ICANN Transcription
Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group
Tuesday, 29 August 2017 at 16:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group Call on the Tuesday, 29 August 2017 at 16:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Attendance may be found at: https://community.icann.org/x/XmfwAw

Recordings may be found at: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-nextgen-rds-pdp-29aug17-en.mp3 AND

https://participate.icann.org/p1k08nsw9c2/

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Julie Bisland: Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the Next Generation RDS PDP Working Group call on the 29th 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 would you please let yourself be known now? Okay, 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.

With this I will turn it over to our chair, Chuck Gomes.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Julie, and welcome everyone. Does anyone have a update to their statement of interest? Okay. Not seeing any hands and since there's nobody

that's in audio-only I'll assume not. So let's move right into our agenda, if we could get the next presentation in the slides please? Presentation in Adobe, please.

Okay, so we're continuing on our deliberation beyond the minimum public data set and keep in mind, even though our charter says what data should be collected, stored and disclosed, we're using the term "collected" – and that's where our focus is – very broadly. Some of it isn't – some of the data is not collected, it's provided by registries or registrars, etcetera. So please keep that in mind and don't take the word "collected" too literally. And I'm going to try to be better in terms of my terminology as well.

So we've been looking at quite a few data elements and hopefully you've had a chance to look at the poll results from last week. They were helpful so thanks to all of you who participated in that as well as to those who participated in the meeting last week and online discussion.

So we're going to take a look at those poll results. First we'll look at the Questions 2-6 and propose some conclusions on those and then we'll go to Question 7 which wasn't a question to try and determine consensus but rather to get discussion going on some other data elements. So hopefully we'll get through those today and maybe even beyond.

So the – and where we would go beyond are those data elements that you see at the bottom of Slide 1 there. Don't know if we'll get to those today or not but that would be our goal. And what we'd be doing is starting discussion on those 10 data elements that we haven't talked about yet. So again, note that you have scroll control so feel free to use that as you see fit. You might want to look at Slide 2 right now where we have a slide there that Lisa put in just to capture some of the email discussion that's been happening over the past week or so on contactability and registrar data versus RDS data.

And a lot of that discussion really – especially the registrar data versus RDS data, occurred several weeks ago, as some of you will recall. The contactability discussion focused on working group agreements related to improving contactability with the registrant or registrant's agent, and so we did agree, as a working group, at least as rough consensus, that the RDS be capable of supporting at least one alternative contact as an optional field.

Some of you wanted it to be mandatory, I'm aware of that. I was probably one of those. Doesn't matter, the – a large percentage of people supported it being optional so that's where we're at right now. As far as space contact types, admin, legal, technical abuse, proxy privacy and business all must be supported by the RDS but again, optional for registrants to provide. Those are rough consensus decisions that we've made at this point in time.

And so keep in mind we can revisit any of these things later, and may have to as we continue to make decisions as we move forward. So let's go on then to – you'll see Slide 3 is just a link for your benefit. If you haven't look at the poll results and so forth, you can use that link, pull it up even during this meeting if you'd like.

Going to Slide 4, let's see, wait a second, I'm sorry. I guess we – now we don't want to – thank you, okay so we're going to look at that link right now, the results. My mistake, the way I worded that.

So here are the results. And again, you have scroll capability. Notice that there were 26 respondents. And I'm going to scroll down to the second slide that – and the bottom in particular, you can look at the bar chart if you like too, but notice that there were 72% that supported the agreement. Now if we scroll back up you'll see the agreement at the top of Page 2. "The reseller must be supported by the RDS and must be provided for inclusion in the RDS by registrars. Do you agree with this statement?"

And so 72% agreed with that; two did not agree with it. And five suggested alternatives. So the – what we have there, and bear with me a second while I get another document in front of me here. Okay, so we have now pretty strong agreement, and especially when you consider that the five people who suggestions weren't really disagreeing, they just thought there might – there could be some improvements.

And correct me if I'm wrong on this, Lisa, but I think that what we recommended here was that the – to use the suggestions in comment Number 5 as maybe a slight variation of the original statement and that was from Roger Carney, okay. Let's look at that one. Did I get that right, Lisa?

Lisa Phifer: Yes, Chuck. And we've actually copied that to Page 3 I believe.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, on Page 3 – oh it's on – of this – that's what I was – on Page 3, okay, bear with me. Oh there we go. Good, okay. That's what I was looking for and I wasn't find it so I was going by my memory which, with everything I have going on right now isn't very good.

So all right so what we ended up recommending, and you're welcome to look at any of the comments if somebody wants to comment on your comment or somebody else's comment, you can do that. But what we suggested after looking at all of the comments is – and you can go down to Page 3 and see that – is that we use Roger's suggestion and say that "The reseller must be supported by the RDS and must be provided for inclusion in the RDS by registrars." And then we added – the leadership team added the parenthetical, "if applicable." Some people don't use resellers is why we put that in there.

So we think that that's a reasonable proposal for rough consensus at this point in time. But let's hear what Steve Metalitz has to say. Go ahead, Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, thank you. This is Steve. I'm fine with the formulation that you have at the bottom of this Slide 3, I was just – I raised my hand because I thought you would said that this was the same thing as Suggestion 5, which is actually different. And it makes it optional even if there is a reseller, which I would not support.

Chuck Gomes: No, okay.

Steve Metalitz: So as I said I'm fine with…

Chuck Gomes: Yes, okay.

Steve Metalitz: …what you do have down there.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, okay all right, good. And I think I misspoke there, Steve, my apologies, but okay, good. Thank you. Now is there anybody that strongly opposes this as a rough consensus conclusion? Now we already know that a couple people didn't like it, but we're dealing with rough consensus right now and not unanimity. So and we have pretty strong, when you consider the 72% plus the, you know, maybe a few others with some modification. So, Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. For clarity, as people have pointed out, resellers can be nested, perhaps many deep. Are we saying here that this must be the reseller who actually had the transaction or some reseller along the food chain?

Chuck Gomes: We're not saying. We skated around that.

