

**ICANN
Transcription
Next-Gen RDS PDP Working group call
Tuesday, 22 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-22aug17-en.mp3>

AC recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p8lgb40xm3d/>

Attendance can be located on wiki agenda page: <https://community.icann.org/x/W2fwAw>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Julie Bisland: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone. Welcome to the Next Generation RDS PDP Working Group Call on the 22nd of August 2017. In the interest of time there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by 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 background noise. Thank you. With this, I'll turn it back over to you Chuck. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much Julie. Welcome everyone. And let me start off by asking if there are any updates to statements of interest. I'll add my congratulations to (Natalie). Thanks for that. And yes, appreciate that. Any others? Okay. Let's go ahead and jump right in.

So if we can have the results of the poll from last week put up, we'll get into that. Okay. Everyone now has scroll capability. So feel free to do a scroll to where you want to be. You can see there were 25 participants in the poll.

And we'll start off with the Question 2 results. Question 2 as you can see at the end of the paragraph there, in order to provide resiliency to overcome communication failure, at least one alternative contact method, possibly multiple alternative contact methods must be supported by the RDS' optional fields.

And you can see the results there both in a bar graph and in a table. About 68% supported that statement as is. Two people didn't support it. And then you can see that there were several people who made some suggestions in the comments.

And if you'll scroll down there to I guess it's probably Page 3 - yes, Page 3. You'll see Marc Anderson's comment. He made a suggestion there for wording that made pretty good sense to the Leadership Team for wording without making significant changes to it.

Notice it says to improve contactability with the domain name registrant or authorized agent of the registrant, the RDS must be capable of supporting at least one alternative contact method as an optional field.

We thought that was (captured). In essence the same thing that the main statement said but worded a lot better, added a few things that's probably helpful. It kept the optional concept that a majority of people supported.

One of the things I want to point out is that if we factor in the comments of the people who suggested alternate wording, and many of them were in essence supportive of the overall concept, that would bring us to about 80% support for this.

So certainly if anybody wants to make a comment, now's the time to do it. But my suggestion is that we add this to our list of working group agreements that have at least rough consensus and add it to our document. (Alex), go ahead.

(Alex): Yes. Hello Chuck. This is (Alex). I unfortunately didn't get a chance to vote. But I still think either there's some context missing or I'm missing some context here.

Is it not the case that this wording is specific only to email address? So it's for example, you know, I would suggest perhaps an alternative wording that makes that clear if I'm correct. Would be helpful for example and I would perhaps reword it as follows.

In order to provide resiliency to overcome communication failure, when using the email address contact method, at least one alternative electronic contact method, possible multiple alternative electronic contact methods must be supported by the RDS as optional fields.

That makes sense to me assuming of course at some point in the future we're going to move on to talking about postal address and phone and the like. I just thought I'd put that out there and get people's thoughts and perhaps be corrected if I needed to be. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Alex). This is Chuck. Well, it says alternative contact. We've already said that there has to be at least one email contact. That's a previous agreement that we had.

Now are you suggesting - let me - here are the alternative wording again just to get your key concepts and what you're trying to change.

(Alex): Well, I guess what I'm trying to understand, and I'm sorry for being a little slow here. I'm trying to understand are these alternative contact methods for

the mandatory email address only or are they in general for - to improve contactability across the (board).

Chuck Gomes: Well, I think it's contactability across the board. It's not talking about the mandatory email. It's talking about an alternative contact to the mandatory email. That's what alternative contact means.

So I guess I may not be fully understanding what you're asking because the term alternative contact means something other than the one we've already required, which is an email. You want to (unintelligible).

(Alex): Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Does that help at all or confuse it more?

(Alex): Yes. Yes. Well no. No. I guess, you know, I asked a similar question last week because, you know, I agree with those who've stated (in the minutes). But last week and this week I think it's important that we have phone and postal address contact available.

So I guess what I'm trying to understand is are we saying that - well, sorry, it's early. Are we saying that we will have the conversations about the requirements around phone and postal address coming up in the future? Or are we - are you - yes. Okay.

So these alternative contact methods are related to the email but separate from conversations that we may have in the future around phone and postal address. That right?

Chuck Gomes: They're related in the sense that they are in addition to the mandatory email. So and with regard to physical address and phone, let me tell you that we had a very intense leadership discussion on that yesterday.

And we decided that it was best to get into that at a later point in time. So those are - that's - those are still (possibilities). Okay. All this is saying is that there would be at least one alternative contact as an optional field and most - a large percentage of the working group members that participated in the poll supported that. Now not everybody.

One of the - a lot of the comments talked about the - they thought that it should be mandatory. I was probably one of those that thought it should be mandatory. But I'm just one vote.

And so what we went with is what a large majority of the group support and treat it as an optional field. Can that change later? It could depending on, as we said all along, as we continue to progress, we'll have to evaluate decisions we've made and some may need to be reconsidered. Steve, I suspect you might want to add to some of this. Please do.

Steve: Yes. Thank you Chuck. This is Steve Metalitz. So based on your (unintelligible) now with (Alex), it seems that this poll result suggests that the (unintelligible) for purposes of contactability under this - under the system that we're working on here will be reduced from what it is today because anything beyond an email address would be optional.

So it'd have to be supported but it'd be optional for the registrant to provide it or even for the contracted party to collect it. And I think that's a step backwards. We shouldn't be reducing the robustness of contactability. And that's why I objected to the reference to optional fields.

And I think that there's - we shouldn't be stepping back from the status quo, which (allows) collection of other contact methods as an obligation. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Steve. And I don't disagree with your line of reasoning there. So appreciate that. Greg Shatan.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. Apologize that I also did not get a chance to vote. I tend to use Sunday to clean up all of my (unintelligible) loose ends and unfortunately the polls all cut down on Saturday night. So I missed the last couple of polls to try to move this loose end to Saturday. Or maybe we could move the closing of the poll to Sunday.

