

**ICANN Transcription
Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group
Tuesday, 24 January 2017 at 1700 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Next-Gen RDS PDP Meeting on the Tuesday, 24 January 2017 at 17:00 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/jrPDAw>

The audio is also available at:

<https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-nextgen-rds-pdp-24jan17-en.mp3>

Coordinator: The recordings have started. Speakers, you may begin.

Michelle DeSmyter: Great, thank you. Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the Next Gen RDS PDP Working Group call on the 24th of January, 2017. In the interest of time today there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants online. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. If you're only the audio bridge today please let yourself be known now.

Okay, well as a reminder to all participants, please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Also, keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this, I'll turn the call back over to Chuck Gomes.

Coordinator: ...you may press star 6 to mute.

Chuck Gomes: What was that last thing?

Michelle DeSmyter: I think that was our operator.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks, Michelle. Welcome, everyone. This is Chuck. You can see the agenda over on the right. And let me ask if there are any updates to statements of interest. Okay. Not seeing any, let's go ahead to Agenda Item 2, which is to review poll results. If we can pull those up?

And we're going to start with Question 8, as you probably saw when the agenda was sent out yesterday, which was the question about publication of raw data for working group polls. So hopefully we'll have a good discussion because there's pretty good diversity in terms of the responses.

For those that maybe didn't look at the poll, let me quickly read Question 8, "In our 24 January call we will discuss the possibility of publishing raw poll data, taking into consideration working group member wishes for privacy and transparency. As input to that discussion, please identify any personal data that you would prefer not to be included in raw data that might be published for future working group polls."

And then you can - you were able to check all four boxes if you wanted and insert comments. So you can see that there's pretty strong opposition to showing IP numbers. And some of the comments, if you read them, relate to that as well.

The - and the others are kind of split. Certainly there were, you know, a little over 1/3 that didn't want name included, there was nine people that didn't want the PDF of individual poll responses and then there was the other data item, there's more responses there.

Now I want to call - I'm not going to go over all of the comments but you'll notice that we highlighted just a couple things in the comments. And you can

see those there. First of all, in Comment 4, and let's give people the ability to scroll please? There we go, thank you.

So you can see that - in Number 4 we highlighted the word "time" in that comment. So just - we wanted to point out that that there is, you know, there's nothing we can do about the time, okay, it's going to show the time in Survey Monkey so we - it'd be a huge amount of work, I think, to control that. Let me let Lisa jump in on that.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. We can illustrate for you the alternatives for Survey Monkey exports, but essentially we have three options. We can give you the actual raw data in an Excel spreadsheet, in which case we could delete the column on time. We could also delete the column that contains IP address and the member's name depending on what this group chooses.

The problem comes in if you want to see the exports of any PDF from Survey Monkey, which are not true raw data but may be what some people are after, for example, the export of individual responses. In that case, the exports do include time stamps for any write-in comment, and there's really nothing we could do other than manually redact that, which as Chuck said, would be a huge amount of work. So it would be important to know that that was really essential to provide you that kind of export with that time stamp.

Chuck Gomes: And then if you look down at Comment 7, we highlighted most of the last sentence. Member affiliation should also be listed, with the caveat that a member may not be speaking for the group. Let's start there and assuming that we decide to provide some form of raw data, and that's not a decision we have made, okay, but what comments do people have about showing member affiliation? Let me just open it up for a discussion on that.

Go ahead, Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the records and what have you. Affiliation, I mean, well in my case I don't really care; my affiliation is always the same so, you know, if you see my name on something it's me speaking as me on behalf of me and on behalf of my company. I don't really - I don't really care beyond that.

I think part of the reason why this entire thing came up was around some of the conversation we had at some point about whether people were speaking as an individual or were speaking on behalf of a constituency or stakeholder group or whether - regardless of what the person thought that they - regardless of who the person thought they were speaking on behalf of, whether their answer would be construed to be on behalf of a particular group. I think that's where this may stem from. Personally, I don't really care.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Michele. This is Chuck again. And let me remind everyone that we're really expecting you on these polls, unless specified otherwise, that you're speaking for yourself. The reason being is, is the polls don't have very much time to respond. And in other words, there's really not time for you to go back and test things with your group that you may be representing overall.