Alan Greenberg: So we say the registrar…

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: …must provide a reseller that is presumably in the food chain for this domain but not necessarily the one at the end? And that's up to the…

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: …that's up to the registrar and the resellers to decide which one to put in? I want to understand what we are saying, not debating it.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: That's a good question and we didn't ignore those comments, okay? In fact I needed a little education because I really wasn't familiar with all the nesting that goes on with – that Greg Shatan and others talked about. And Michele wasn't on our leadership call yesterday so he couldn't help me, but the rest of the team did and so the nesting and I now understand the difference between a reseller – a registrant interfacing reseller and a registrar interfacing reseller.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Somebody needs to put their phone on mute. I'm guessing that was a dog or something, but it doesn't matter. So Alan, that will have to be dealt with maybe even as soon as when we get into the policy area, certainly when we get into implementation. And…

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Excuse me, Chuck, then there should be a note made that that is specifically unclear and needs to be refined, or perhaps needs to be continued, be silent but that should be a conscious decision because as with you, not everyone understands that this could be a long chain of resellers.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thanks. So let's add – that's a good suggestion, let's add a little note to that affect so we can take that as an action item. So anybody strongly object to this with the footnote or note that explains that eventually we're going to have to deal with the issues of a chain of resellers that come up when there are a chain of resellers. Okay. So let's accept that, add it to our list of working group agreements.

And by the way, one of the things we're going to do in…

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Chuck, it's Alan. Volker and…

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Volker in chat said he's dialing in because he objects strongly.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. All right. So okay we'll get to that. And I saw Marc Anderson's hand up but it went down so the…

Marc Anderson: Chuck, this is Marc. I was just raising my hand to make the same point that Volker – point out Volker's messages in chat.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, let me look at that in chat. I see he strongly objects, he must have said something earlier. Okay, Volker, we're working with rough consensus; I think you know that already, we're not looking for full consensus, 72% is nearly 3/4, that's not too bad in a working group like ours. And we're not at a point where we're doing formal consensus. I know you already understand that, Volker. Are you now have voice? Go for it.

Volker Greimann: Thank you. Yes, Chuck. We're currently working with the system where the field for the reseller is strictly optional so if a registrar that has reseller wants to omit them that's strictly their call and they're able to do that. And it does make sense for business reasons in many ways to have it like that. For example, if you have nested resellers then the reseller may not want to be in the Whois himself, but may want to have nothing in there rather so that the resellers would not be pointed to – the resellers would not be pointed to a medium reseller or a – a place up the food chain.

If we want to change what we have right now then that should be very well considered and not just based on the majority vote that does not reflect how the GNSO works and how the GNSO is set up. So while we might have a lot of voices that are in support of that, I'm not entirely sure that reflects a consensus of the GNSO, the consensus of the GNSO would have. So I think we should discuss this and if there's arguments for forcing this to be in there then it should be very well considered and it should consider also the problem of nested resellers and other problems that are involved in having that field.

I mean, we place it there for a reason but others don't and I think we should make sure that all options are considered and before we reach any consensus here, we should discuss it rather than basing that consensus on a vote.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Volker. This is Chuck. So my understanding is you would support the way Roger said it and instead of "must be provided for inclusion in the RDS by registrars," it should be "may" is that what you're saying?

Volker Greimann: Correct, that's the way that the current RAA is set up…

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I'm aware of that.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thank you. Okay, let's go ahead and talk about that. So the issue at hand is in the second "must" in that conclusion where it says "must be provided by the registrar," Volker and others are saying that that should be "may." And some people said that that was one of the debates in the comments, "may" versus "must" there. I think everybody was pretty much in agreement that reseller must be supported by the RDS. Doesn't mean any field that's there has to be completed, but it must be supported by the RDS. But where the debate is is whether registrars should be required to provide it, once we define what it means as Alan pointed out, and others in the comments, and – or should it be optional? Should the word be "may"?

Who would like to support your position on it? Now, Steve Metalitz, I think you like the way it's worded now; you didn't like the – the word "may" there that was in Comment 5, is that correct – Steve, you want to comment on that and just explain why you think that way? Go ahead, Steve, since I called on you, I'll get back to Alan.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, I would certainly prefer the "must" formulation. I got to say it's not just because of this issue but it really harkens back to the discussions of last week or two. When it's optional that means you should assume it's not going to be there, if somebody is using the RDS you can't count on having this information.

I think this is probably less important than the fact that under the rough consensus decisions, if you want to call them that, that we made last week and two weeks ago, you can't count on having anything there other than email address. You can't count on having a phone number, you can't count on having a physical address, you can't count on anything else other than one email address. And that's I think a serious flaw in what we what we put together so far.

With reseller I think people have said some of the advantages of being able to contact a reseller directly rather than having to go through the registrar

who may or may not, you know, forward that on promptly, I think that has some utility enough to justify saying that the mandatory element, if there is a reseller, and I agree with the change that you made in the formulation, if there is a reseller that reseller should be identified and made contactable, if you will.

So that's the reason that I would prefer that formulation to the formulation that Volker has been supporting. Thanks.

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

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. This is a messy area and I'll explain why. It's not dissimilar from the situation with proxy providers that a proxy provider does not have to reveal who it is that really owns the domain if they are willing to take full responsibility for whatever happens with the domain, you know, just as your lawyer may register it and take full responsibility without revealing who you are.

And resellers to some extent are potentially similar, there are – well there were last time I looked at this, registrars who act on behalf of their reseller, so in other words, when you get the reminder letter saying your Whois information has to be correct or the reminder saying your domain is about to expire, in some cases if the domain was sold by a reseller the reseller sends that. In other cases, even – or again it was and I suspect still is – even if a reseller sold it, the registrar may be the point of contact and acts on behalf of their resellers.

In which case it is reasonable that there not be a reseller list because the reseller (unintelligible) agent but is not the active agent acting on behalf of the registrar in relation to that domain. So, you know, taking that into account there may be rationales why the resellers is the worst person you'd want listed there because they only handled the transaction and are out of the game after that for the rest of the life of the domain. So I think we have to

look at it and make sure that we're putting something in that makes – that is useful, not just the name. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Alan. This is Chuck. Volker, you're next. And, everybody, so that as many people can share as possible, please be as concise as possible in making your point. Go ahead, Volker.

Volker Greimann: I think it was all points have been made especially with the concern of chained resellers. A lot of resellers also do not want the registrar to know who their resellers are to prevent poaching, that is a very real problem for some – for some resellers, they fear that their registrar may take over their direct business. Another thing is that so we as registrar would never know how the ultimate reseller is because the reseller would never provide that to us.