In any case, the - my views are aligned with what (Alex) and Steve have said and generally with those who voted in the third alternative wording group most of which seem to be consistent internally (to systems).

I think that there are a couple of problems here. One is that we're asking a very abstract statement when we're really concerned with a series of very concrete options. So that's the first problem. We should be talking in more particulars.

I understand that's coming later. But the problem is that these vague high-level statements could be used to influence what seems to have thought so far. I think there's - and it's also some survey kind of bias or at least ambiguity.

One of the things that I have learned in various drafting contexts is that at least is a really dangerous phrase to use because it can be interpreted in many different ways and cause trouble for that reason.

Somebody who supports having two - at least two would also support having at least one unless the option of at least two is also an option. So, you know, I would want to have, you know, the kind of the holy trinity for the moment, which is email, telephone and physical address and those should all be mandatory.

And I would - it would be best of that were actually asked as a concrete question rather than some sort of implicit behind the (unintelligible) sort of

possibility. So that's basically where I'm coming at and concerned, you know, specifically of Steve's idea that this was a step backwards from the current contactability, which is, you know, generally requires the trio. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Greg. This is Chuck. I have a question for you because there's one statement you made that I don't understand. I don't understand why at least is dangerous.

Greg Shatan: Sure. At least is dangerous because it is not - like up to, it's not an actual number and it can be interpreted - it can include both those who believe it should be no more than and those would prefer those that it would be more than.

So one could credibly answer the - if you wanted seven, you could still answer at least one (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: But it doesn't imply more than.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: I think that arguably it does - it implies that not more than is an acceptable result. It does not rule out more than and does not rule out not more than. So it...

Chuck Gomes: Correct. I agree...

Greg Shatan: ...actually covers a variety of...

Chuck Gomes: ...with that. I agree with that.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yes. I agree with that wording. I didn't agree with the way you expressed it the first time.

Greg Shatan: Until I make sense. It happens several times a year. So I think the point is that it actually embraces a number of different responses that are actually contradictory in terms of what we're trying to do and creates ambiguity. That's the problem.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Greg. Rod, you're next.

Rod Rasmussen: Thanks Rod Rasmussen here. So my interpretation of this and the discussion we've been having is we're worried about capabilities right now for the RDS rather than what is actually required to be filled into any particular field. Right.

So the current Whois systems does not have this concept of alternative contact methods supported. So the question (unintelligible). I think what we're trying to get that accomplished here is establish the idea that alternative (unintelligible) contact methods are a good thing and should be supported. We are not deciding whether or not email, phone, postal or anything like that is an absolute requirement.

So I think what I'm hearing is people getting caught up in the wording thinking we're making two decisions at once, which is the capability of being able to support these things along with the requirements around what is being - what is going to (actually be) filled in.

So I would suggest that maybe the wording be changed to something like irregardless of whatever is required, something like that - paraphrase that, you know, an alternate contact method should be supported.

And so it takes away the concerns is this email, is this postal, telephone, is it other stuff. Because irregardless of all that other stuff or regardless -- if it's

irregardless or regardless, they're the same word -- this is something that the RDS should support.

And that's the way I was taking this. I was not thinking about postal versus phone versus email and that context.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Rod. This is Chuck. Jim, you're next.

Jim Galvin: Thanks Chuck. Jim Galvin for the record. I guess I've had the good fortune to be on vacation the last couple of weeks. So I haven't, you know, participated and been here or done the polls.

And I guess - and I apologize for (then) you're in the middle of all this. But I guess I'm just kind of wondering why is it that more than a single contact method is not just a business decision?

I mean I have no trouble believing that we certainly need any method of contact. Maybe we want to specify which one for standard purposes. But I'm wondering if there's been some discussion about this and maybe if someone could say a little bit about this.

I appreciate that alternate methods, more than one method, all of those kinds of things are certainly very helpful in a business context. Any business would like to be able to hang onto their customers and the ways in which they do that is valuable.

But I'm wondering why are we requiring that this RDS across all of the registrars and registries be obligated to do more than one thing. I mean building on what Rod said especially since this concept doesn't exist today. So I mean what (unintelligible).

And I, you know, resiliency, which I'm not resiliency in communication and I'll respond to that directly. I still think that's a business issue. It's not clear to me why that's important overall to the system.

I mean if somebody only gives you one contact method, it doesn't work, then, you know, the consequences of that are that you lose the domain name in this particular (unintelligible). That's what it comes down to. So yes, anyway. Thank you. You know, why do we have to have more than one anyway? How did we get to this place? Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jim. This is Chuck. I won't try to repeat everything we've talked about this - in the last several weeks because there's been a lot of discussion on it. And certainly a large percentage of people thought there should be at least one alternative contact but that there could be more. And all we're saying here is that the RDS must be capable of supporting that. Let's go to Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Chuck. Michele for the record. I'm not going to address the last speaker's queries because I really can't. But I think a couple of the people who were talking to this seem to be assuming that what we're talking about is ignoring what's already been collected.

So under the current system you collect physical address, email, phone, possibly fax though I'm not sure why. But anyway, what the root of this entire discussion was around adding extra electronic methods for communication or other methods.

So in the chat (Alex) has put in language, which for somebody like me I see as being perfectly fine. The system needs to support something, extra contact points. There's no requirement for people to collect (them in it) but it should be able to support them, which is why I think several of us were supportive of this.

I think the concern some people have voiced is that by looking at this particular aspect of contact management through a microscope I suppose people have kind of missed the bigger picture and are assuming that we're - because we're not explicitly stating what data has been collected and what - and all that - that certain things are going to go away. And I don't think anybody had been suggesting that. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Michele. (Jim), is that an old hand? Okay. Thanks. All right. So how do we move forward on this? One option is just to record the statement as worded by Marc as a rough consensus conclusion and note that there's considerable objection to that.

One of the things we want to start doing less and less of is trying to wordsmith in meetings like this because it is terribly ineffective. So one of the things we could do if there's enough support in the working group is to form a small group of two or three people that could go off and do some wordsmithing based on what they heard and come back to the working group with that.