So the understanding is that you will be, in most cases, speaking for yourself even if you do represent a group. That said though, it is possible that if we show people's affiliation, that some people, especially those that may be looking at some of our work from the outside, may assume that you're doing that. So there's a little risk there. But just wanted to point that out. You are - we are assuming that you're probably speaking for yourself just because of the short timeframe we give in the polls.

Lisa.

Lisa Phifer: This is Lisa Phifer for the record. We have actually been examining the distribution of responses across affiliation for every single poll. We don't actually need to gather that information from each of you for each poll and

certainly something that we could add to the raw data that is provided to you. It's information that we have from your statement of interest.

Speaking as the person that compiles the data, I would actually prefer to add it as opposed to collected from you each time, simply because the - looking at the distribution of responses across different groups would be challenging if people provide different affiliations or, you know, variations on the same, you know, stakeholder group and constituency each time they respond. Working from you're affiliation on the statement of interest would provide more consistency in looking at the results and their distribution.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa. This is Chuck. Anybody else like to comment on this? Not having much discussion on it, let me do a quick online poll, okay, not a formal one that can be done because I didn't warn the staff on that. But anybody - how many of you, if you would click on the red X, disagree, if you would not like to see member affiliation? Again, we haven't decided to show any raw data, we're going to work on that, we're going to talk about that further, but if we did, how many of you would be strongly opposed to that? Would you put a red X in Adobe?

Xs still being added so I'm going to wait just a little bit. Okay, if you could remove those Xs. And then my next question for a response, if it's really important for you for us to show affiliation, even if it's as Lisa described, that we would add it based on our membership records, put a green check. And then if you would be prepared to talk to that.

Okay, I'll call on you in a little bit, Nathalie and Holly. Just let's give a little more time for people if there are any others. Okay so Nathalie, could you tell the working group why you think that would be very helpful? Oh, your mic doesn't work. Can you - if you can put something in chat that would be helpful.

In the meantime, Holly, how about you? Can you explain why you think that's important?

Holly Raiche: That's fine, but people are asking what the question is. So before I answer, maybe for the people who don't remember, could you repeat the question?

Chuck Gomes: Sure. Sure, I can do that. So if you look at Comment 7, okay, the suggestion is, is that we add in the poll - or in the raw data, excuse me, and it could be added in the poll or not, as Lisa suggested, member affiliation. Now Lisa pointed out that if we add a poll question on that, it could be fairly complicated and difficult to manage so she suggested that the easiest way to do that would be for us to, after people take a poll, we can determine based on their name, what affiliation they have from the membership list and provide that.

So the question is, right now, how many think it would be very helpful to have member affiliation shown in the results of the polls? And that's the question. So what I asked, because Holly checked a green check and now Carlton has, and previously Nathalie had, there's others. So let's - Holly, would you like to respond to that?

Holly Raiche: Okay, the first part of my answer was what you answered and that is the information is available anyway if people go through the transcript of any meeting and look at the working party, they know.

That said, not everybody has memorized where everybody is from. And very often, giving the affiliation does explain to some extent where people are coming from. I don't think I, and certainly I hope others don't think this is the organization speaking. And that's why I suggested in the chat, perhaps we make it very clear on the survey that people are speaking individually. But that said, it does assist us in knowing at least a little bit about where people are coming from. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Holly. Let's go to Carlton. Are you on mute, Carlton? Not hearing anything. Okay, maybe we'll get him later. Greg Aaron, go ahead please.

Greg Aaron: Hi, Chuck. This is Greg. Can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Well my thought is when we communicate in any other way we identify ourselves. We do that in our phone calls, and through email. And this is another form of communication and we should be able to identify who is providing information or providing an opinion. That's what we're here to do, to share that kind of thing.

I'd also note that the GNSO Working Group Guidelines are clear that polls are not votes. They can be used to get a sense of the room and that kind of a thing, but these aren't consensus calls or anything. And they shouldn't be taken as such. This is a way for us to get the feeling for what other people are saying and we should understand who is saying what. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. Carlton, is your mic working now? Very hard - sounds like it's working but it's very hard to understand.