In other methods, in other points there is like Alan said, sometimes the reseller sends out the messages, sometimes the reseller resource sends out the messages and we just get a log that shows that these messages have been sent. So the – this has the potential for a lot of customer confusion rather than helping the customer. If we put, for example, only our reseller, but that's not the (unintelligible) for the customer. So this will have to be considered and I think we are too early to say that we have any form of consensus on that.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you, Volker. Greg Shatan, you're next.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. First, I think this concept here is obviously (unintelligible) concept. There are sub-concepts that can be dealt with beneath it as well as edge cases. I think we're getting wrapped out the axle on this or using edge cases to – in an attempt to justify thinking the top line concept. In my comment, which was Number 3 on the hit parade, I noted that there are, you know, sometimes more than one reseller and that if the reseller is the point of contact for the registrant, but is not that of the registrar, the registrant should put that down or perhaps the reseller.

Whatever we can get to the minutiae of implementation, but I think there's plenty of ways to deal with the issues of multiple resellers and what role they're actually playing is well beyond the level of detail that any data (unintelligible) hope to deal with. So in the transaction, out of the transaction, really doesn't matter, I think, you know, the issue of – that people are going to be confused you know, if you contact the reseller and he says, you know, all we did was X, then that's it, there's really not a matter of confusion. What we're trying to do here is provide information for users of the database.

And so I think it's – keep an eye on the top line concept and, you know, think about ways to deal with the next level concept. But none of that kind of attacks really the validity of the top line concept with which I agree, it must be supported and it must be provided by the – the reseller, the registrar knows about should be supplied by – must be supplied by the registrar.

And, you know, overall I find some of the harping on whether this is rough consensus or where it's at I've heard this a lot in groups lately that whoever is on the wrong side of the decision doesn't like the decision making process. And I think we need to be careful where we go with that because ultimately it just blows up the whole process. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. As you know, Greg, that's what I'm trying to avoid, but the concerns are legitimate and we need to hear them on this particular issue, I think. What I'm going to do is do a quick meeting poll on the one issue that is being debated, and that's where registrars should be required to provide reseller information or it's optional.

So if you think that it should be required, an several of you have already expressed so that I expect you to respond, put a green check in the Adobe, if you think that the wording of the statement should be a "must" instead of a "may" that the registrars must provide the reseller information. Just put a green check please. I just want to get a sense.

Volker Greimann: I'm sorry, you were quite unclear what the green checkmark means now.

Chuck Gomes: It means the word "must" would be used, not "may." Registrars must provide the reseller information, that's what the green checkmark. In a minute you're going to get a chance – in fact, while we're at it, if you disagree with that, you think it should be "may" put a red X, sorry, I have to deal – use the tools at hand. We could have done it separately but put a red X if you think it should be "may" instead of "must." And it looks like we're getting – I'm not counting but it looks like a pretty even split or enough of a split that I don't think it's fair to even reach a rough consensus conclusion, certainly it wasn't that widespread in the original agreement and the original poll, but it certainly is now, and that's why the discussion was important.

So my recommendation, unless somebody has a better one on this one, is that we leave the first part of the statement as it is, that the – certainly the RDS should support the reseller field, and we will have to deliberate further on that – on whether it's a must or may later. So let's accept the first part of the statement. The – and we're going to defer the others because there's quite a split – quite a significant split in terms of whether it's a must or may.

And a lot of people have raised important issues on both sides of the argument, so – and I apologize for how many things we end up deferring, but if we try to get final resolution on everything that we run into like this, we will literally go nowhere and we're going slow enough as it is. Now, that means we're going to have things to cover later, that's true, but as we get more clarity in terms of data protection law in some parts of the world and other things, hopefully we'll be able – some of that clarity will guide us in terms of which way to go.

Maxim, go ahead. Maxim, you put your hand down? Okay, all right, that's fine.

Maxim Alzoba: It's Maxim Alzoba. As I understand the (unintelligible) party if we're talking about resellers is the Registrar Stakeholder Group. I suggest we request their formal opinion on that because most people whose business interests or maybe business practice is not relevant to what resellers do may be unaware that they exist – the typical patterns of behavior, etcetera, etcetera. And since they contacted mostly registrars, yes, I think there the only party has information we need. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Maxim. Let me suggest this way of doing that, those of you who have relationships with resellers, which certainly should be a lot of registrars in this group, please feel free to reach out to them and ask them to provide their concerns one way or the other on this. And then communicate that to the working group, okay?

All right, let's go on so that we don't spend all the time on this one here. And so we have a shortened working group agreement here. "The reseller must be supported by the RDS." End it right there for now. Okay?

Let's go to the next question, Question 3, this one I hope will be a little easier, you never know in our working group. But if you look – if you're on Page 4 there you'll see the statement, "The URL of the Internet (complete) site must be supported for inclusion in the RDS." And a lot of the discussion – a good discussion on all of these, and a lot of the discussion on this one focused on should it be in the – in the response to a particular domain name query that the Internet URL? Or should it be in some general site that's available to everybody?

Discussion, and it, you know, who knows what the best answer is there? All of us have our opinions. But there seemed to be good support that the RDS should support this. Now I'm sure some people would say well it doesn't have to be part of the RDS, it could be somewhere else. And there were discussions on that on the list as well.

For right now rather than spending a lot of time on this, because I don't think this is a make or break issue, it's an implementation issue, primarily. So I suggest that we accept that as is for a working group agreement. We're going to have to deal with it more specifically certainly when we get into implementation, because it is definitely an implementation issue. Any objections to that?

Okay, let's go quickly on then to Question 4, if you go down to Page 6, if you're not already there. And you can clear any agrees and disagrees in the Adobe room. The – so you can see the statement here is, "The original registration date must be supported for inclusion in the RDS. Do you agree with this working group agreement?" And there was, again, I'll let you read the comments on your own, they were good. They – a lot of good points were made, okay?

Now the leadership team proposes on this one – proposes this as a possible agreement. "The original" – and this on Page 6, okay, in red. "The original registration date, see footnote below, must be supported for inclusion in the RDS." And you'll see in the footnote we referenced the definition on Page 57 in the Expert Working Group report of what that means, because quite a few of you asked what does the original registration date mean? And it's a legitimate question, okay?

It's a – and so what we're saying in the agreement here is the – that must be supported for inclusion in the RDS. Now, in stating that, I recognize probably as much as anybody that this is a real complicated bit of information to get if there's a series of registrations for a particular domain name. This is really complicated for existing registrations that have been around for a while. It would be easier to implement it going forward for a brand new name registration that's never been registered by anybody before.