I'll try and get a sense of where the (unintelligible) call are on that as we move forward. But right now let's listen to Tim.

Tim O'Brien: Hey all. Tim O'Brien here. I think there's two things we're muddling here. One is the - having the option for multiple contacts for a particular domain name.

And then for each of those contacts having primary and alternate ways of communicating with that individual whether it be mail or fax or whatever, right, understanding that some places don't have good communications in areas. All of us are not in first world countries.

Some of that is because companies close, people pass on, horrible things happen. Those Web sites, those domains get compromised and start

spewing malware and it makes a - forces it to be a business issue decision for the other people on the Internet. And how do we get in touch with those individuals to that try to put that fire out as it were? Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Tim. And Jim Galvin, I think that at least starts to address part of your question in terms of the rationale that's been discussed over the last few weeks. Certainly one of the simple points that was made was if the primary method of communications, if email fails, what happens?

Now like Jim said, one option is that (unintelligible) if they don't - if their email doesn't work, their domain name gets deleted. I think a lot of people are not comfortable with being that restrictive on it.

So that's just a little bit more in terms of some of the thinking that's - and discussion that's gone on over the last several weeks. (Unintelligible).

Jim Galvin: Thanks Chuck. Jim Galvin for the record. So I think I'm catching up here at this point. And I'm trying to have a couple little chat statements here. I think what we're trying to get through here (is that) this is not about what must be collected but what it must be possible to collect I think is the distinction we're making at this point.

So we're simply stating that in more concrete terms, you know, the registry, if you will, you know, needs to be able to take onboard a variety of contact methods. And we're not specifying which one they're going to get but they have to be possible for them to get them and perhaps get more than one of them.

And I don't mean to get overly specific about it. I hope that's not going to derail the conversation. If it is, you can just tell me not to go down that path. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jim. Comment appreciated. So let me - so again, I don't want to get into wordsmithing. So again, I gave two options. There are probably more that we could consider.

But one of them is to accept the wording -- and let's use Marc Anderson's suggested wording -- as is as a rough consensus conclusion at this point in time. And certainly there - several people have expressed opposition to elements of that.

What I'd like to do right now is find out how many people would object at this point in time (unintelligible) judge it by the people on this call right now so I can make a decision. How many people would strongly object to this statement as worded by Marc as a rough consensus conclusion at this stage of the game? Put a red X in the chat if you would object to that.

I'm just trying to get a sense of the room how strong the objections are; how many there are. Okay. So my sense of it right now...

(Alan): Chuck, it's (Alan). People in the chat are asking can you be (unintelligible) question are you talking - what wording are you taking about?

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Like I said earlier (Alan), if you scroll to Page 3 and look at Marc Anderson's comment, I'll read it. Okay. To improve contactability with the domain name registrant or authorized agent of the registrant, the RDS must be capable of supporting at least one alternative contact method as an optional field.

If you strongly object to that conclusion at this stage of the game, put a red X in the chat. Okay. And those on the Leadership Team help me out here if you disagree with my conclusion. And it's fine to do so.

At this stage of the game - okay. There are five people out of 35 that object to that wording right now, which is consistent with the 80% figure -- fairly close to it -- that we found that supported this particular approach.

Now keep in mind those of you that object your issues are not dead. We can come back and change these things. But at this stage of the game it appears that there is at least rough consensus for that statement. So we'll add it to - as a working group agreement.

And I wouldn't call it consensus (Volker). I would say that it's a rough consensus with I think some strong objections, which we should note. Okay. And we can come back and - if we have to based on additional work, we may have to come back and revisit some of these things. (Alan).

(Alan): Thank you. Since - as I read that wording, the opposite of it is it should not be capable of supporting a second communication path. I'd like to hear from the people who put X why they are objecting to it.

Chuck Gomes: So (Alan), this is Chuck. I don't think that's totally fair because there are several elements of this. And when (unintelligible) comments, people's concerns covered a couple areas.

One of them whether - is whether it should be optional or mandatory. Several people thought it should be mandatory and a couple of people have said that again today. Maybe three people at least have said it today.

So that's - could be the aspect of it that they're disagreeing with; not the point you're making. So there's a little bit more to it than just the one aspect. Greg Shatan, go ahead.

(Alan): Yes. Chuck, if I may have a follow on.

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

(Alan): I understand why people are of different views on much of this and if this statement were to have said this is all it should be able to do, I would object strongly but that isn't what it's saying. That's why I'm concerned. Are people objecting to what it's saying or is it a larger objection of where they think we should be going? Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Alan). Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. I think (Alan) actually sets up my point quite well, which is that there are multiple opposites to this statement. My concern, why I objected to it is that it makes it seem that we think it is sufficient for there to be nearly one alternate contact and for that alternate contact to be (unintelligible).

In my mind that is insufficient. And therefore I can't agree with this statement. But again, I - my problem is that the statement itself lacks clarity. And, you know, working off of it I think is flawed. So there are those who could object because they think it goes too far and those who object because they think it implies that this is as far as we can go and that we should go further.

So even though it doesn't say exactly one and no more, it implies that exactly one and no more and optional and not mandatory is an acceptable state of affairs. So if it's meant to include all of those who want one or more and those who want it to be optional or mandatory, then I'll sign on.

But I don't know what that tells us except that it distinguishes those who think there should be only a single contact point that distinguishes them from everybody else. If that's what we're trying to do, that's not - this is not the question to ask to get that point. So I think we're in the end I'm getting kind of an invalid result out of this whole thing.

I think we need to clarify exactly what we're trying to say rather than try to kind of look at various abstract statements that don't really quite say anything clear. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Greg. All right. Let's move on from this. I already made a decision. That decision can be overruled later. And keep in mind what I'm expressing is not necessarily my views.

If it was just me, I probably would have handled this very differently. But it - there's more involved than just me. So let's go with that for now and let's go to Question Number - and my apologies to those who don't like that. Let's go to Question Number 3.