Carlton Samuels: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Yes, it's impossible to understand. I don't know what's happening. So if you...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...now, I saw your previous comment in the chat. If you can put something in the chat, Carlton, until that problem is resolved, that would be helpful. Michele, go ahead. Michele, are - you took your...

Michele Neylon: I'm not going to say anything.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay, thanks. Thanks. Okay that's fine. So Carlton - I've never heard anything quite like that, Carlton, so sorry for the technical things. But if you can put something in the chat. So now, Greg Shatan, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Sure. It's Greg Shatan for the record. Yes, I'm kind of two minds on this. You know, on the one hand there's value of transparency and the fact that we generally do identify ourselves. But on the other hand, I'm, you know, just - there's a certain value also in just, you know, toting up the - in kind of being anonymous and in toting up the totals. And I guess I'm, you know, also concerned about, you know, whether - and how the data might be manipulated and also the fact is, you know, affiliation by themselves are kind of brute force or very blunt or obtuse measures of where one comes from.

You know, within my constituency we have a variety of opinions on most matters and any one member is going to be, you know, different than another recognizing that anybody is obviously we're all speaking for ourselves. And, you know, there's also the question of course of whether nationality is something that should be dealt with as well. This is an issue that's come up in other contexts. And also whether - if you're affiliation is with an organization or you might at least be here, you know, on the whole representing a corporation or an organization or an affiliation or an association as opposed to an individual, does that matter? I mean, it's - kind of gets us into a bit of a garbage in garbage out question.

I don't mean to make it all, you know, complicated but I'm just trying to see, you know, whether I might convince myself that it's a good thing to do this or a bad thing. So that's kind of where I'm at and I haven't really heard anything, you know, compelling in either direction.

And since, you know, the general procedure has been just to take the sense of the room as the room, and not to get more granular I think - when I think back to the concept of humming, and I've never been to an IETF meeting so

I'm only talking about this conceptually, one of the advantages of humming is that you don't have to open your mouth so you don't - nobody, except those right around you, knows whether you're humming or not, they only know how loud the hum is.

And I'm wondering if that's a reason why humming is used for that, although I know - I recognize that's used actually for consensus and not for a sense of the room, or maybe it's used for both, as I say, I am - I've only observed the IETF from way outside the bubble. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. It's Chuck again. Now, let's - unless you guys think I'm being unfair, I'm now going to turn it to those who put the red Xs in the Adobe. If several of you would explain why you oppose showing affiliation, that would be much appreciated. Just raise your hand if you're willing to do that. Okay there we go, good. I remembered a few names so I was going to call on some of you. So, Jim, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: So thank you. Jim Galvin for the record. I had originally said, no, but after listening to discussion I've decided to change my response to yes. In the spirit of transparency, I really have no issue with disclosing the data if that's our consensus. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jim. Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: Yes, this is Klaus Stoll for the record. I feel also between the fences on this point, but I still think that you might one point yourself why we shouldn't do that is quite simply because there is a danger that people will associate the answers somebody as the opinion of the organization he's representing. And I just want to avoid this danger. That's the reason why I put an X. thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Klaus. There were four or five others I think. Any of the rest of you want to change your mind like Jim did or explain why you oppose showing

affiliation? Chuck still speaking. Let me - thanks, Greg, that's clear. You did already respond. So, Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I did not object. But just a comment to Klaus's statement. We've been hearing at ICANN for a decade now that people can't speak because it will be assumed they are speaking on behalf of their organization whether it's the GAC or the Board or whatever. Steve Crocker just made a comment on a document, it doesn't matter which one, but there was a long discussion we were told in the Board, about whether he should be allowed to make that comment on his personal behalf because it will be assumed it was a Board comment. Ultimately, he made the comment.

I think it's really important that people speak out and if they want to be disassociated with the organization they come from, then they should say that. But that doesn't make the - make it - that relationship invisible. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: So, Alan, this is Chuck again. And in the poll, it would complicate the polls a little bit more if we ask everybody to always identify they're speaking for themselves, but I suppose we could just have a little check box at the beginning of every poll that people could check if they're speaking for personally.

Alan Greenberg: You can put it..

Chuck Gomes: And maybe that would cover that. Did you want to respond, Alan?