But of the 100- and I don't know what it is now, the total registrations for gTLDs, 150 million or probably a lot more than that, registrations that already

exist, if any of those have been registered by somebody else before, registrars certainly wouldn't be able to easily provide that; it would be a hugely complicated thing to implement. So in fact if any of you read my comment on this one, you can see it up there now, Number 11, you know, I could only support this one if it was cost effectively implementable. And I'm not sure it would be.

But let's open it up to discussion and let some of you talk on this. Jonathan, go ahead. Jonathan Matkowsky, you're probably on mute because we are hearing nothing. Let's go ahead and go to Anne – oh are you there, Jonathan?

Jonathan Matkowsky: Oh, can you hear me okay?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, hear you. Thanks. Go ahead.

Jonathan Matkowsky: Oh great. Sorry for that inconvenience. I just wanted to support exploring the burden and benefits of being able to – of including the most recent registration date, I mean, creation date is probably a defined term in terms of the first creation date, so I might – it might be a bit ambiguous.

But the idea of including the most recent re-registration date when it's not the creation date is extremely important for evaluating abuse as we saw in the most I guess the recent gTLD study of DNS abuse. The security community looked to the (recency) of the registration as strong indicator of the maliciousness of the domain. So it's extremely important to have that information.

Chuck Gomes: So, Jonathan, you're proposing something different than what the EWG definition of original date is. You're proposing the most recent previous registration, not necessarily the original, is that – did I hear you correctly?

Jonathan Matkowsky: Yes, I don't want to talk about the creation date because I think that's probably a defined term as the first creation as opposed to if the domain is not, you know, it has been re-registered, since the creation date, then it's important to include the most recent re-registration of the domain. Like it probably requires some word-smithing because re-registration…

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Jonathan Matkowsky: Might imply that it's by the same registrant and clearly that's mostly not the case. So…

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Jonathan Matkowsky: I'm not sure of the right word, but the concept is the most registration date of the domain should always be required.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so to make sure we're all on the same page because I think I understand, you can correct me if I'm wrong but I think I understand what you're saying. So if there was a domain name – a domain name let's call it domain name XYZ, that was registered four different times in history by different people, and what you're talking about would be the third registration, whereas the definition that the EWG gave would have been the first registration. And of course the creation date is the fourth registration. Did I get that right?

Jonathan Matkowsky: Yes, so I was proposing – I'm proposing adding a requirement, I'm not advocating in favor of removing the first creation date…

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay.

Jonathan Matkowsky: …necessarily. But the – but you got it right in terms of the most recent registration requirement.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Jonathan Matkowsky: That's the strongest indicator of abuse compared to the creation date per
                 se because that could be – it could be created 10 years ago and then
                 theoretically not have been re-registered until a week ago.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I may come back with a way to handle this later but let's let people talk.
                 Thanks, Jonathan, you were very clear and thanks for making the point that
                 you're not – you're supporting the original as defined by the EWG but you're
                 suggesting adding the most recent. Thank you very much. And I will come
                 back. Andrew, go ahead.

Andrew Sullivan: Hi there. This is Andrew Sullivan. Thank you. I am really uncomfortable with
                 the drift of this discussion because people keep talking about, you know, oh,
                 we should do this if it is commercially feasible. And (unintelligible) to
                 understand that we're not talking about commercial feasibility or not here, this
                 is literally impossible for some registries on the Internet. And what that means
                 is that there will be a field that is mandatory to populate and in some cases it
                 will have false data in it.

                 That is a very bad data model. You should never, ever create data – a data
                 field that you know will sometimes have bad data in it because what that
                 means is that people will take that data and they will act on it even though it is
                 known to be false in some cases. So I am very strongly opposed to the
                 inclusion of this even though I understand the reasons why it would be
                 desirable.

                 You know, we're many, many years into the history of the Domain Name
                 System, it was invented in the early 1980s, and it is impossible for us to
                 recover that past data. So I really strongly oppose the creation of this element
                 just because you know, we've got all these years of history and we can't
                 possibly fill in this field correctly. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Excellent point, Andrew. Thank you. Alan, you're next.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I was trying to look up the Expert Working Group report and see exactly what words they used. I cannot even figure out what the utility of the original, original date is even if we could get it definitively. And other than for an academic study on the use of domain names and how they evolve over time, I'm not sure what the purpose is knowing that someone registered this name 15 years ago, deleted it a year later, and now someone again has registered it.

And it's certainly nothing the registrar can provide when they're registering the domain name and creating the new one. So it would have to be obtained from the registry or from some third party site; it wouldn't be reliable and I'm not sure what the utility of it is. So are we sure we're talking about the right thing? Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. Volker, and let's go to Volker and Tim, and then I'm going to make a suggestion if I can get some cooperation from a few people in terms of dealing with this. Volker, go ahead.

Volker Greimann: Yes, thank you, Chuck. Volker Greimann speaking. The way we've always treated this from a policy standpoint at least that has been our interpretation is that a domain name ceases to exist at the time of deletion at the registry. If it's newly – if the same string is newly registered that's a new domain name. So basically if you're talking about that domain name, that's the one that's currently registered. Any previous registration is a different domain name with the same string. I think if we can agree on that interpretation we will already evade a lot of pitfalls that (unintelligible) otherwise.

Secondly, though, I think Alan's correct, we need first to define the purpose for the collection of this. Trying to achieve by having the registration date – creation date of that domain name speaking of the domain name that's currently registered, because there are (unintelligible) may defeat that

purpose, for example, if I transfer that domain name to my brother, my brother becomes the owner, does the creation date still matter for the purposes that we collected for?

Does it have – so basically what I was trying to say is let's – before we try to say that this has to be in there or that has to be in there, let's try to define why it has to be in there, make solid decision based on that argument and then decide whether we – that argument cuts or not and we want to include it or not.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Volker. Good suggestion. Tim, you're next.

Tim O'Brien: Morning, all or hello, good evening all, depending on your time zone. This is Tim O'Brien for the record. As was mentioned earlier, this particular date is very useful from a threat intelligence, from an information security perspective in regards to tracking actors, helping determine whether it's malicious site, looking at activity within the organization of hey, what's all the domains that we've gone to in the last four hours that have been registered within the last week, whatever, we can come up with a couple different use case scenarios there.