And look at the results that's - Question 3 is on Page 4 on the slides. You'll see that the statements at the bottom of that paragraph. PBC, that's purpose based contact types identified. Admin legal, technical abuse, proxy, privacy and business must be supported by the RDS but optional for registrants to provide.

You can see the results there. About 65% supported it. Another 17% provided alternative wording. Okay. Again, if (unintelligible) factor in the - those who put the alternative wording, which seemed to support a similar concept, that would bring us up to about 80% support there.

So - and then of course there are four who didn't support it at all. I'll let you look at the comments yourself. The suggestion from the Leadership Team is that the - that we accept that statement as a rough consensus conclusion. In other words, a working group agreement at this point in time and add it to our list. But I'll open it up now for discussion. (Alex).

(Alex): Thank you Chuck. This is (Alex). So again, I'm having trouble with kind of an abstract concept here. I think I agree on the abstract that those types must be supported.

I guess the question is as the statement suggests that it's optional for registrants to provide them. But the question is if they do not provide, then what contact information kind of concretely is available? And this may be again an issue getting caught up again on context and perhaps previously agreed to statements.

But I'm curious as to if no - if registrants do not provide this data, then what data is available? Is it none? I don't think it could be none. Again, I'm trying to make this a more concrete discussion versus abstract. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And by the way, I empathize with the request for more concrete statements. But as most of you know because you've been in this environment for a long time like me, the more concrete you get, the harder it is to get agreement.

So I'm very empathetic to that. And we're going to have to get more and more concrete as we move forward. (Alex), let me take a stab at what you ask. I don't know if I'll do a very good job.

But okay, so right now we have at least - there has to be a email contact, right. And you're right I think. I think what that means is is okay, it's possible then if these are all optional. And by the way, in the comments several people made this point.

It's possible then that that's all you have is an email contact. Okay. Because if they opt not to provide any of - any contacts for any of these six roles or any other roles we might add, then you just have the email contact.

And if that fails, we go back to what Jim said. And if their email doesn't work, then their domain name can be put on hold and, you know, it's kind of a drastic move but that's kind of where we're at right now with this. So let me be quiet and turn it over to (Alan).

(Alan): Thank you. My concern is very closely related to that in that the answer in my mind depends on decisions we have not made yet. And I'll give you a specific example.

If we later decide that (unintelligible) access, then certain classes of requestor gets certain information. And we for instance say that the UDRP provider will only get legal contact. Then it's going to depend on whether we default the legal contact to the one we do have or leave it blank.

And if we may decide later on that for instance UDRP providers only get a single contact, then it's really important to make sure they actually get a contact as opposed to a blank line.

But we haven't had that discussion yet. So it's not clear whether it is acceptable to say they don't (unintelligible) because the real question in my mind is it going to get filled in by someone so it's available.

If on the other hand we say if anyone can get any contact, they get all the contacts, then it's a moot question. So it's really contingent on a decision that we have not discussed or made yet. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: (Alan), I want to thank you a lot for the way you expressed that because I think it portrays the challenges that we have in front of us because you're right. When we get to more detail down the road, we may run into - we may decide that in a certain case that can't be optional, has to be mandatory under certain conditions.

I don't know. I'm not suggesting that's going to happen. But you're absolutely right. And that's part of the reason probably why we have to keep these at a fairly high conceptual level at this stage until we move further down the road. And that's why we may have to come back and revisit some of these things in a broad context with more specific information later on.

So again, I said, you know, for those of you that don't like where we're at, there's still the possibility that we'll come back and make some adjustments. But well said (Alan). (Alan).

(Alan): Chuck, just to be - one more follow on. If the question had asked does the RDS need to contain all of the elements as opposed to does the registrant need to provide them, it's a very different question. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: It is. You're right. (Alex), go ahead.

(Alex): Thanks Chuck. This is (Alex). Yes. So I think that the discussion in the chat has kind of touched upon what I wanted to say, which was, you know, in your previous comment you said that email address, you know, is a method. I was - but I believe email address has to be an element of some purpose based contact, right. It's just not a standalone element.

And so my thinking was if that's the case, then the default mandatory contact is simply the registrant's contact, which is what Marika mentioned and seems to jive at least with my thinking.

If that's the case, then that helps me at least put this into context with regard to what should be optional and what needs to be mandatory and what contact information may be available - well first collected and then eventually when we get there available for viewing. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Alex). And - this is Chuck. And as you know in the chat and sorry, I haven't been following - I haven't been following the chat thoroughly. But we had quite a bit of discussion in the Leadership Team on the fact that if the registrant opts not to provide information on these various roles, then it will likely default to the registrant and they're responsible.

Now is that sufficient? Well, in our recommendations first of all for requirements, you know, we'll talk about that. And of course then we - and several people in the comments got into the need for accuracy of contact information. And we will get to that because one of our questions -- I think it's our fifth question in the charter -- has to do with accuracy.

So we will get there and that's a critical factor. But that's why we're not addressing that now. I'm just looking at the chat. Okay. So I'm - keep in mind right now we're talking about this collection, not display. Okay. So let's go to Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. I think the conversation that (Alex) had, you know, allayed some of my concerns as well but I think we need to be clear and it's not just likely but true that these purpose (unintelligible) would be the registrant if they're not populated with an alternate contact.

You know, and it definitely needs to be clear that the alternate (contact) isn't just go suck an egg. So that's what one might think if it's left blank. So I think it needs to be clear leaving it blank isn't just don't bother me, I don't have an abuse contact.

Chuck Gomes: No. Yes. I - and the point you're making and that others have made Greg I think is important. The - and we may have to state this in a - some sort of a requirement that if the registrant elects not to provide any of this information (unintelligible) to assume the responsibility for any other purposes that we may decide on going forward. Okay. We started our purpose discussion some time ago and we got off on the key concepts but we'll have to come back to the purposes again and that'll be a critical area of work for us. (Magaly), go ahead.

(Magaly): Thanks, (Magaly) for the record. I'm not 100% sure what we really want to go down the path of getting that prescriptive at this juncture about what goes into

which contact and whether - what to do in the case of something being (blank).