Alan Greenberg: You can put a checkbox, you can put I'm from - I'm the Chair of ALAC but I'm speaking personally as text, I don't really care how one does it. I think those are valid positions. I certainly sometimes speak - and generally speak on my own behalf unless I'm formally being told to speak on behalf of ALAC. And, you know, I don't think anyone thinks I'm speaking on behalf of ALAC every time I open my mouth. I certainly haven't cleared everything with the ALAC

and had a formal vote on everything - every session including this one. But I speak on a regular basis, so I think that's the way we have to work. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. This is Chuck. Klaus, go ahead.

Klaus Stoll: Sorry, old hand. But I'm getting more and more convinced that I have also like Jim, change my position. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Okay so looking - now looking up at the results of the responses, and there were 23 people that responded to Question 8, obviously quite a split. Now there's not a full agreement in terms of which one should be allowed. Strong opposition to IP address. But so one of the things we could try in the near term is this, and I'm - you can suggest a totally different idea than what I'm suggesting.

But as I'm thinking and listening, one of the things we could do is we could provide an Excel spreadsheet after each poll and we could delete the name column and we could delete the IP column. That's pretty easy to do. And show a spreadsheet that gives the data. That wouldn't offend those who don't want the name on there. And we could add affiliation.

I'm not sure how we would show - before we go to what Lisa has put on the screen, and we're going to come to that, that's about me, by the way, so but we'll come back to that. So we could - how would we show affiliation if we - there seems to be a leaning toward showing affiliation. How would we show that? Anybody can respond in terms of the way you'd like to see it shown. But, Lisa, do you have an idea how you would show affiliation in the results that we report?

Lisa Phifer: Sure, Chuck. We've actually already been compiling that. What we do is we take the respondent name, map it to the affiliation in your statement of interest and add that column to a spreadsheet that we've been using to plot

out, you know, distribution of responses and detect if there's any affiliations not participating.

So it'd be easy to, for example, see the Excel spreadsheet on the screen, you could replace or add a first column that includes that working group affiliation based on the respondent name. The question I still have is whether that person would want their name included in the list or not, the Excel spreadsheet. We could do the affiliation with or without the name being included in the published data, that's up to you guys.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa. And would people have an option whether they wanted their name shown? Is that easy to do?

Lisa Phifer: That's easily done in raw data, Chuck, it wouldn't be easy to do in any of the PDF export forms.

Chuck Gomes: But it could be done in the spreadsheet?

Lisa Phifer: Correct.

Chuck Gomes: Okay all right. What do people think about that, giving people an option, again like we would probably do with Alan's suggestion is give people a chance to say that they're speaking in their personal capacity. And that could be a simple checkbox. We could also give people a chance to say whether they're okay with their name being disclosed.

Would - any discussion on that? Any opposition to that? Either one of those things, I'm actually talking about two things. Alan's suggestion, having a checkbox just to - even though we have said that we're assuming people are speaking on their own behalf, we could give them the opportunity to check a box that reaffirms that. And then the second thing would be give people an option whether they want their name disclosed or not. Holly, go ahead.

Holly Raiche: It's just a thought, picking up things that other people have said, there is so little time when you've got a poll to get a firm answer back, I'm not sure that - well, I mean, maybe have the option but the one option that makes sense to me is if people are not comfortable having their affiliation there. Although I think the affiliation is on your SOI and people know anyway and it's helpful. I don't see how people would have time to go back into their organization and have sign off and then not want their name published but have their affiliation published. Just a thought. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: So Greg Shatan asked what the purposes of this is, and I assume that - well let me back up. So one of our members requested raw data. And I'm not sure if that's what you're asking, Greg. So the purpose of this discussion is we as the leadership team didn't think it was up to us to just provide that without a group discussion and group - at least strong working group agreement that that would be okay and doing it in a way that we hopefully don't minimize participation in the polls, which was one of my concerns. So I don't know if that answers your question, Greg, or not.

And, Steve, yes, you've heard Lisa and I say that we're assuming personal views, but like I was trying to respond to Alan's point that people should say that if that's what they're doing. So we could very easily give them that opportunity just to reinforce it. You're absolutely right that we could always conclude that it would assume personal views unless stated otherwise or unless we're actually doing a formal vote, in which case we would want people to identify who they're voting for whether it's individual or group.