Yes, we understand that it's a lot of data that's in the you know, Whois currently is an error and flawed and so forth, that's into the accuracy conversation that we've beat the dead horse with on previous occasions. But this is what we're trying to do for the next time. And yes, there are very valid use cases and concerns for this particular data point. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Okay, Jonathan, you're up.

Jonathan Matkowsky: I wanted to mention the most frequent use case that I've seen of the creation date as it's defined, the first creation date. And I'm not – I don't think it's more valuable than the most recent registration date, but I do think it adds

of (unintelligible) specifically from an intellectual property perspective and domain dispute resolution perspective.

The first creation date is often used as an indicator that – of whether or not a domain has benign like benign intent, separate than, you know, trying to mimic a trademark. So it comes to the defense a lot of times of domain registrants when the first creation date predates the trademark registration or filing date. It's often relied upon by panels as some evidence that, you know, to pay closer attention, that maybe there is a benign purpose in the domain as it existed before the registration rights.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jonathan. Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks. Lisa Phifer for the record. I'm going to put again in chat, and restate here the reason that the EWG recommended this data element, which would be optional and only provided when it was available, the reason or the definition given was that because a domain could be registered and deleted and registered and deleted many times, this would capture the first time that a particular domain name had been registered.

And the reason that that was discussed within the EWG long ago is there were several use cases having to do with intellectual property, in particular, where it was useful to research how long a particular domain name had been in – around. Is it relatively recent? Is it very, very old? In that case it might have some other history to search for. That's my recollection of the EWG's motivation in including this in their recommendation.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks for that insight, Lisa. Alan and then I'm going to make a suggestion here. Go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. Both Jonathan and Lisa's comment I think support what I'm going to say. Those are good reasons why this information is useful, but it is not clear why it needs to be in the RDS. Since it may not be in the

RDS, as Lisa pointed out, since it may not be available. It may be there and not be accurate. There are services that can provide this, if you are going to court or arbitration you will often bring in experts to give you information. And this, you know, the number of times it has been independently registered, the first time it has been registered, and by whom in all of those cases is very important information in establishing trademark issues and related things. It's not clear it needs to be in the RDS. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. I'm going to ask for some volunteers, okay, we're going to put this aside for now and not – conclude any agreement on this based on our discussion here and my evaluation of it. A lot of good points have been made on both sides, and maybe there's more than that – in fact there's probably more than two sides. So hopefully everybody's heard those.

What I'd like is for a few of you to be willing over the next two or three weeks to just have an email exchange with one another and see if you could come back to the working group with a recommendation to have the – a recommendation and justification for having the RDS support this or not or some compromise situation like making it optional or – that was brought up by the – by Lisa, I think in the EWG.

So do we – if you'd be willing – and all we're talking about is just a two or three week email exchange, and probably it'd be helpful if we had someone who'd kind of coordinate that, keep the discussion going. If you'd be willing to contribute to that offline, you know, online via email over the next two or three weeks, raise your hand – or excuse me – put a green checkmark in the chat right now.

Okay, Benjamin, good. Mike, I think that's – Mike Palage, your checkmark has been in there. Because it's been in there so long you've just volunteered to help this group. I'm guessing you didn't intend that so you better either remove your checkmark or you're a part of the group. Volker, good. I need to scroll down because there's a nice turnout in today's call. Tim, good. One

name that's missing that I really want to see in there, I'm going to pick on you, is Jonathan, would you be willing to help in that?

Jonathan Matkowsky: Yes, I was just asking what – I couldn't hear – what are you looking for volunteers?

Chuck Gomes: Is for this small group of people to exchange – and staff will identify the people and include their names in an email to start the process, okay. And just want you to discuss this issue and see if you can come up in the next two or three weeks, some recommendation for the working group in terms of how to handle this one. Should this element be supported in the RDS? Should that be optional to provide? Should it not be supported in the RDS?

And you may decide we couldn't come to a conclusion, but it looks like we have enough people on different sides of the issue that if nothing else you decide, hey, we don't think we can come to a conclusion on this. We're not asking you to spend hours and hours on this, but if you could have an email exchange. And again, staff will include the people that have green checkmarks there. Michael Palage, are you still on the call? I think we better leave Michael out of that, okay? Because his checkmarks been up there for a long time. And I don't think it's for this. So don't include Mike Palage in that issue.

Tim, is that a new hand? Thank you. Okay so we've got some names. Thanks, everybody, who volunteered there. Watch your email, staff will be sending something to all of you and just toss this one around over the next two or three weeks. You can come back and then – are there – is there one of you who would be willing to kind of be the coordinator? And all I mean by that is, you know, hey guys, haven't heard anything in a couple days, what do you think? Maybe ask some questions or something like that. Some of you have already raised some good issues.

So be careful about removing your green checkmarks unless you want to volunteer for that very light coordination role. So it looks like Volker is the winner because he didn't remove his checkmark. Are you willing to do that, Volker? Oh, went away fast when I said that.

Volker Greimann: Sorry, yes, I was only half listening at this point.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Jonathan.

Volker Greimann: Yes, sure.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead. There you go.

Jonathan Matkowsky: It sounds like Volker just- Volker, I think just agreed if no one else wants to take the role then I'll do it but if he's…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay thanks – thanks, Jonathan, I appreciate that, very much. So and again, I'm not talking about anything heavy duty, but if you would just kind of try and facilitate the discussion however and other people should, you know, cooperate in that. Thank you very much. And, Jonathan, if you could report back to us in two or three weeks, if you have made any progress and any information that might be helpful. So okay?

Jonathan Matkowsky: Sure thing.

Chuck Gomes: All right. Thank you very much for that. I'm assuming that's an old hand, Jonathan, if not speak up. Okay, let's go to Question 5 on Page 8, "The registrar abuse contact email address must be supported for inclusion in the RDS and must be provided by registrars." Now, what we're going to do on

this one, we're going to combine 5 and 6 – 6 had to do with a telephone number, right, for the abuse contact.

And if you scroll down to Page 9, you'll see a possible alternative that the leadership team wants to throw out for consideration on this. So on Page 9 there you'll see in red this alternative. And we think it covers both, okay. "A registrar abuse contact must be supported for inclusion in the RDS and must be provided by registrars. Registrars should have a choice of abuse contact methods they support."

