. So see it there. Now, to kick off discussion here, I'm going to ask the question you see at the bottom of Question 4 results there. What is the benefit or disadvantage of stating each specific requirement whether that be a requirement for the number of alternative contacts, or whether it be identification of a particular type of contact like a telephone number or a postal address or a - etcetera.

So and this really relates to both Question 3 and 4. I think it might be helpful as we kick off the discussion on these two questions to understand what member thinking is with regard to advantages or disadvantages of being very specific about the number of contacts or about what the types of contacts are. So let me be quiet and open it up for discussion.

Daniel Nanghaka: Daniel, can I say something?

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Daniel Nanghaka: Yes, Daniel for the record. When it comes to specific contacts, I feel that the postal address may not be - may not be able to bring so much strong information, for like these reasons, because give an African perspective, especially like Uganda (unintelligible) perspective whereby different registrants do not necessarily have these postal addresses. But if probably the physical address could be linked to the data that is being collected together with a different emails, which have to go through verification, I think that would provide probably (unintelligible) information. Thank you. Back to you, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Daniel. And this is Chuck. And I'm going to ask you a follow up question. So did I understand you to support the inclusion of a postal address or did I misunderstand you?

Daniel Nanghaka: Daniel for the record. I do not support the inclusion of postal addresses. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, so you do not support that. Now, I want to call your attention to one of the comments - I think it was Michael Hammer that submitted it. Michael made a comment - let me check real quick, doesn't look like he's on the phone although otherwise I'd let him talk to it. But he made the point that he thought that some - in some jurisdictions, any legal notices have to be sent to a postal address. Now, assuming he's accurate there, and I have no reason to believe that he's not, then might it be necessary to include a physical address?

And I'm just throwing that out for discussion. And I hope others will enter into the discussion on this. Jonathan, go ahead. Are you on mute, Jonathan? Doesn't look like it but we're not hearing anything. Still not hearing anything, Jonathan. I see you said - put something in the chat. Okay, yes, go ahead and try and fix your mic.

Jonathan Matkowsky: Okay, did I fix it okay?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, you're coming through now, thank you.

Jonathan Matkowsky: Can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Jonathan Matkowsky: All right, sorry about that. I just wanted to mention that under other ICANN policies and procedures, postal office is required for - to meet the process, for example, under the UDRP. The provider has to send the notice out by fax, by

postal mail and by postal mail. That's also common in the UK, for example, under Nominet's procedure. It has to be sent by courier and a copy of the receipt must be uploaded into the docket.

So - and that's also true actually for a lot of the providers under the UDRP. They have to provide proof of sending it by postal, by courier, in some cases. And if it doesn't reach the recipient for due process's sake, it would be noted to the provider to consider as a substantive matter on the merits in the decision.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Those are very important points for us to consider. This is Chuck again. I'm going to come back to Daniel, note, Daniel, that if you got into Adobe you may not have yet, but that Greg Aaron asked for a little more explanation of why you did that. And I see that - who was it that - the chat's going really fast, Kal, I think tried to answer for you. But I open it up to you if you'd like to provide further explanation. What Kal said in the chat is I think the reasoning was that it isn't particularly reliable in the speaker's region. Is that correct, Daniel, was that your reason for not requiring a postal address?

Daniel Nanghaka: Daniel for the record.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, go ahead.

Daniel Nanghaka: Yes, one thing that's…

Chuck Gomes: Did we lose you?

Julie Bisland: Daniel's line has dropped. We're going to try to get him back.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so we'll come back to Daniel. Now the follow up, and others are welcome to respond to this, if we didn't require it, and this is the question I was going to ask Daniel, and maybe I still can if he gets back on, is if we

didn't require it then, how do we deal with these other policies and requirements that do require it? It's something. Now we have the opportunity when we ultimately recommend any policy to do so even if it affects other policies but that would require implementation action in the cases of those other things, but that's the question I was going to ask - the next question I was going to ask Daniel. So if he gets back in we'll try that. Let's go to James. Jim.

Jim Galvin: So James Galvin for the record. Thanks, Chuck. I'd like to suggest that we approach this question of, you know, which contact elements to include from a different direction. You know, my motivation for this is we're sitting here talking about is postal address should require or not. Well, you know, just like any of the various contact methods, whether it's postal address, phone number, fax number, you know, mobile number, email address, you know, different people will have different reasons for wanting to give one or the other. Different jurisdictions may have reasons for wanting one or the other.

And so the question that I would ask us is to step back and think at a higher level, what problem are we trying to solve by having these contact methods? And so I'll just make an assertion for discussion, I think that, you know, our requirement, the problem that we're trying to solve is just that the registrant be reachable and be contactable. And so now the question we have to ask ourselves is do we actually care and then I would ask why, you know, which one of those methods is the way to contact them?

So you know, I tend to side on the - I'm biased in favor of there should be, you know, more than one method of contact but I don't find myself compelled or motivated to pick any one over another at the moment. And I know that one of your follow up questions is going to be, well, you know, if we just leave the door open what about all these other policies we have which say you've got to send it by postal or you've got to send it by email and various other things, I think that, you know, those policies I'll assert a position in a relatively provocative way to spark some discussion here, but I think that, you know,

we need to get with the 21st Century here, people are allowed to choose how they want to be contacted.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jim.