But we're not voting in these polls so - and notice that Lisa responded also to Greg's question. Michele, your turn.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. It's Michele for the record. I'm trying to think of how I address this diplomatically. We've spent a lot of time on this and I'm trying to understand what the actual problem is. I mean, starting off - I mean, I think some of this started from sharing personally identifiable information, which several of us

were opposed to. But it seems to have mushroomed out of that into what now seems to be becoming more and more confusing about different things, about whether people are speaking in one capacity or another and trying to make things very, very, very complicated.

And I'm just trying to understand who is having a problem and what do we need to - and what are we actually trying to address? I'm just - we just seem to be spending a lot of time, so I'm trying to understand what the problem is that we're trying to fix and I have no real understanding of it at this stage.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. Good question. This is Chuck. Does anybody want to respond to that? Anybody have an opinion as to what problem we'd be solving if we showed raw data, whatever way we decided to do that? So, Lisa, why don't you talk about what's on the Adobe screen right now?

Lisa Phifer: Sure, Chuck. Lisa Phifer for the record. What I'm showing on the screen right now, and I'll show you another thing in a minute, what I'm showing on the screen right now is a PDF of an Excel spreadsheet. This Excel spreadsheet is just the one row from Chuck's responses to the last poll. He was kind enough to give consent that I could use his actual response to give you a real live example.

So you see that, although it's represented here as hash signs because the column was too wide to display, that raw data would include the start date and end date of when you took the poll, that's a full time stamp including time of day and UTC. The IP address of the device, from which you took the poll. I think one person commented that they took the poll from a public location and so it would have been an added IP address. That's true. Sometimes it'll be dynamic but for some companies it would be a static IP address.

And then the first and last name, which in this case is Chuck Gomes, and then the actual data for each of the poll questions. If I tried to display the entire Excel spreadsheet it would be five pages wide even at this tiny little

magnification. So raw poll data we can certainly provide to you and this is what it would look like, but it does certainly take some work to weed through.

Showing you - and not that we can't publish more than one form of data, but showing you another option that you have. Another option that you have is - apologies, I'm not seeing the file that I wanted to share so just a moment please.

Chuck Gomes: So as we're doing this, I want to reiterate Michele's question, is what problem are we solving if we do this? I suppose if it makes some people more comfortable, with our polling process, it's certainly more transparent - you know, more transparent and that's good. But is it going to be used? You know, if we show the raw data is it really going to be beneficial? Members are going to have to make that decision. Go ahead, Lisa.

Lisa Phifer: And just to finish the options that we do have, what I just showed was Chuck's individual responses for this weeks' poll. And so you can see each individual would be a PDF page or two with all of the poll questions and their individual answers. And just to point out on the very last page here, our last Question 8, was a write-in question. Chuck happened to skip this answer but if he had written in his answer it would have been time stamp as well.

So you can see that IP address and the start and end times are always included in poll results. And we could strip out this answer to Question 1 from anything that we published if we wished. We could also stop collection of IP address if the working group wanted to.

And then the third option is to get poll results that are essentially what you've been getting, but one of the things that we do, I take the Survey Monkey export of the entire poll results, I strip out all the time stamps and I strip out Question 1, which is the name of the respondent. Other than that the third option of Survey Monkey export is exactly what you've been getting.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Michele, for refraining from screaming. We appreciate that. So any questions about the raw data, don't worry too much about what's on screen now, we'll get back to that as we continue in the meeting. But, Michele, you want to say something? Don't scream please.

Michele Neylon: I'm not going to scream, Chuck. I mean, the temptation is strong and I will refrain from using more colorful language. And I'm going to be - I'm on my best behavior and I'm trying to be very Zen. I suppose the question I have - the questions I have are kind of the same thing. If somebody has a burning desire for the ability to be able to answer these polls in an anonymous fashion, would they please let somebody know?

If somebody has a burning desire to, you know, change the methodology, but, I mean, at this stage now I'm seeing people looking at doing a very kind of ICANN-esque thing which is looking at every possible permutation of how people could possibly answer things and all these different edge cases and everything else. But nobody has actually answered the question that I asked which is what is the problem we're trying to fix? And I don't get the impression that there is a problem that needs to be fixed because it's not as if this is a vote, these are quick polls. That's it.