The concerns people have raised should be noted, but I wouldn't be 100% comfortable about making some kind of final decision on who ends up with what.

I mean, depending on people's business models, maybe in some cases, you know, everything defaulting to the abuse contact for the registrar is perfectly fine for a lot of these things.

Maybe in some cases people would like it to be left blanks so that the only option would be to contact the abuse contact. And there are many, many other facets of something like that that would - might need to be looked at.

And ultimately as well, a lot of this is going to vary on where this information is going to end up and who's going to have access to it.

So what I think it's important to look at in the various different possible issues around all this, I'm not 100% comfortable with the idea of getting that prescriptive about what goes where and who goes - who gets what and all that kind of thing at this juncture. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Okay (Magaly), I appreciate that. So I'm going to do the - handle question three like I did question two and find out how many people strongly object -- on this call, okay -- to accepting the statement -- PBC types identified, admen legal, technical abuse, proxy, privacy business -- must be supported by the RDS but optional for registrants to provide. And that's at the top of Page four on the Slides if you're not there.

(Unintelligible) to accepting that as a rough consensus conclusion. In other words, one of our working group agreements -- and they're tentative working

agreements based on future work, right -- at this stage of the game, would you put a red X in the adobe room?

Okay, so again - oh, is there a comment? (Alex), did you want to say something? Oh, you just hit the wrong button? Okay.

(Alex): No, yes, no, I'd like to if I can.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, (Alex).

(Alex): I guess two thoughts come to mind. I think it would be helpful if this poll question were actually two, right, two types identified must be supported by the RDS period and then another one around which are optional and which are required to provide, which if we did have that conversation I think we would have to add to the list of PBC types the, you know, the registrant -- the plain old vanilla registrant purpose-based contact. I think that would make sense to me.

Chuck Gomes: Well keep in mind, (Alex), we already covered registrant and we have some working group agreements on that already. But, you know, in fact, you'll see that in just a little bit when we get beyond our results here. But thank you for the comment.

So I see...

(Alex): Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...two or three people that was strongly objected. So again, we have a sense that a lot of people don't object to this at this stage. So (Allen), go ahead.

(Allen): Thank you, (Chuck). You said something as you were describing it, which I think is really important. You said this is a decision we make which we may revisit when we have looked at other things.

There is a tendency in these kind of groups -- and I'm not predicting your behavior or behavior of this group -- to once we have made a decision considering it's sacred, and if (unintelligible) which is contingent on several other things we have not come anywhere close to discussing yet and may be completely reversed based on those decisions, that's different than saying it's a tentative agreement, which has a form of rigidity and being set in concrete in it, which I think is completely inappropriate, which is why I put my X. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry, (Allen), I didn't - what is completely inappropriate?

(Allen): To say that this is a decision -- even a tentative decision -- of the group, when it is a tentative decision contingent on several clear things that we haven't discussed yet.

Now, you know, in other words, if there was a we will reopen after we have discussed the following five points, that's fine. But just labeling it as a tentative discussion -- which yes we could reopen if necessary -- I think it makes it far too rigid than it should be. Thank you.

I understand the desire of why we want to get rigid answers and keep on going, but I think in cases like this, there are just too many if buts.

Chuck Gomes: Well, that's a start.

(Allen): Indeed.

Chuck Gomes: So I don't know how we get around that, because we can't get anything done if we have to do in part.

So to comment a little bit on the first, (Allen) -- and this is (Chuck) speaking -- the - when we get to the point where we formally (unintelligible) the level of

agreement in the working group on specific recommendations, that's when we will get to the point where things become more sacred. We're not going to go back and revisit things after we do that.

We're a long ways from there now, so let me move on from there. (Alex), you're next.

(Alex): (Chuck), that was an old hand.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, Greg Shatan, Greg Shatan?

Gregory Shatan: Thanks, Gregory Shatan for the record. I hear (Allen's) concerns and your desires all at the same time (unintelligible) item, maybe not generally. I think that the problem with trying to come up with something that sounds too decisional is that there are too many variables that haven't been dealt with -- variables makes it sound too wonky -- too many facts, too many pieces of the puzzle that are not visible yet, and there are, you know, conductivity paths.

And so either these are very meaningful decisions that take us down certain paths, so they're not particularly meaningful because they don't foreclose other paths, but they could be used that which, you know, gets me to where (Allen's) fear is.

So I would say two things about how we do move forward. I think we need to recognize that this is a somewhat irradiative process. And if you make something sound too definite, that can get in the way of a proper irradiative process, because then people start clinging to what they - to a result that satisfies their needs, not because it was in fact a group result.

The thing is to try to get down to some of the missing pieces that are causing, you know, (unintelligible). We put the puzzle pieces down, (Marika), but we don't glue them down (unintelligible) a profession Lego artist, then you do glue the pieces together.

But other than that, you know, we have to be prepared to move (unintelligible) in indicative places, but we need to know what we're indicating and sometimes you find out the piece is in completely the wrong place.

So I'm suggesting if we put these down, we need to put them down with the idea that we're going to revisit them and that they are not kind of right, or not decisional milestones of the group. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Greg. Thanks for bringing up the irradiative. We haven't mentioned that in a while. There was a few weeks there where we were mentioning it every week. It is an - it has to be an irradiative process, so please remember that. And it's the only way we can do it, I think, or at least I haven't seen anything that allows us to do it any differently. So thank you for making that point.

Okay, so again, let's record (unintelligible) if you don't like the word tentative. I think you understand what I mean by that. We are in an irradiative process. We may revisit it. We probably will in lots of cases. So let's accept that.

And I'd like to move on to start looking at data elements in particular. And so if we could take this off - Greg, is that an old hand? Okay, thanks. And (Chuck) is speaking.

Okay, so let's take the results off and let's put up the next set of slides, which is going to go back (unintelligible) survey we did back I think - associated with our face to face meeting in Johannesburg.