Jim Galvin: I'm sorry if I'm talking…

Chuck Gomes: Daniel, I'm going to come back to you in a minute so I'm glad you're back on. But let me follow up with Jim first of all. Thanks, Jim.

Daniel Nanghaka: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Really I think constructive input there. And what I want to do - what I want everybody to do in follow up to Jim is skip ahead just briefly to Slide Number 5 on the screen because we're going to get there. And this really starts to deal with what Jim is talking about. You can see that what staff did is they categorized the comments that - on Question 5 by several things. One of them is contactability which Jim made reference to, and resiliency, and a preference for type of contact, which Jim actually talk about. Another one that people mentioned was abuse reporting and so forth.

And then if you skip down to Slide 6, and we're not there yet, but our plan is to ask these four questions, and we may expand it in our discussion about this. And, Jim, you gave us a really good lead in to this. So we'll be asking some of the things - I think directly related to what you're suggesting. And then going beyond that we'll talk about whether okay, should it just be fairly flexible as long as there are multiple points of contact. But very good comment.

Now I want to go back to Daniel, Daniel, are you there?

Daniel Nanghaka: Yes, I'm here.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thank you. So a follow up - was Kal correct when he said that your concern about postal address was primarily because the postal addresses are not very reliable in - I think you said Uganda, is that right?

Daniel Nanghaka: Yes, that's right. I mentioned an example of Uganda. And also it's the same when you go to (unintelligible) when you go to Tanzania and very many African countries.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So my next question to you that I asked just after you dropped off so the rest of the people have heard it, is, okay, so what would - how would you suggest we deal with other areas of ICANN policy and requirements and contracts and so forth that require a postal address?

Daniel Nanghaka: One thing that the postal address can be (unintelligible) as an option but also if we could identify the physical addresses which can be used to locate the different registrants who have to go through all this. So we have like multiple or - alternatives whereby in case one fails (unintelligible) alternative, that makes sense.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Daniel. And I think if I understood correctly, you're kind of confirming what Jim just said in that we need to have some flexibility there as long as there are multiple points of contact. So thanks for that. And like I said earlier, we're not required when we make policy recommendations as a PDP working group to be in compliance with every other requirement and policies that exist. But if we make recommendations that impact those sorts of things, we need to reflect that in our implementation plan to the extent that the working group would work on an implementation plan.

So just because, for example, I'll pick on the UDRP requirement for postal address, just because that requires a postal address, doesn't mean that we can't recommend that postal address is not mandatory. I'm not suggesting we shouldn't recommend that, I'm just trying to make sure everybody understands that if we do make a recommendation that impacts something

like the UDRP policy, then that needs to be dealt with in the implementation in case any adjustments need to be made there. So hopefully I didn't confuse you more than help. But let me be quiet and go to Greg Shatan.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. It's Greg Shatan for the record. I think the whole discussion of the last 15 minutes or so points to the need for a plurality of contact information. Personally I'm in favor of the holy trinity of email, phone and postal address. I suppose it's possible that all three will be unreliable for a given person even in good faith. But it seems, you know, vanishingly unlikely the more that you add in you know, as we move into the 21st Century it's possible other ways may prevail but I think we're still more or less aligned along those three.

And I think the solution is not to withdraw the requirement for a postal address because it is, you know, reliable and preferred for many purposes in many regions, but to make sure that is bolstered with other forms of address so that if it is not reliable you're not stuck. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. Well said. This is Chuck. Alan, you're next, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I generally agree that we need to move forward and we don't want to be stuck on old fashioned technology. On the other hand, the street address, you know, typically everyone has an address whether it's reliable means or not and therefore it is a mechanism of identification and I'm not sure I would want to see that dropped. But going forward I think we need to, you know, be flexible to make sure that people are or registrants are reachable. But, you know, the mechanism may vary.

With regarding other policies such as UDRP, I think the statement is stronger than what you said, Chuck. You said in the implementation we have to cover it. This is a policy development process, a PDP, and we are allowed to make recommendations to change any policy. So if indeed the UDRP currently says you must use a postal address and we are going to - if we recommend that postal address no longer be mandatory, then part of our process has to

include a recommended change to the UDRP to factor that in, it's not just the implementation, it's actually the policy itself that we're going to have to change in parallel with whatever else we decide. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. Well said. Greg Aaron, you're next.

Greg Aaron: Thank you, Chuck. This is Greg. I do want to reiterate what Greg and Alan just said and also make an observation about what Daniel said. In all of these pieces of data and so forth, there are always exceptions and corner cases. But exceptions and corner cases are usually not compelling enough to negate the rule. Daniel mentioned there are some people who don't have a structured mailing or postal address, and this is true. But what we have seen over the last 20 years in practice is that people put something into that address field as best they can. And sometimes you may see something like my address is third those down from the city hall or something like that, you'll see that but that's the best a person can do. That's okay.

But most registrants do have a structured address, well above 90% I'm sure. And so the absence of structured addresses for some people is not a compelling reason to drop the requirement to have a postal address for everybody else. And again, because as Greg and Alan said, that is a very useful and often quite reliable way of contacting people.

So my plea is, bring up exceptions but let's make sure that they don't drag everything down…

((Crosstalk))

Greg Aaron: …and exceptions, if they come up, they need to be compelling ones that we'll have to deal with in policy. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. Again, well said. In fact this is a great discussion. I'm hoping that everything that's being said will lead us to some key concepts that we

can agree on out of all this because a lot of excellent points are being made. So - and this is Chuck speaking. Let's go to Jonathan. Jonathan Matkowsky.