And I think it was Alan or somebody else mentioned somewhere it's this kind of discussion which kills working group participation. Just for the record, I don't think this is particularly productive for us. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: And, Michele, so would it be your position - your personal position, right - that we shouldn't show raw data or we should?

Michele Neylon: Personally, I can't get terribly excited about this. If you're going to ask me and (unintelligible) actually said looking at it, you know, should we have raw or not - we didn't have raw previously, why do we need it now I suppose is my answer.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thanks. Nathalie. Are you on mute? Not hearing anything, Nathalie. So still don't have audio possibly. And we can wait for Stephanie to respond or we can ask her to respond. I think probably the better thing is to ask her to respond on the list. So I'm just looking at the chat here a little bit while I'm doing that. Jim, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: So thank you, Chuck. Jim Galvin for the record. I really, you know, on the one hand don't feel strongly either way about whether we do this or not. But I do have to ask what problem we're trying to solve. I think as I reflected back on the conversation we've been having, I don't have a clear picture of why we're spending so much time talking about this. What is the problem we're trying to solve by changing the way we're doing this? These polls are nonbinding, they're just informative, they're just intended to, you know, sort of head us down a path unless something else pops up. I'm struggling with the answer to the question what problem are we solving and why are spending so much time on this as opposed to actually progressing some substantive work? Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jim. And, Lisa, your - in the chat there you're speaking what you understood Stephanie's position, is that correct?

Lisa Phifer: Yes, that's correct. I went and found the link to her actual post to the working group, I posted that in chat. And she made four points. I just summarized three of those points there. Her points, just as a quick recap is that ICANN is a fundamentally open and transparent multistakeholder organization; that the data is useful to those who are trying to understand where people are coming from; and at a fundamental level, data that's used to form even rough concepts of consensus should be accessible to all.

Her fourth point was that if you don't want to have your name published you don't need to be a working group member, you can of course participate as an observer.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa, for going over that. Of course, if you participate as an observer you can't participate in the polls. So there's a little bit of a disconnect there I think. Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Michele again, speaking for the record on a topic that I really don't care about. So okay looking at what Stephanie put on there, just to bring this in for a land, how about - how about this as a compromise just to kind of get some of this over the line so we can all get on with our lives.

That in the polls that are done there be a field added, well a couple of fields added that are optional fields, not compulsory, one, affiliation be that stakeholder group or constituencies or other grouping; two, just for the sake of completion, the name of the person - the person's employer field, again an optional one; and thirdly, just for the sake of completion, if people want to optionally state something - say opt in to say that, yes, they are speaking on behalf of the collection of humanity or whichever group it is that they pertain to.

Beyond that, I don't really understand what can possibly be achieved from making any changes to our current modus operandi and I think if we have to continue talking about this I will respectfully drop off the call and get back to doing something which actually earns me some money. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: So, Michele, please don't drop off. I'm going to end this shortly, even if we don't come to a decision today. So hang in there please. The - I don't want to - I'm concerned about it getting too complex so now we're talking about employer, we're talking, you know, the only comment that was submitted was that affiliation and that's the reason I brought up affiliation.

My inclination right now, unless somebody or all of you convince me differently, is that we will - defer this for now. I'm not sure that Michele's question, and the one that Jim repeated, is what problem we're solving has still been answered to their satisfaction or to mine for that matter. So let's -

Lisa, let's ask Stephanie to respond on the list. I know she's at a conference in Europe this week so don't know what kind of ability she'll have or time to respond but let's try and get a response on the list before our next meeting.

We will not spend this much time on this next week. And we may just have to, you know, try something like I suggested if there's not strong opposition in terms of an Excel spreadsheet, give people an option to not have their name shown if they'd like and give them an option to specifically state they're speaking for their personal capacity.

That, to me, is not too risky a thing but let's let Stephanie respond to what problem we're solving and please, try and discuss that on the list because I really don't plan on giving much time to this particular issue next week at all. If we can't solve it, come to a conclusion in 10 or 15 minutes that would be total max I think we can afford to do on that.

So let's end this discussion. We've got an action item for Lisa on that and for those who wonder where Marika is, she's in LA at the ICANN facilities for the policy team meetings there this week. So she was unable to join us today.