Now we did this after reading and carefully considering all the comments that were submitted on this – on both of these 5 and 6. And one of the things that I recall was pointed out was that some registrars have a Website that you can go to to deal with abuse. And they may not have an email address that you send to, for example and so on. And that's just one example.

But we throw this out as a possible compromise that we think addresses the – most of the concerns that were expressed and comments that were made. So let me open that up for discussion and then I'll see if there are any big objections on that. But let's just open it up for discussion. Jonathan, is that an old hand or is that a new hand?

Jonathan Matkowsky: That's a new hand.

Chuck Gomes: Okay good. Go ahead.

Jonathan Matkowsky: So I'd like to just make the point that (unintelligible) representing enterprises with large-scale threats need to be able to implement workable tools to be able to mitigate abuse. And if every registrar can basically create a contact method that – of their choosing it makes it a lot more difficult to come up with something scalable that could combat abuse that impacts upon large organizations.

Chuck Gomes: So this is Chuck. So you would prefer the way it was, where there's an email and a phone number?

Jonathan Matkowsky: Absolutely, I believe that an email and phone number should be required.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Jonathan Matkowsky: If a registrar wants to include additional preferred methods of contact, and vendors could try to work toward meeting those requests in order to mitigate the abuse effectively, I'm all in favor of that but there should be an absolute minimum threshold for combating abuse which would include an e-contact and preferably a phone number that works.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thank you, Jonathan. Volker, you're next.

Volker Greimann: Yes, thank you, Chuck. Volker speaking for the record. I'm not very a big fan of the phone number because a lot of information gets lost over the phone. And if somebody calls us about any complaint issue then all they'll hear is send us an email, we'll answer it by email. Phones disrupt the process, we cannot (unintelligible), it's just not really helpful unless it's a very, very urgent thing, that the police or law enforcement is calling us about. But they have their own contact; they don't need – so we don't have to have the public phone number in there.

The second point I wanted to raise though is the comment that I made in (unintelligible) which is that we should make clear what that abuse contact is actually responsible for because the way it is right there is it says "abuse contact" so everyone and their dog contacts us about anything they have with any Website, may have a problem with. If they don't get the shipment on time, then we are the person they complain to. If they – when they order something.

If they feel that a certain link should be removed from the Website, we are the ones they contact. But we do not have control over the shop that's operated under that domain name or on the Website, we don't have control over the hosting that controls what is available on the Website. So we should make it clear that this is for domain name abuse, not for abuse or problems with hosting services. And for those complaints they should contact the registrant directly.

I'm not saying we should not have that address in there, I think it's helpful for a lot of reasons, but we should add a disclaimer in some form that explains what the email is actually there for and what it's not there for. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Hey, Volker, hang in there because I'm going to follow up with a couple questions. First of all, okay when I first read your comment, and it was a good comment, in terms of this particular data element, I think it makes sense to explain what the purpose is for, and we could certainly do that of the contact because I'm sure it gets abused all the time and used for other things.

But I also thought, okay, so if somebody – if there's something illegal going on from a content perspective, now that's not a registrar's issue. But somebody may have or think they have cause for having the domain name taken out of commission because of the problems that are being – and I'm not saying they should be able to do that or not, but that's really not necessarily a registry issue but they may need – excuse me – registrar issue – but they may need registrar action to deal with the problem.

So those things kind of overlap. So how do we, I mean, your point is well taken that it should be domain name issue. And I guess it is even if they're dealing with a contact issue; they need you to do something about the domain name. Is that – do you agree with me on that? Would that be a domain name issue that should be – so they should contact the abuse contact?

Volker Greimann: Well, it depends. If the domain name is blatantly illegal providing for example – let's look at Daily Stormer, for example, because it's a recent news event. In Germany that would be blatantly illegal, anything they're doing on that would certainly not survive very long. And then as registrar we might have cause to take action for that.

But very few cases that we see have blatantly illegal uses for the entire domain name. So if there's only a link that's a problem, we're not the right person to contact, but people still think that we are because it says "abuse" right? So that's what I mean. Of course we do receive comments and I think the description should make that clear what we are there for. However, in most cases, even if content has some problems with illegal issues, the registrar is usually not the right person to – or the right entity to make that call.

We are neither equipped to make that call nor are we legally qualified to make that call. In most (unintelligible) to say to the complainant, that's interesting, we cannot check if that's illegal or not, please go to the (unintelligible) and then that gets done. Waste our time because we could have just pointed that out (unintelligible) for such cases where certain issues may exist, the police should be contacted.

Chuck Gomes: Okay one more…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: One more question for you along a little different line before I go to Steve and Greg. So you as a registrar, and I'm putting you on the spot, sorry about that, but you as a registrar, would you be comfortable with requiring an email abuse contact and providing something like (unintelligible) proposed here that registrars may provide an alternative method to email?

Volker Greimann: Absolutely…

Chuck Gomes: That's something that sounds reasonable to you?

Volker Greimann: Absolutely. I have no problem with providing the email address as I said, when I first started on my little excursion. The email is helpful and it does solve a lot of problems, and I'm very much in favor of having it there. We should just (unintelligible) for and what is not there for.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Volker Greimann: And any other means that a (unintelligible) employ to make it easier for people to come to them and resolve the issues, if we can make that possible then I think there is nothing to say that we shouldn't. If we want to have a Website there that people could – could go to or a Facebook page or whatever, that we want to use for that and we freely offer as a registrar, then why not put it in there…

((Crosstalk))

Volker Greimann: I like optional fields.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, okay. Steve Metalitz, sorry to keep you waiting, but it's your turn.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. I actually surprisingly agree with Volker to some extent, not on his point that there's a bright line between content and all other kinds of illegal activities, or abusive activities, I don't agree with that. I think he's already explained why that point is not actually valid.

                   But I think this is a good example of why all of the data elements need to be defined so that there is some agreed upon definition of what each one refers to. And we talked about this back when we were talking about technical contact and administrative contact, none of which is defined now and there's

vast confusion about what they even mean. This is the same way, an abuse contact does need to be defined.

My other point about the abuse contact, I mean, I do support the original formulation that said email or phone, but if we deviate from that – email and phone, which is the status quo, but if we deviate from that and say the registrar can choose the form of contact, we probably ought to have something that makes it clear there needs to be multiple non-proprietary, you know, in other words, redundant, non-proprietary means of contact.