Jonathan Matkowsky: Jonathan Matkowsky for the record. I think it's very important to take into account that there are literally hundreds of years of jurisprudence, I'd imagine not only in the United States but I could talk at least to some of the federal courts in the US that I'm familiar with and the constitution that discuss in quite a lot of detail the importance of the (unintelligible) methods of service of process and the importance of that for due process.

So while we could make recommendations to change the UDRP, I think we have to, you know, recognize that those kinds of requirements are based upon legal analysis of due process requirements, they take into account considerations of formality and the signal that certain types of notice sent to a person - the informality potentially of, you know, receiving a text message versus mail. And even in cases where courts allow for publication or email as a method, you know, they require for constitutional in the US due process requirements that traditional methods of service will be complied with.

And if we're going to make recommendations to change that, I think we need to call in the legal - at least some legal experts just like we did with respect to the data requirements from a data privacy perspective, we need to take into account the legal complexities of making such a recommendation and make sure we have the experts involved before we would go down that route. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jonathan. Points well taken. But I want to empathize, in talking about - and the UDRP example just was an example okay, nobody is advocating making changes to that policy at this point. I just wanted to make sure - and I think Alan was reinforcing the same thing, we're not restricted because of requirements in other policies in our recommendations. But at the same time, let me emphasize that it would be naïve of us not to consider implications of things like that.

And it's okay for us to make a decision based on how it might implicate other policies, and create other work and even due diligence work like Jonathan was just talking about. So it's okay for us to consider, you know, is this so important that we want to cause this extra work that's going to be required in other policies? Those are factors that we can take into consideration when we make recommendations. So thanks. Jim, you're up again.

Jim Galvin: Thanks, Chuck. James Galvin for the record. I just want to summarize what I was saying before and ask the following question. You know, what problem are we trying to solve? You know, there's a lot of discussion about postal address here and (unintelligible) that for the most part it seems the most prevailing reason for keeping postal address is because that's what we've always done. And, you know, I'm still stuck with the idea that what is the purpose of this group and what is it we're trying to solve? What is the purpose of registration data? And, you know, the purpose of contact information is to be able to contact a registrant.

Why do we think that we have to emphasize one choice over another instead of just suggesting here the set of choices you know, pick X number of them. So I'm looking for more discussion on exactly why a particular contact element is the preferred mandatory one versus just saying, you've got to give me at least two and here's the set you can choose from. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jim. This is Chuck again. And I don't think I heard anybody say that postal address is the preferred mandatory one. I think a lot of people support the fact that it should be mandatory but not necessarily preferred. So let me ask in response to what Jim just said, a lot of people have pointed out in our discussion so far on this, that there are some real advantages to having multiple contacts. Does anybody disagree with the fact that there are advantages to having multiple types of contacts? And Jonathan, is that an old hand or is that a new hand?

Okay, Marc, you're up.

Marc Anderson: Actually, Chuck, this is Marc Anderson. I have a request for clarification. When you say there are advantages to having multiple contacts, can you clarify, do you mean contact types, contact data or…

((Crosstalk))

Marc Anderson: …actual people? You know, are you saying - so you are saying there needs to be an admin contact, a registrant, a billing, a technical, a legal, is that what you're asking?

Chuck Gomes: No, I was really getting at for - any of those categories it may be advantageous to have different types of contacts in terms of mode of communications. So email, postal address, phone, fax, I'm not sure that's one we'll go for, but that's what I'm talking about.

Marc Anderson: Okay, then I would interpret that to mean you're asking if there are advantages to having multiple contact methods or multiple…

Chuck Gomes: That's good.

Marc Anderson: …ways of contacting the registrant…

Chuck Gomes: That is correct.

Marc Anderson: …not multiple contacts which to me has different meaning.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks for clarifying.

Marc Anderson: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: All right, Greg Aaron.

Greg Aaron: This is Greg Aaron. I'm going to address Jim Galvin's question, which is that Jim asked, "Why should we specify specific contact methods and instead just say one or two or however many are required." This isn't actually question I think that is important enough to answer in policy, specifically which types of contact information are required. If we as the community do not answer those questions, then it will get decided by somebody else in an implementation phase.

And we don't know who that would be. But I would suggest that this is the kind of question that must be answered by the working group and not left to some unknown party to choose at some point. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Good point, Greg. Thanks. This is Chuck. Alan, you're up.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I'll point out the comment Jonathan just made, which is for due process a formal mailing address is required. And I was going to allude to that. I don't know to what extent that is correct in what jurisdictions or not. But if the only place that a postal address is explicitly mentioned is in the UDRP, then if we are debating whether omit the postal address as an option or not we should be talking to UDRP providers. I don't know if there are any on this call right now.

You know, they have lots of experience in how reliable contacting registrants is in various circumstances. And if we are going to make a change or thinking about making a change which might impact them, they need to be involved in the discussion. And as I said, I don't know to what extent there are any on this call, I haven't heard any people talk from that perspective at this point. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. You definitely motivated some hands going up, so let's see if Greg and Jonathan can add something there. Greg, you're first.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. It's Greg Shatan for the record. I'll assume that that's the Greg. In any case, I don't think that UDRP is the only place where we're talking about addresses or even the only place where we're talking about due process and the use of addresses. There are, I think, and I'm not going to speak for Jonathan, obviously he can speak for himself, but to my mind, you know, the concept of due process applies broadly to the ability to - to receive notice and to be aware of proceedings in which you are being involved. So those can be court proceedings, other types of arbitration proceedings, and, you know, whatever other highways and byways in which due process, you know, is part of - and the service of process are relevant.