All right, going on, let's - we now have in front of us the poll results for questions - you can see Question 1 from the poll is up right now. And for all seven questions, which is the dealing with the proposed purposes for collection of this data, the results were strongly yes, as you'll see - as you may have already seen. And you can scroll through and see that.

There were some no's, in this case you can see there were three no's, which was about 12.5% of those who responded. And there are 24 that responded on this question. What we're going to do is talk about some of the comments. So it seems clear from the numbers and the percentages that we've reached rough consensus on all seven purposes. Certainly not unanimous and some people feel strongly about that.

But so there's rough consensus that all seven purposes, and we're adding that to the two we got the same results for previous week, for a total of nine, seemed to be strongly supported by working group members who participated in the poll. And of course, in follow up to the poll results we give people - other people a chance to comment as well.

So but there are several comments that I think it's worth talking about. Now, most of these I picked out but some of the other leadership team members identified some as well. And the ones I didn't pick out aren't - I didn't do that because they are not important or were not considered. In most cases, they're things that we're going to get to, you know, whether it be gated access or access and so on.

So we will get to those. We will discuss those. So a lot of the comments will be covered in the future and that's why I didn't pick them. But there are a few things I picked out and others picked out on the leadership team that we want to at least flag.

And the first one is in Number 1 here on Question 1, "I'm also not convinced it's the purpose of RDS to facilitate certificate authorities." As I read that one, well, I guess that's true of just about everything with a purpose. Is it the purpose of an RDS to support intellectual property enforcement? And I'm not opposed to that, please understand it, I'm just pointing out. I think that question could be raised for just about any purpose. I don't know, you know, maybe except some of the technical reasons that Whois was originally created for and so forth.

So and so let me just pause there. I see a couple hands up and let people comment. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Good afternoon everybody, boys and girls, now we're talking about something a little bit more substantive. Yay. Okay when it comes to this entire thing, first off, one, we're talking about thin data here. Thin data. There's

nothing personally identifiable in the thin data. I would be one of the first to advocate for stronger privacy protections and everything else if we were talking about something which was actually, you know, causing it potential issues with respect to privacy. In the case of thin data, it doesn't. So just putting that out there so a lot of this - a lot of the commentary around this, in my view, moot.

Secondly, when it comes to SSL certs, last time I checked, nobody was running around the place putting guns to people's heads and forcing them to get SSL certs. They may feel that they need to get an SSL cert due to the way various things have changed online and are changing, but there is still no obligation on anybody to get an SSL cert. So if you are getting an SSL cert, you are voluntarily doing so and as part of the process of getting an SSL cert the CA is going to do a certain degree of validation, which again, is voluntary because you are the one who asked for the blood certificate to start with. So again, I don't see the problem. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. Jim, you're next.

Jim Galvin: Thank you, Chuck. Jim Galvin for the record. I will admit up front I actually did not participate in this poll. If I had, I actually would have said no to all of these questions. I would not have changed the majority response, but just want to put that out there on the record.

I like your question, Chuck, because in fact, that's kind of really the question that I have. You know, when you asked about, you know, the purpose of collecting the data. What I think is an important distinction to be made here that I'm struggling with in this discussion, we are putting ourselves, for some definition of self, and I think that's part of the question here, as being an active party in these purposes.

So, you know, the first purpose of collecting the data for management of domain name control seems fairly obvious, I mean, how a role, and this is this

royal “our” or this definition of self that we have to define, of course, is about controlling domain names in one form or another. So collecting data for that seems fairly obvious to me and kind of self-evident, if you will.

The rest of these purposes don't seem self-evident for me. And I'm wondering, you know, why we are inserting ourselves and maybe we need to define what that self is, in this process of collecting data for it. So we're looking at domain name, you know, certification. I mean, the first thing that jumps out at me is of course thin data, there's not enough there to even support domain name certification. So if we believe that that's a legitimate purpose we're already going to have to add to the list of things that are put out there it seems to me, for example, I mean, even the name is not there.

So, you know, I think that's my comment. I think you asked a very good question, Chuck, and, you know, I'd like to reframe that question a little bit and ask, you know, why are we putting ourselves in the place of being an active part of these purposes? What is the basis for us to do that? You know, under what authority, if you will, I mean, there's a variety of ways to phrase that question. But, you know, why are we an active party? Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jim. Mark, you're next.