We've talked about this is other contexts that it can't be – you shouldn't be able to have to rely on a means of contact that – for which you have to, you know, register or join a club or something like that in order to make use of it. So email and phone have the advantage of both being non-proprietary in that sense and anybody who was on the Internet or on the phone network can send an email or make a phone call. So at a minimum that should be the requirement. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Steve. Greg Aaron.

Greg Aaron: Hi, this is Greg Aaron. Thank you, Chuck. When people see some sort of a problem associated with a domain name, something – a problem on the Internet, a lot of people are not going to understand the exact technical problem. It may be a problem where you should go to the host, sometimes it is a problem where you should go to the registrar, sometimes it's a problem you may need to go somewhere else to solve.

But we cannot educate people on those nice (unintelligible). And make sure that registrars don't get calls they shouldn't. In some ways I think the way to think about this is look, the RDS is providing information about a domain name, that's what it does. So an abuse contact is related to the domain name, it's not related to the hosting, it's not related to the IP addresses that the Website is on or anything like that, it's about the domain name.

When you look in an RIR database, there are abuse contacts for networks and IP addresses. Those are abuse contacts for the IP addresses. So I mean, to a certain extent registrars do incur some costs and those are the costs – and sometimes they get called about things that ultimately aren't something they can solve. But that is also a cost of doing business in the industry.

Now, Chuck, I was a way for a couple minutes, did the latest consensus policies come up in these discussions?

Chuck Gomes: Not yet. You're welcome to.

Greg Aaron: Okay, because it's highly relevant. We had a consensus policy that just went into effect 30 days ago. Now, I think everybody is familiar with the consensus policy process, it's very hard to get through and it goes through a lot of process and requires a big consensus vote of the GNSO and the ICANN Board has to be approve it. Now, just 30 days ago we had a consensus policy go into effect and it says that the abuse contact information must be provided by the registrar and it must be published in Whois output.

The community literally went through an entire process and decided this issue just recently. So if we're going to debate this all over again, I think that's first a waste of time and second, there's got to be really compelling reason to overturn what the community just decided. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Greg, thanks. This is Chuck. And as you might guess I'm a strong believer in not duplicating effort and especially intensive effort as what goes on in a PDP as you describe. So your point is really well taken. So in this particular case, now I haven't look at that consensus policy in detail yet so you can probably help me out and others out as well, so if we were to take these two, 5 and 6, does the policy itself require email and phone?

Greg Aaron: I actually quoted the consensus policy in my poll comments so you should be able to see them there.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I've got those handy here.

Greg Aaron: It requires an email address. I forget about whether it requires a phone.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Before I go to Volker, I'm going to throw this out, and we'll talk (unintelligible) Volker, okay? One of the things we could do here is to just come up with an agreement that we will support – the working group supports the conclusions of the recently implemented consensus policy and identify that and so forth, as it impacts the RDS. That would…

Greg Aaron: Yes, and…

((Crosstalk))

Greg Aaron: …and Chuck, one of the things to note is the poll question didn't talk about publication of the…

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Greg Aaron: …the address. The consensus policy does.

Chuck Gomes: Understand. And we'll get there…

Greg Aaron: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: …well I won't (unintelligible) that but we could when we get to disclosure and display and so forth we – probably assuming we would support an approach like this now, I would suspect we would support the disclosure of that then too. Thanks, Greg, that's very helpful. Volker, you're next.

Volker Greimann: Yes, thank you. Just to respond to what Greg said, I have no problems with (unintelligible) address, I think that you misunderstood me there. It should be there, and I agree it's a cost of doing business, but we shouldn't just stand still at that point and shrug, oh well, we get so many complaints that are not really helpful that we can't do anything about, okay, they waste our time, they slow down the process for the domain name where we do have a point to make, where we do have to – have something to contribute.

If we get 100 emails every day, and only 50 or something or 20 or something that we really can do something about, those 80 that we do get we can't do anything about but still have to provide by policy and by response to even if that response is always the same two liner, that wastes our time for those to be ready and to provide a timely response to those to be able to make a difference.

And I think that's something that we should consider as well. So where's the harm of adding a disclaimer providing somewhere on the RDS landing page a brief introduction what each contact means and what it's there for and what it's not there for. I don't think that hurts or harms anyone, and the data that we are providing is there for those to use it.

And they won't – there will still be misuse and of course we will not be able to reach everyone and teach everyone what the contact is for, but providing that information in a very easy to find place near where the search results would be able to be gathered I think provides a valuable – a valuable addition to the service, both for the registrar that has to deal with less complaints that they can't do anything about and would not be able to assist anyway, and to the community that might get – might see a faster response time to their valuable complaints.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Volker. Greg Aaron, I'm going to come back to you there. I'm guessing that you probably wouldn't have any objection to – as long as it's

carefully worded some sort of a direction and guidance for those who might read it and use it. Am I correct on that?

Greg Aaron: There's already some guidance about that somewhere on the ICANN Website, but I don't think we need a guidance note in the Whois output. So something that doesn't need to be – necessarily be addressed specifically in the output. I mean, we're going to have a ton of ornaments hanging off of our output here if we try to deal with every problem…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yes, okay. Thanks.

Greg Aaron: I mean, I think it's good to have some explanatory text somewhere but I don't think this – you know, jamming in a lot of stuff in our output and lots of bells and whistles isn't necessarily the way to go.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, and we're going to have to really get down to the nitty gritty when we get to implementation on that, but thanks. Thanks for both of you on that. Jonathan, your turn.

Jonathan Matkowsky: Yes, I just wanted to raise the possibility of including a privacy abuse contact. Most of domains that are abused are compromised. Those that have privacy it's extremely important to have a privacy abuse contact to mitigate that type of threat. I don't want to – I don't know if there's a way to do that within this working group or maybe it's sort of going outside the scope but I'd love to get some feedback.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jonathan. So well very quickly, new hand, Volker, keep it brief, please.

Volker Greimann: Yes, just in response to that, I don't think we need to worry about that because the Privacy Proxy Implementation Working Group is currently on

that and probably will finish their work before we do. So we can, at that point, look at what the Privacy Proxy Accreditation Working Group has come up with and try to plug that in to our work as well. In the best interest of not duplicating work, I think that makes more sense.