So I would look at UDRP as a case but not the case for use of postal addresses and of course we're just talking about trying to send people something in the mail, this is not the most disturbing development that I can think of. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. Chuck again. Jonathan, your turn.

Jonathan Matkowsky: Yes, Jonathan Matkowsky for the record. I agree with Greg that due process is obviously not just about the UDRP. It comes from the courts as well and, you know, years of jurisprudence. There's a reason why the court (unintelligible) the concept of snail mail and it being required in many cases to accomplish due process not withstanding modern technologies.

So to give a couple of examples that come to mind, you can't deprive someone of their property, for example, without due process of law. And if you go to court and you subpoena this information, assuming like Stephanie is pointing out if I understood correctly, that we're talking about even the collection and not necessarily the publication, this information collected must be provided under a subpoena to the complainant in a Jane Doe or John Doe case, for example.

And that information is provided for the purposes of applying due process, that the - you don't take someone's property away without complying with their constitutional requirement. And in all - I don't know of one jurisdiction in the United States that would allow for that deprivation of property without proving that an effort wasn't made to - not an effort, that you didn't try to - that you didn't actually effectually service by a physical mailing address.

If we don't have that information, yes, I guess we could make recommendations to the court to change those laws, and we can make, based on our recommendations, but no one's going to listen. And we should bring in the experts before we do it and to account for the implications. So it's not just the UDRP, there's a reason why this jurisprudence exists and we should really proceed here with real caution because we're talking about potentially depriving people of their property without due process of law.

Chuck Gomes: So one of the things I'd like to suggest is that if points have already been made, let's try not to repeat them, it's okay to say yes, I agree with that in the chat, or something like that, but for time sake let's try not to keep repeating ourselves and thins. A lot of excellent points have been made.

Now before I go to Marc, apologize, Marc, and Paul who are in the queue now, but I want to go to a couple comments, and Stephanie, I'm going to pick on you for a little bit. Apologize. But you said as long as - oops, I got to scroll up, just a second. Your first comment just went away. You said, "As long as there's a contact method, the individual can be contacted and asked to provide the postal address as required." That assumes that the contact method that's available works.

And even if it's an accurate contact information there are failures in various methods of communication. So I'd like you to respond to that. But also you later commented I think in response to Alan that - you said, "I realize that this is the attitude of ICANN, which has prevailed over the years and resulted in over-collection of data. Not acceptable from a privacy perspective." And I do

understand from the answers that we got from the data protection experts and so forth, that there are - there is value in minimizing the data we collect. But we do have methods now and no method is full proof completely, but we do have methods to restrict access to this information to very limited parties who have a definite need to know when there's a clear purpose and we'll have to agree on those purposes.

So Stephanie, if you'd like to respond to my points there, you're welcome to right now.

Stephanie Perrin: Hi. It's Stephanie Perrin for the record. Over collection is over collection, Chuck. The profound problem that we have, it seems to me, and that we're not unfamiliar with in the data protection business, is that there's a lack of track of registrants. And you can see that over the years the requirements that have been imposed on registrants in terms of the registration data collected, the escrow and retained, speak eloquently of the lack of trust of registrants.

Now, there may be a lack of trust of other participants in electronic commerce transactions, but you will find generally that things that are subject to country or jurisdictional law you still don't get to collect every single data element in order to establish some trust measure on the part of the ones providing the service or good vis-à-vis, the person getting the service or good.

Now, arguably of course in the case of ICANN, they're controlling a resource that allows people to transact business or theft or whatever on the Internet, so that has been used as a justification to over-collect data. You've more or less got a license to operate on the Internet once you get your domain. And apparently immediate take down is not enough as a defense mechanism against that lack of trust.

I don't think that's a defensible position under data protection law. The data protection supervisors have told us it isn't a defensible position and we're

about to hit a wall next May in terms of whether it will be defensible once the GDPR comes into effect.

So I think there's a kind of very strong incentive on our part, at least on the part of circumstances, that are hitting ICANN now to make sure that what we do is defensible. And the data elements that are provided should be accurate. The two contact methods, if that's what we agree is necessary, should work. I understand that all the legal practitioners who are dealing with fraudsters, don't trust that those two data elements will work and they want a legal address, postal address, that they can serve papers on. But that's not going to work either.

So I just - I don't understand how collecting more inaccurate data is going to help us solve this fundamental trust problem. And loading a validation - a data validation or verification requirement onto the registrars or the registries, is not going to solve that trust problem, it is instead going to make the sale of - or the registration of domains - prohibitively expensive for the innocent guys.

Where are we going with this? Make it two contact points and leave it at that. That's basically my argument. The…

Chuck Gomes: Thank you…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Stephanie. This is Chuck again. Now, we're not going to discuss the over-collection issue right now. We will have to make some decisions going forward what the working group determines is over-collection and not. We're going to have to make decisions on specific contact methods, whether they are collecting (unintelligible) information, or not. If we get into that discussion right now we could go for a month on that one.