Now, on this - in that survey, the - we - I think there are 39 data elements that we surveyed, okay, and we ask you whether you strongly agree that that's a data element that should be supported in the RDS, whether you agree, whether you're neutral on it, whether you disagree, whether you strongly agree.

And in fact, (Julia) or (Marika), I'm not sure which one of you are controlling the slides, but just flip through -- just stopping about ten seconds each -- on all the slides that are in this deck right now so that people kind of see the way we've organized the results from that survey. Can you scroll to the next slide just briefly? And let's go on beyond that one. I'll come back and talk to that one in more detail -- and that one.

Okay, here's where I wanted to go next. So here's a group where more people disagreed or were unsure than agreed, okay? And go to the next slide, please. And then the others fit in a couple categories there and there's a scoring system there. So now go back up to the top for me, please, and you can give - well let's not give control yet to everybody else, because I want them to (unintelligible) so it's easier to follow.

So again, for the sake of everybody's memory, the scoring system that (Lisa) used on this, for a strongly agree, it counted as two points. For a strongly disagree, it counted as two points. Agree and disagree counted as a point, and then you have the neutral, which - so that's what the scoring is. And so it's just a simple arithmetical measure of weighing the level of support, okay?

And what you see in front of you here are called mostly agreed data elements. So total points ranging from -- what is it -- 32 up (unintelligible) 51, okay, so 51 being the highest level of support based on this measure that we're using, okay?

And so what we're going to start today is getting some feedback from you -- first of all -- on the mostly agreed data elements, okay? And then we'll go to the mostly disagreed elements -- and I'm not sure we'll get that far today -- and then we'll go to the rest of them and try and get a sense of where the group is for each of these data elements.

And keep in mind, all we're talking about right now is collection, okay? We're not talking about access yet, okay?

So let's go now - keeping these data elements in mind, we're going to break those down in a couple categories. So let's go to Slide 2. So some of these have already been covered, okay? The registrant name and organization -- Working Group Agreement 27 -- at least one element identifying the domain - - i.e. registered name holder -- must be collected and included in the RDS, okay?

Registrant country, we have a working agreement on that -- Number 25 -- registrant country must be included in RDS data elements, must be mandatory to collect for every domain name registration.

Registrant email address -- Working Agreement 29 -- one that we've talked about recently -- at a minimum, one or more email addresses must be collected for every domain name included in the RDS for contact roles that require an email address for contact availability.

This is one, by the way. That last clause may create some confusion and we may revisit that sooner rather than later. We've kind of noted that in the leadership team. But for now, focus on the first part mainly (unintelligible) addresses must be collected for every domain name included in the RDS.

And then for purpose based contacts, for admin contact, technical, proxy, privacy contact, we've hit on those a little bit in our - in fact, really, one of our agreements today hit on all of the purpose based contacts, okay? So we have those.

Now let's go to the next slide. Next slide, please, okay. So the ones that we haven't covered at all are reseller -- and these are the ones of the mostly supported contacts, right -- reseller, URL of the complaints site, original

registration date, registrar abuse contact email address and registrar abuse contact phone.

So those are the five that -- and you can give scrolling capability to everyone now so that they can move to one of those previous slides if they'd like -- so on these five -- again, noting that in our survey, a lot of people think these should be supported -- in other words, collected and supported in the RDS -- which, if any, of these would any of you object to being supported in the RDS?

And we'll identify those and we'll talk about the reasons, your rationale, why they shouldn't be included. So I'll just throw it open right now. Are there (unintelligible) on the call, object to any of these. If so, raise your hand and then be prepared to give your rationale so that the whole group can understand your thinking. (Volker), you're probably on mute, (Volker). I'm not hearing you. Still not hearing anything.

Man: He says he's not on the phone.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, you're not on the phone. Can you please type something in the chat? Okay, so he said that the URL for complaints site should not be out there. And if you can put your rationale?

Okay, so (Volker's) rationale appears to be because the - it has to do with hosting. And (Marika) notes it refers to the internet site.

And so again, (Volker's) argument is that content, it's dealing with content, which is beyond ICANN's mission. He didn't say that; I added that in the WHOIS problem reporting site. And then (Greg), (Aaron) is saying it has nothing to do with contact.

(Marika), let me let you talk.

(Marika): This is (Marika). I just want to make clear that indeed this is probably the abbreviated version, but the actual data element is the URL of the internet complaint site -- which is an ICANN website dealing with WHOIS problem reporting -- so I want to make sure that people understand that this is not a general URL that is expected to be included or something related to registrant or the registrar. This is a very specific URL.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, and (Volker), you're right, we need to make that clearer. Obviously this is a slide in very brief form. So (Volker), would you - now that you understand that, would you still object to that being supported -- collected and supported in the RDS?

So I guess what you're saying, (Volker), is that it shouldn't be shown with the individual domain data. I think that's going to be an implementation issue, depending on how an RDS system is implemented, where that would particularly show.

But assuming we can agree at some point on where it's most appropriate to show that data, I'm concluding that you don't object to that (unintelligible) understanding that we'll have to figure out the best place for it.

It's collect - all we're talking about, Greg, is collection. Greg Shatan, all we're talking about is collection. And (Volker), you're right, the internet link, at least for now, is pretty constant, but (unintelligible) shown for people who are looking at a RDS record.

Greg Shatan, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. I think your last statement about saying whether or not it should be shown is why I asked about whether we're talking about collection or display. But earlier you said you're only talking about collection. So I think the point here is that the - if this is a constant email or a constant address, a URL, that,

you know, is not distinct for different registrants, then it's not something that needs to be collected from the registrant at all.

So it's not really - it doesn't seem to be part of our conversation, at least not during the collection aspect. When we do get to what should be shown to WHOIS or RDS users at the other end, then I definitely believe it should be shown and displayed, especially if it isn't WHOIS complaint (unintelligible) have to give any place to complain to or hide it, but I think that's probably not where we're aiming at.