Chuck Gomes: So my question to the whole – to everyone on the call, if you would support a statement, and we can let our great staff team word it later unless they – unless sometimes they're really quick and come up with it on the spot – but support for the recommendations of the recently implemented consensus policy regarding abuse contacts, as it relates to the RDS, if you would support that, would you put a green checkmark in the Adobe (unintelligible) reason to not support that, put a red X.

And Greg's described pretty well what that is. And part of the answer to what I'm asking now really relates to having respect for the consensus policy development process itself and realizing that a bunch of people and the community as a whole and the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board as Greg Aaron already said, you know, did their homework and did a bottom up process and came up with these conclusions.

And who are we to change that? In fact, we should take advantage of that. Marc, you have a comment on that?

Marc Anderson: Hey, Chuck. It's Marc. Thanks. You know, I'm, you know, I'm supportive of this and, you know, of what you said in general, you know, unless we have a compelling reason to change it. I think the, you know, the status quo is fine but haven't been involved in that process. I want to point out that this was not something that was specifically discussed by the previous policy group. You know, it was not actually debated by policy.

What the policy – the – what is debated was that the policy should – for Whois output should be based on the 2013 RRA, or sorry, the RAA, the 2013

Registrar Accreditation Agreement. That itself was the result of bilateral negotiations between registrars and ICANN staff.

So just sort of in the interest of, you know, sort of full disclosure here, you know, that the decision to include the abuse contact phone and email really didn't come out of consensus policy, you know, it really had its roots in this 2013 RAA discussion. That said, I'm not opposed to this and sort of I think my position is to support the status quo here. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. That's good context to this. And thanks for sharing that. Volker.

Volker Greimann: Volker Greimann speaking again, for the record. I think the presumption should be that any recent policy decisions by the GNSO – any recent consensus policies should be implemented into our work simply because it does not make sense to reopen the book on something that just has recently been decided. I think we should still leave it at the presumption of implementing it as we might come up with a better idea for different things and then it might not be compatible anymore and we might have to twist and adjust certain issues. But in this case, I absolutely support it.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. And so I'm going to very quickly jump – so let's test that in our poll – that and we'll let staff come up with some wording and maybe even including some of the background comments like they always do in the poll, not the comments necessarily quoted but the concepts that were shared by Marc and by others and Greg and so forth. So we'll do that.

And then secondly, I want to come back to email. Is there anybody on the call that would be opposed to the RDS definitely supporting an email abuse contact? I got the sense – by the way please clear all your checkmarks in the Adobe so we don't confuse it. But is there anybody – raise your hand if you oppose requiring an email abuse contact. And then be prepared to explain why.

Now, so we've already polled on that, and okay, go ahead, Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks, Chuck. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I was actually raising my hand to ask a question on that. We did poll on that and forgive my aging memory but why would we (unintelligible) a particular communication channel type for an abuse contact? I thought we had more or less agreed that while, you know, it might be say (unintelligible) somebody else might want SMS or some other social media tool. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, well I don't think we reached total agreement on that but I do think that in most cases we have agreed on email. I'm going to suggest, because we're out of time now, if there aren't any huge objections and we don't have time to do a lot of talking about it, that we accept the poll results for Number – I think it's Number 5, right, on the email contact for the abuse contact as a rough consensus conclusion and move on on that.

Now if there's a lot of objection to that – I've actually heard some people – quite a few people express they're okay with that. So let's accept that as a rough consensus conclusion. The support was pretty strong for that in the poll we just did and there's no use re-polling it. So now we've got to wrap this up now. Volker, one more (unintelligible) please.

Volker Greimann: Just yes, just to respond to Stephanie, I think we should have some – a form of consistency therefore one common method of communication for all registrars, I think makes sense. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Volker. And I think there was a lot of support in the group, Stephanie, for, you know, the possibility of other forms of communication, ideal forms of communication, but I don't think we definitely agreed on any of those and we'll be looking at more. So we're running out of time, we just have a minute I think.

Our call next week as at the same time. I think we have at least a couple poll questions. We will (unintelligible) on the elements that we polled on on Number 7, we'll be talking about those next week and hopefully getting beyond that. And so please be prepared to do the poll this week and be (unintelligible) discussion on the (unintelligible) poll Question Number 7. And we'll show the results of poll Question Number 7 next week to get that discussion started not to analyze the results like we will this week's poll questions.

Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thank you, Chuck. Lisa for the record. For those of you still on the call, if you would take a look at today's call handout, the pages that we didn't get to, actually summarized the comments that were received on those data elements that were included in this week's poll Question 7. And so you may find it useful to prepare for next week's call to take a look at the comments that were received, and they're broken down by data element just to make it a little easier to organize your thoughts.

The other thing that you'll find in today's handout is actually the next batch of data elements that we'll deliberate should we finish all those in Question 7 next week. So you may want to take a look at that as well. It's at the tail end of this call's handout.

And then, Chuck, I have a question for you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Lisa Phifer: You suggested accepting the results of Question 5 as a tentative agreement for now but we also did a show of hands on an alternative to that agreement per recently approved consensus policy both the email and phone must be supported. Were you setting aside that possible alternative?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Lisa Phifer: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: And we can talk about that further later, but I think so at this stage based on –
                but there seemed to – the email part seemed to be strong enough, that's why
                I picked on that one so…

Lisa Phifer: Got it. Just wanted clarity for the recording.

Chuck Gomes: Yes…

((Crosstalk))

Lisa Phifer: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: …appreciate that. Thank you very much. Okay, I want to reinforce what Lisa
                said and then we'll adjourn, and that is that handout with regard to Question 7
                really makes it easier to – in my opinion – to get a view of the comments and
                they're organized in a way and there's a little chart that shows how many
                supported this, a little tabular thing that is very helpful.

                So look at that and look at the – also it has the – like Lisa said, some things
                for the data elements beyond those in Question 7, okay? So take a look at
                that before next week's meeting, I think you'll find that really helpful and you'll
                be – it'll help prepare you for next week's meeting.

                So I – is there anything else we need to cover before we – I think we know
                the action items, we're already over so I don't want to belabor it. Thanks,
                everybody. A lot of great input and much appreciated. Have a good rest of
                the week. And we will talk again. And hopefully on the list. Thanks for the
                small group that's going to be working on some email discussion on the

original registration data and the issues associated with that. Hope you'll get started on that discussion this week.

With that said, let me adjourn the meeting. The recording can stop.

Julie Bisland: Thanks, Chuck. (Darrin), can you stop the recordings please? And…

END