We will have to get there and as someone already pointed out in the chat, over collection is in the eye of the beholder. Certainly we will have to be in compliance with laws and various jurisdictions including in Europe. And we will deal with that. But let's not go there right now. We have very different points of view on that and somehow we're going to have to try to find some resolution going forward.

Let me turn it over to Marc and Marc, sorry, to put you on hold for so long.

Marc Anderson: Chuck, this is Marc. Sorry, I just dropped my hand. I think the points I was going to make have been overcome. There's a lot going on in chat and discussion so I'm just dropping my hand at this point.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Marc. Paul, you're up.

Paul Keating: Hi, this is Paul Keating for the record. I think a lot of the issue, you know, the comment about, you know, over collection is in the eyes of the beholder, it's also in the eyes of the purpose. Everybody that I've heard speak in this conversation so far has come at this from a distinctly US jurisprudence context. Okay, we issue subpoenas; people are required to respond, all of these things. And what we're not taking into account here is the fact that this - the main system that we're dealing with and the Internet in general is global by nature.

And there are a lot of countries that just simply don't have the same rules that the US abides by. And, you know, in most of Europe if you don't serve somebody at the exact official address that they have listed, then you haven't completed service. And I don't care whether they know about your law suit or you don't.

There - the issue is - I guess boiled down to an essence is, I think that many of the speakers on this call, and I'm saying this as an American, as a former American, I'm an ex-pat, but you really have to get out of this mindset of

everything in the world is just like it is in the US; it's not. And there are ample errors in the UDRP and ICANN policy that are derived from being US-centric in nature without thought to jurisdictions as they exist outside of the United States. And I really think that some people ought to sit down and seriously think about this before they make the comments that they make. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Paul. Jonathan, you're up. And then I want to change directions a little bit, not that we're going to leave this subject but I want to tackle it in a different way that I already hinted at earlier. Okay, go ahead, Jonathan.

Jonathan Matkowsky: I agree that we should not approach things from a US-only centric approach which is why it's very important that we have these kinds of working groups representing different views. And ironically, which is the very reason why the laws in Europe regarding privacy have been so much focused on like because they're maybe taking too much of a European-centric approach.

I mean, and that's not undermining the substantive importance of the issues made by GDPR, it's just that those kind of laws have been around in many different countries, varying laws for a long time. So I think it's important to consider the principle reason for why these countries have the laws, address those underlying principles and get as many people to participate. But to say that we shouldn't take into account the US law because it would be US-centric would sort of defeat the purpose (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Jonathan. This is Chuck. And I want to call to everybody's attention that in this discussion we have talked - several people have mentioned purposes. And I think sooner rather than later we're going to need to get back to our purpose discussion and agree on - try to agree on purposes for collecting a certain data and of course ultimately purposes for giving any access that might be given as well. So hopefully we won't be too long before we get to that.

Now what I want to do now is I want to go on to - if you'll scroll down to Question 5 slide, which is Slide Number 5, there are a - there's a categorization of the comments that were submitted for Question 5. And Question 5 was, as you can see, was "If you support requirements for alternative or preferred contact methods, what is the purpose of collecting this data?" Now a lot of you have been already naming purposes on this call, which is great because it ties right into Question 5.

You can see that staff did a good job of categorizing the comments - the one that Jim Galvin mentioned is - was mentioned often by people, contactability. But you can see others that are - other comments there. And we're not going to go through those in detail.

What I want to do is jump ahead now to the last slide and I'm going to - we're going to do some polls? But before we do some live meeting polls, what I want to ask each of you each of you to do based on everything that's been said over the last I don't know, 30-40 minutes or whatever, what are some key concepts that we might be able to agree on based on everything that's been talked about in the meeting so far? Because a lot of good points have been made.

So I want you to be thinking about those. And I'm going to come back to that in a little bit in terms of those. I don't want to - I don't want you to suggest those right now but we're going to come back to that and see are there some key concepts that we can agree on from the great discussion that's been occurring in chat and audibly today? And then what I'm going to do is I'm going to do some little polling on these four questions. Paul, is this something that relates to where we're going or critical to what we're doing next? Go ahead.

Paul Keating: Yes, I think it does. This is Paul Keating for the record. I think that it boils down to what's the purpose of the requested data stream, we're talking about, the data elements? And contact information is a great example of this

because if I'm a privacy buff I don't want anybody to know about me, right? So I want to give the least information possible.

But if I'm coming at this from a due process standpoint, I want to make sure that the registrant has notice before I do something relative to his or her domain name. So in that regard I want to make sure that I have the widest possible net of contact data. So - and if I'm a registrant then I want to make sure that I get notice of something before my domain name is taken; I want to give as many as we can.

So I guess what I'm suggesting is that in addition to the issue of access is the concept of volunteering data, okay. So I get that there's a certain amount of due process that has to be fulfilled. So we have to have some globally recognized formula of contact - formation of contact data in order to satisfy the kind of global concept, the lowest common denominator of due process. But I think that registrants should be given the option of providing additional information if they so wish. Right?

And on top of that layer then of course we have the access layer that you discussed also, Chuck, which is, you know, who's going to have access to this data and under what conditions? So I think that we should perhaps throw it out there that we should stop thinking about this as necessarily all being mandatory that one provides, and perhaps also think about it being voluntary on behalf of the registrant, that the registrant may want to actually be known and may want to have more contact data available for them. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Paul. Now I'm going to - Stephanie, I'm going to put you on hold because I want to get to these quick little polls for those on the call. Okay? And I'm going to ask you to use Adobe, Daniel, doesn't look like you were able ever to get into Adobe and if there's anybody else that's not, you can speak up and let us know your opinion when we get there.