So I think we just need to kind of clarify (unintelligible) probably don't need to consider the (unintelligible) complaint site for WHOIS needs to be collected.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, and we talked several weeks ago about the problem of the word collection, because some of the elements -- even in our minimum public data set -- are not actually collected from the registrants, so hopefully everybody remembers that. And if we use the word collection, realize that not everything is collected from the registrant.

Since we're on URL of complaints site, I'm not saying - I think it seems like there's - I'm not saying any - (Volker) had the one objection, but I think we've dealt with that.

Are there any other -- and again, I haven't kept up on the chat totally, so help me out, other staff and leadership team members if you need to point something out there -- are there any others that (unintelligible) about URL of a complaint site? Are any of the other elements there (unintelligible) not be supported in the RDS?

Okay, so is it fair to conclude then that there are no objections to these five data elements being supported in the RDS? Okay. (Volker), you said reseller can be problematic. Please write in the chat why you think that's the case.

Well (Volker), you said since the registrar does not necessarily know the ultimate reseller, we could still collect it even if the registrar didn't know that, couldn't we? I mean, we may have to implement some new procedure for that, but I don't think that eliminates collecting it.

And of course, we have to be in sync with the privacy proxy policy recommendations that were made recently in a PDP that are still being implemented, I think.

Yes, let's not get into all the edge cases of a chain of resellers or whatever. In implementation, we'll have to make sure we cover those, to make sure that it's implemented appropriately (unintelligible).

Some of you are getting into implementation issues. We need to deal with those if and when we make recommendations and recommend policies that do that. But I think that's something that can be done in the implementation phase.

Yes, okay, all right, so I'm going to conclude unless somebody raises their hand real quickly -- and I'm doing a better job on the chat right at the moment -- that probably won't last -- that these seem to be (unintelligible) five data elements. There's strong - there's no objections -- at least no strong objections -- and the objections we hear we've kind of dealt with for these five elements.

Let's go then to the next slide. It doesn't look like I have control of that. So, okay, there - okay, let's go to the opposite end of the spectrum. And so my question will be a little bit different this time.

So here are five data elements that were - where there was more disagreement and unsure votes than there were agree or strongly agree.

And so my question for you at - on this one is, are there any of these that anyone on the call thinks that they should be supported?

Okay, you're on mute, Steve -- Steve Metalitz -- there we go.

Steve Metalitz: I'm sorry - yes, Steve Metalitz. Well I guess the question - I'm not quite sure what you're asking. Are you asking whether these ought to be supported, or whether these ought to be mandatory? Because didn't we just reach a tentative conclusion -- at least if some (unintelligible) of the first question we talked about today are correct -- didn't we say that - when we're talking about alternative contact methods, weren't we talking about things like SMS, IM, social media...

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Steve Metalitz: ...alternative electronic contact methods? And we decided those all should be supported but none of them should be mandatory.

Chuck Gomes: Well, the only difference (unintelligible) I think, Steve. Here's where I'd make a distinction -- this is (Chuck) speaking -- we didn't specifically say that the five contact -- the five data elements on the screen right now -- should be included in that optional - as an option, okay, as a contact.

So what we're asking (unintelligible) we're specifically asking, should the RDS support -- and if we go by our other conclusions -- forgive me for that for those of you who want mandatory, okay -- so, okay, what we're asking now is, should these five elements - should any of these five elements be included as and supported in the RDS as optional contacts -- contact methods? Whatever term we want to use. Did that make sense, Steve? Make sure - I'm not sure I did.

Steve Metalitz: Back in June - well, I guess what were we asking back in June? Because back in June, we disagreed about including these elements. And I don't

know whether we were being asked, should they be mandatory, or should they be supported?

Chuck Gomes: I don't think we're that specific.

Steve Metalitz: Because now, today, we've decided they should be supported but not mandatory. Okay, I...

Chuck Gomes: Oh, not these five - we haven't - no decision has been made...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...that these five elements should be supported. That's what I'm asking right now, that...

Steve Metalitz: I thought that was the interpretation - that was the interpretation I thought that - sorry.

Chuck Gomes: We're getting to the next level, Steve. We generally said that at least one alternative (unintelligible) in the RDS but it should be optional. We're going to a more detailed level right now.

And we're - now the sense of the poll was, these shouldn't, so I'm asking for anybody who thinks they should be specific, optional contacts should be supported in the RDS to say so now, otherwise we'll conclude that we (unintelligible) of possible alternative contacts.

I don't know if I said that clearly or not. Did it make any sense, Steve? Okay, let's go to (Allen).

Steve Metalitz: Yes, okay, I think I understand what you're asking, but I think we already answered it.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, so I'm giving people a chance to disagree with the - well I'm not sure (unintelligible). If we already answered it, what was our answer?

Steve Metalitz: It should be supported. That is our answer -- this is Steve Metalitz again -- the answer (unintelligible). That was the first question when we talked about alternative contact. And people were interpreting that as an alternative electronic contact. Either that, or else we were deciding that it's optional to collect mail and phone.

I don't think you can have it both ways, (Chuck). Either that was about alternative electronic contact methods such as SMS, IM and social media, or it was about other alternative methods such as physical address and phone.

Chuck Gomes: Let me try again. In our conclusion that we approved today, we said there should be at least one alternative contact. But we did not say what - which alternative contacts should be in that set of possible alternative contacts. What we're doing now is getting more specific.

So let's go back up to the previous slide, please. In fact two slides up to the support ones. Okay, so what we decided -- and what I concluded we decided, maybe I was wrong -- that all of these contacts here are possible alternative contacts. Some of them are not so alternative like registrant name, but the ones that we have are already in registrant email address.

But if you take out those that we've already said need to be mandatory, all we're doing now is going a step further and saying, yes, all of these should be supported in the RDS.

Now go down two slides again to the not supported ones. Okay, and so you can see now - so we're getting more specific. Should these contacts here be part of that set of possible alternative contacts?