But my question for everyone on the call is, do you support improved contactability as a purpose for collecting alternative contact methods? Notice I'm not asking how many or which ones, just simply do you support improved contactability as a purpose for collecting alternative contact methods?

If you support that, please put a green check in the Adobe; if you don't, put a red X, and as is typical, my approach, if you put a red X I'm going to call on you to explain why you disagree. So let me just give people a chance to first of all do that. And I'll be honest with you, I'm surprised that more of you aren't responding. This isn't a very complicated question in my opinion, so and that is my opinion.

So let's ask Marc Anderson why he doesn't support improved contactability as a purpose for collecting alternative contact methods?

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. It's Marc. I guess I think I don't disagree with the concept; I think I'm struggling with the wording a little bit. Improved - like contactability is binary, you can either contact somebody or you can't, you know, I think, I mean, I support having an alternative contact method.

You know, I've supported that in all the polls so I support having an alternative contact method; I look at it's a backup. If for some reason the primary method doesn't work, you have a backup. I mean, so I think it's the improved contactability that just has me scratching my head. Either you can contact somebody or you can't. So I guess that's my thinking, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: So my suggestion, Marc, is that there are times when wordsmithing is critical and we need to do it; there are other times when I'm not sure it adds too much value. So I don't think I want to spend any more time on that. There's probably a much better way to word it, but you understand the concept and you kind of indicated that. And so I'll leave it at that.

Stephanie, you disagree. Go ahead and explain.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks, Chuck. This is why I put my hand up actually before you did the pop poll, Stephanie Perrin for the record. I brought it up last week actually, we have layers of data that ICANN as a data controller require the registrar to collect on its behalf, on behalf of the escrow requirements, which is partly ICANN and certainly in the benefit of the registrant. But also which is required for the registration data service. And I'm using that in the sense of a tiered access complete service.

So the other thing that could be done via the contracts is to require not just data that is retained for eventual law enforcement purpose, but data that a registrar might maintain on its own not in the RDS, that would benefit the individual in terms of contactability. That since ICANN has control over the basically commercial relationship between registrars and registrants, and the authority to alter that, that could be done and you would then have the benefits of heightened contactability or the user's benefit, as part of that commercial relationship without having a breakdown of trust that it's going to be accessible through the RDS. I hope I'm making myself clear there.

It goes without saying that…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Let's first of all put trust…

((Crosstalk))

Stephanie Perrin: And that's why I'm objecting.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, I'm going to come back to you, Stephanie.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Hang in there. I'm going to come back to you. Let's put trust and accuracy aside because we're going to get to accuracy later. And if in fact we're successful at dealing with accuracy and improvements have been made in accuracy, it's - it's far from perfect yet, but let's not concern ourselves right now with trust and accuracy, we'll have to get there and we will.

But so is what I'm hearing you say that as long as the registrar has multiple ways of contacting a registrant, then we don't have to have it in the RDS or RDDS or whatever we end up using there. Is that what you're saying, Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: Basically what I'm saying - Stephanie Perrin for the record - is you can stick with the two contact points; you don't need multiple contact points. If one doesn't work there's another one. If neither one works, then you go to the registrar.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, that's…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …clarifies what I was asking.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Okay, so - and that I understand because that's an approach that can be taken, so thank you very much for that. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I think we have to be a little bit careful when we start going to this area. The registrars in general will have ways that they believe are going to be as reliable as necessary if they presume they're going to want to renew a domain, for instance. There seems to be someone else talking at the same time.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, somebody needs to go on mute please?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. The - for instance, the Whois data reminder policy says the registrar must contact the registrant. It doesn't say it has to use the Whois contact information to contact them. So the registrar could use the private information it has. However, when we're looking at policies, such as the UDRP, but perhaps not restricted to it, a registrar is not necessarily going to release their private information unless they have a reason to want to do that or unless they're compelled by law. And we have to make sure that the other polices that in - that rely on contact with the registrant such as UDRP, do have something within the RDS which can be accessed within the RDS process and not resorting to a subpoena or something like that. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. Would everyone please clear their marks in the Adobe, the checkmarks, red Xs, whatever. Clear those please, in Adobe? Okay. Now let's go to the second question. And do you support resiliency to communication failure as a purpose for collecting alternative contact methods? And let me reword that as to what I think it means. Lisa, if I get it wrong, correct me please. But basically what we're saying is do you support alternative - having alternative contact methods for the sake of situations where one contact method or another fails so you have a backup is basically what this is saying.

Do you agree with that as a purpose for having alternative contact methods? And again, we're not talking about how many; we're just saying at least one alternative, okay? If you agree with that, please put as a purpose; please put a green checkmark in the Adobe. If you disagree with that as a purpose for having at least one alternative, then put a red X. Okay, I don't see any red Xs. People know I'll call on them. Maybe they don't want to talk. Anyway, okay, go ahead and clear those. Clear your green checkmarks, please. We're going to go to the third question. A few people haven't cleared their green checkmarks.