The sense of the group in the survey we took back in July was, these shouldn't be. And I'm giving people a chance to argue against that conclusion right now. Should any of these be concluded? The sense of the group in the survey results was no, they shouldn't be.

(Allen), let me turn it over to you. Maybe you can help me out here.

(Allen): Thank you very much. My comment to some extent does not apply to facts -- and I'll go back to that in a moment -- I do not believe that the RDS should have dedicated fields to the social media of the day or the communication method of the day. This changes over time and we're doing something for the long haul.

I do believe that there should be an alternate contact type of entry in the RDS where the registrant can specify what is the mechanism and then this is the ID. So they can say Facebook such and such, or SMS or Skype such and such. And I think there should be - they should be allowed to -- should they choose -- specify multiple ones of those. But I would strongly object to actually having fields associated with SMS or immediate messaging, because we're going to have to specify which one anyway. So all of those, I think, fall under a single category.

Fax is a slightly different category, because although it's getting out of vogue -- I took it off of my business cards several years ago -- it does have legal meaning in some places and we may want to consider fax differently.

But in the general one, yes, people should be able to, in the RDS, be capable of storing it, but in a generic way, not specific for each of these perhaps multiple kinds of media that change over time. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Allen). Greg Shatan, you're next.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Greg Shatan for the record. I think (Allen) makes a good point, maybe we are - this is a point where we're actually getting too granular (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry for laughing. But go ahead, Greg, I'm sorry. Is that all you wanted to say? Okay, I guess it was. So now we're not going to have time to finish.

Greg Shatan: Sorry, I was having a little microphone problem there.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, go ahead, Greg.

Chuck Gomes: No problem, that was just a - I'm glad to hear you laugh, (Chuck). These are supposed to be your salad days and your golden years and so you should be amused every once in a while. I appreciate your hard work -- hardest working retired man at ICANN. Maybe there are others but I think you're still harder working.

At any case, if there's just a field for alternates, we can just have that. I don't know if we need to support an IM versus an SMS, you know, we don't need to declare these unsupported -- that's the one thing -- because things will change over time.

You know, fax is truly peculiar. As legacy as it is, it has certain - it's used in certain legal contexts -- maybe unfairly -- and we don't know what's going to come up, so we should just be agnostic in allowing for (unintelligible) wish to give.

You know, it's generational. My son communicates on, you know, various chats and messengers and texts far more than email. And who knows if that'll be the case when he turns into a young professional.

So I think, you know, freeform and multi - and there should be more than one. You know, if you want to give everything down to your Myspace page, be my

guest. I think that, you know, most people will want to provide what they believe are the ways that they can be contacted best, or ways that they might want to be contacted only for these purposes, keeping other channels kind of free of friction (unintelligible) for once.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. (David), you're going to get the last comment there other than concluding comments. And keep it brief if you can because we're just about out of time and we need to wrap it up.

(David): I think we may (unintelligible). I'm just going to say that the level of sort of granularity means we may have strayed into phase two implementation territory rather than phase one requirements or discussions (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (David). Of course, one of our key questions in our charter is to decide on what data elements would be in there. So part of it, we have to answer. We may not have to be this granular, as Greg just said and others have said.

So but we're going to have wrap this one up. We'll continue this discussion next week. Let's try and remember the comments that have been made.

So let's talk about our poll. We've reached - I think what the leadership team will do is create a poll on the 10 or 12 -- however many data elements there were on the mostly agreed data elements -- that there were - there was really no objection after discussion on, at this point, supporting - having the RDS support this.

Now I want to go back to (Stephanie's) comments in the chat a little bit ago. (Stephanie), this is another example where we may have to come back and revisit some things, because you're right, certainly the data protection experts have said that we need to minimize the data that's been collected and so forth. And we have an independent review of those questions that they answered being done and we hope to have a final report from that process in

the next month or two, at which time we may have to come back and revisit some of these things.

So that's under - that's, again, back to what we talked about earlier, this is an irradiative process. We don't have our independent review yet. And once we do, we're going to have to factor in that with decisions that we've made, and so that is understood.

(David), is that an old hand?

Okay, so I think, (Marika), are we, are you okay in terms of what we need to do with the poll and armor? Any questions there? Our next meeting is next week the same time and day, so we have that.

And so our poll (unintelligible) strongly agreed ones, which are the green ones, which are not - no green ones shown here. So anyway, so we will have a poll coming out hopefully later today.

(Marika), go ahead.

(Marika): This is (Marika), just a quick question on that poll. Is the approach (unintelligible) the small set of people weren't sure if they should be included that we actually are saying restate if you object for these to be included in the RDS, leaving aside whether that's optional, mandatory, or what is getting displayed, but actually ask people to state reasons why they believe it shouldn't be provided or in the RDS, which then, of course, may set us up for further discussions.

Chuck Gomes: So I think what we should do is the way we've been doing it in the sense that there were no -- after discussion -- there were no objections to any of these - the following data elements -- and we'll have to list them -- being supported by the RDS.

And then I think you're right, if you disagree with any of these elements being supported, please identify which one and cite your reason. Now, do we want to do that in 10 or 12 separate poll items or all together, we can figure out the logistics of that. Does that make sense, (Marika)?

(Marika): Yes, but if I can just pull up, are we talking about the ones that are on the screen here, which is...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: No we're not, we're not. That's the wrong screen.

(Marika) Which one are we talking about then?

Chuck Gomes: It's the mostly agreed data elements at the - up a bit. Those, right there.

(Marika): Okay, so only the remaining ones that we didn't cover yet by agreement, so basically these five?

Chuck Gomes: That's right, correct. So it would be - it'd really be these five. Thanks for catching me on that. Okay.

(Marika) Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, all right, anything else we need to do before we wrap this up? So that's - the action item is for a poll to be created and everybody to respond to the poll. And thanks, everybody, for your participation today. We're, again, a little bit over, I apologize for that. And we will - I will adjourn the meeting and the recording can stop.

Woman: Thanks so much, (Chuck). Everyone have a great day. (Darren), can you please stop the recording.

END