And I understand, by the way, on that question I just asked, while we're waiting for one more person - Farell, if you could clear your green checkmark, I'd appreciate it. We probably should have worded that, "Do you support resiliency to communication (unintelligible) purpose for collecting at least one alternative contact method?" that would have probably been a little cleaner, but, Farell, you still have a green checkmark in there, if you could clear that? Otherwise it's going to count towards the next question.

Okay, without taking any more time, do you support providing contacts with a choice of contact method as a purpose for collecting preferred contact methods? Let's go ahead and - we got a couple hands raised. If they're critical to this - I'll give you a chance, please focus on where we're at. Greg Aaron, go ahead.

Greg Aaron: Chuck, this is Greg. I'm not sure I understand this question especially the second half of it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Greg Aaron: It seems - it seems circular.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, probably is, it'd help if I'd look at it. Forget the circularity, basically what we're asking is - and I hope I paraphrase this close enough to accurate to be correct. Again, I'll let staff correct me if I'm wrong. But basically what we're asking is, do you support giving contacts the opportunity to select to choose a preferred method of contact? Jonathan, you need some clarity as well?

Jonathan Matkowsky: Yes, I didn't understand the question. So I'm listening carefully to try to appreciate…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Did you understand what I just said, did it make sense or is it just as confusing?

Jonathan Matkowsky: Could you repeat it?

Chuck Gomes: Sure. Do you support giving contacts the opportunity to select their preferred method of communication? In other words, I would like text communications or I would - I'm a contact and I would like postal mail, or I would like email or I would like telephone or that's my preferred method, that's what we're saying.

Jonathan Matkowsky: Is that in exclusion to required additional method?

Chuck Gomes: No, huh-uh. Totally independent. This is an idea that's come up over the last few weeks. So put a green checkmark if you support that; a red X if you don't. And if you don't like the wording there, go by mine; if that didn't work, sorry. So…

Alan Greenberg: Chuck, it's Alan. Could I ask a clarifying, please?

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, the way that's worded that implies to me that of the contacts that they specify, for whatever reasons - in whatever way we write the rules of what they may specify, they may then specify a preferred contact. Is that the intent?

Chuck Gomes: I don't…

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Or are we talking about a selection of which ones they are…

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: …they provide?

Chuck Gomes: I think you're making it more complicated than it needs to be. But…

Alan Greenberg: No I'm…

Chuck Gomes: Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. Lisa Phifer for the record. Just to be clear, we weren't actually trying to pose actual agreements that were being voted on here. What we were trying to do was probe support for different concepts that people voiced as part of their comments to the previous poll. So several people noted in their comments that they were supporting a particular type of contact method or particular number because they thought registrants should have a choice in providing contact methods that they prefer.

So that's really what the third bullet is getting at. I agree, this is not actually posed as a proposed working group agreement, we're just trying to get a sense of support for the concepts behind it so that we can construct actual agreements.

Chuck Gomes: And that's really important to clarify. None of these, by the way, these polls are not like our poll - our written polls, these are just to get a sense of the room type polls. So we're not suggesting that because there are more green checks than red Xs that we're reaching tentative conclusions on these things, but it'll help our discussion going forward.

So okay the hand went down. So let's very quickly and we're just about out of time so if you can be as - keep it within about a minute that would be great. Let's start at the bottom with Stephanie on the red X, why don't you support that? Stephanie are you - you're on mute. There we go.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks, Chuck. I just think this question is basically too ambiguous and too much of a mess to poll on. I think it needs to be corrected. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. People, let me suggest that we, again, word-smith when we need to, don't be too stuck on - we lose way too much time because of that. Greg Aaron, why do you object to that?

Greg Aaron: I'm with Stephanie, this question is so ambiguous that I do not know how to answer it.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: So I don't think what I said as ambiguous but I'll accept what you said. Alan, you're next.

Greg Aaron: But I can still interpret what you said a couple of different ways, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Greg Aaron: And, look, if we're going to poll something…

Chuck Gomes: That's fine.

Greg Aaron: …got to be clear on something, okay? Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, all right, well again, we can spend weeks working on wording and we'll never finish. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. What Greg said, this is not an issue of the wording needs to be refined, I have very two very different interpretations of what this is asking. And one of them…

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: …I would answer yes to, one would I answer no to.

Chuck Gomes: Which one would you answer yes to, Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Allowing people to specify what of the ones they provide is preferred, allowing them to only specify their preferred ones out of a wide selection, I would not support.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay. So I see. Okay. All right, that's fine. I intended the first one but that's okay. Mike.

Michael Hammer: Michael Hammer for the record. So I agree with the others, not only is the question as written ambiguous and poorly worded, and it's not a wordsmithing issue; this is about the concept that people are agreeing or not agreeing to. But then also when you restated it the second and third times verbally, you actually stated it in a different way so that may be adding to the confusion.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Michael Hammer: So if it is related to - here's the methods that we are collecting including the required ones, but they get to say here's my preferred one out of the ones that are being collected, I would agree with that. On the other hand, if they get to express a preference in terms of what they're actually providing, I would be opposed to that.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, okay. Good clarification, thank you. Let's go to the last question very quickly. Please clear your Xs and checkmarks. Keeping in mind that we're just trying to get a sense of the room here; we're not making any conclusions, okay? All right, so Sam and Farell, you still have green checkmarks there. Let's go ahead to the last question which is, "Do you support enabling

reporting of domain name abuse as a purpose for collecting alternative contact methods?"

Okay again, what we tried to do is ask questions related to comments that were submitted. So much of the wording really comes from comments that were submitted. And again, we're just trying to get a sense of the room; we don't have time for a lot of discussion. Alan, can you be really brief in your…

Alan Greenberg: I can be very quick. The cause and effect, the two parts of the sentence seem to be a non sequitur to me. I can report domain name abuse when the when the domain name is completely anonymous as to who the registrant. So I don't see the connection…

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Thanks, Alan. Okay, we have some green checkmarks. Kal, can you very quickly explain why you don't support that?

Kal Feher: Yes. Thank you, Chuck. Kal Feher for the record. I was - I think if you're providing some contact data to a registrant and the premise is that they receive communication from you for all manner of things, including potential abuse, having an alternative seems to - it seems a backwards or almost - in contradiction to why you'd want to initially ask for a contact in the first place.

So either you can communicate with them for all things or you can't. And if we think that we need another alternative contact method simply for abuse, and I'm not thinking here of the alternate contact types but just a second method, it doesn't seem like a good enough purpose to me. It's like having a different…

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks, Kal. Let's go to Marc. And, Marc, please be brief because we're out of time.

Marc Anderson: No problem. This is Marc. I basically have the same point as Kal. Going back to our discussion on roles, you know, I think it's good to have a domain abuse

role. That doesn't need to be, you know, that's not a reason for collecting an alternative contact method so. That may be the same person as your primary contact or you may have a reason to have a different person. But I don't support that as a reason to collect another alternative contact.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks. Okay, well we - thanks for - I think we got a reasonably good sense and several of you pointed out some ambiguity in the way they were - the questions were worded. Thanks for that. The - so the - Lisa pointed out to me individually that one of the key issues that a lot of you think is, is that any alternative should be optional or voluntary especially with regard to the second bullet. "Do you support resiliency to communication failure as a purpose for collecting alternative contact methods?" And Lisa pointed out that a lot of you think that that should be optional, voluntary.

And that's a good point that came out of this discussion. So that's helpful. What we'll try to do as a leadership team is maybe come up with some poll questions to follow up with some poll questions to follow up on the sense of the room that we got that may help us move a little bit closer to some key concepts.

Now, because we're out of time, I really wanted to have some time to maybe some people to suggest some key concepts that we may be could agree on based on the many, many excellent points that were made by people today. But because we're out of time now we don't have time to actually maybe entertain those now.

So - and a last action item for staff will be to send out a request to the list for members to - and it'll be easier for those who were on the call but others can listen to the recording or read the transcript, to suggest any key concepts that you think maybe could be reached as tentative conclusions based on everything we talked about today including this last little polling that we did during the meeting.

So if you have some suggestions for concepts based on what you heard, not only what you said, but what you heard everybody else say as well, what things do you think we would be - we might be able to agree on based on what you heard, that would be helpful.

Daniel Nanghaka: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Daniel, did you want to say something? Oh, you're in Adobe now. Okay good. All right, thank you. Thank you. Okay, all right, well we're out of time. I'll ask staff to confirm the action items and I don't know if we had any decision points or not today. Our next meeting will be at the alternate time next week so for most people that's Wednesday. And for some of us it's still - it's late on Tuesday. So keep that in mind. Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Chuck, in answer to your question, we had one working group agreement and that was on Question 2 which we'll record in our working document. I'd like to clarify that last action item that you gave the working group, do you have a timeframe that you want people to suggest key concepts? Is this over the course of the next week? Or…

Chuck Gomes: Yes, let's try and do it by Friday.

((Crosstalk))

Lisa Phifer: All right, then we will not have a poll this week?

Chuck Gomes: We may. Let's decide that as a leadership team. If any of those on the leadership team want to suggest maybe a follow up to the - during the meeting type polling that we did, as a follow up question, like for example there was one of them that there were no disagreements on so that might be a question that we could poll on to the broader group. Some of the others might lend themselves to some follow up questions that we could poll on so let's try and decide that today.

So we may or may not have a poll but let's see if in the next few hours as leaders whether we might want to try to follow up on those. Anything else, Lisa?

Lisa Phifer: Amr, do you want to recap any other action items?

Chuck Gomes: Amr, are you there?

Amr Elsadr: Yes, sorry, this is Amr. Just a little trouble getting off mute. Apologies for that. We had two earlier action items apart from this last one. One is for the working group members to continue the discussion on the, you know, the distinction between RDS and RDDS over the working group mailing list and possibly bring that up as a discussion topic during next week's call.

And, yes, and the second one is the one that Lisa mentioned on recording the working group agreements regarding Question 2 which is now working group agreement Number 30 I believe. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Amr. Anything else before we adjourn? Okay, my compliments on what I thought was great interaction today, great discussion. And hopefully it'll get us closer to some more key concepts by next week. Everybody have a good rest of the week. Remember to enter into the discussion that Michele generated on the list. And our topics for discussion this coming week, or anything related to what we talked about today would be in bound so I encourage ongoing discussion. Thanks for all the contributions in the chat. I apologize, I have not read all of them because I was unable to keep up with all the chat and everything else going on.

But great discussion, thanks, and have a good rest of the week. Meeting adjourned, and the recording can stop.

Julie Bisland: Great. Thanks, Chuck. And (Darren), you can stop the recordings. Everyone have a great day.

END