Mark Svancarek: Thanks, Chuck. This is Mark. I raised my hand because this is actually my comment. Full disclosure here. And Jim, you know, I wanted to thank you for jumping in because you very eloquently described, you know, exactly what I was struggling with when I wrote that comment. You know, I had trouble answering this question because I feel like domain name certification is a legitimate purpose in a vacuum. But it's not necessarily the purpose of RDS. It's not necessarily, you know, our purpose on this working group to solve that.

You know, if it is I think we'd need to go back to the RDS purpose discussion and add in, you know, a purpose of RDS is to facilitate, you know, is to

provide sufficient information for certificate authorities to, you know, to confirm that of the certificate requestor. You know, I, you know, I really struggled with the - I guess the wording of it, you know, I feel it's a legitimate purpose but it's not really the purpose of RDS. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Mark. And by the way, and I throw this out to everybody - this is Chuck speaking - that, you know, we also struggle with the wording. We had quite a bit of discussion on the leadership call yesterday in terms of the use of the word "collection" and for thin data. And we'll probably come back to that - probably not today but we'll talk more about that. We might get to it today.

So please, feel free to suggest better wording. One of the problems that that - we're encountering right now in the working group is we're trying to break things down into small little pieces so it's more realistic to make some progress because if we tackle too much at once it becomes really hard.

And that's the case with regard to the, you know, narrowing it down to just collection of thin data right now. I think those of us in the leadership team kind of agreed yesterday that we need to soon get beyond just collection and then after that beyond just thin data because a lot of the things are going to get even more serious and important when we do that. But bear with us in the meantime if you have suggestions for better wording, please let us know.

Let's go to Greg Shatan.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Chuck. It's Greg Shatan for the record. I have no problem seeing a domain name certification as a purpose for thin data collection or as a purpose for the RDS generally. I think some people might be taking too far constrained view of what the role of RDS or Whois is intended to be in this technical policy governance ecosystem.

And we don't necessarily need to go back to all the history but, you know, hopefully we don't rewrite it or decide to take a massively different approach

and, you know, I'm looking at Comment Number 2, I think that's looking at the issue much too granularly as if it's, you know, it needs to be collected only if each - if the data originator is actually going to seek certification, which, you know, for what I do I don't think I'm ever going to seek certification. But, again, I would want the data to be there if I did. And I have no problem having that data available should I someday change my mind and run a site where I need certification as opposed to, you know, little family site or blog site that I try to run unsuccessfully for the most part.

So it's - the point is just I think we're taking a very constrained view and trying to take this back to a very constrained view that I don't support. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. Jim Galvin.

Jim Galvin: So thank you, Chuck. Jim Galvin for the record. I want to clarify a little bit of my position in listening to Mark and to Greg in particular talking, it occurs to me to clarify something would be helpful here. I really am drawing - the fine distinction that I'm drawing - maybe this is a response more to Greg directly - is not about whether or not to collect the data and not about whether or not I think domain name certification is a useful purpose of data that happens to exist.

But the fine distinction that I'm drawing here is whether or not it's a reason to collect the data. I actually have no objection to any of these particular uses with respect to, you know, data that's present. I mean, if there's data that's present and is useful for these people I think that's great. In fact, we demonstrated, you know, for legacy reasons we have a lot of history that shows that the data that we have can be valuable in these circumstances. And I think that's a good thing.

I'm being very careful to observe that I don't think that any of these purposes are a reason for collecting the data. The fact that we collect data that would be useful to you, because of the purpose that we do have, the one self-

evident purpose we do have, about needing to control a domain name, management of that domain name, however we end up fully defining that, is one point.

I just - I'm not in favor of automatically assuming that we're collecting the data for all the rest of these purposes. I think, what I'm asking for specifically, is if we want to define this as a legitimate purpose for collecting the data and thus guaranteeing that it will always be available on the receiving side for an appropriate set of people who ask for it, I would like to see us state definitively why this is a legitimate purpose. You know, that's really my point in all of this.

You know, I don't know why this is a purpose for (unintelligible). I don't know why we are inserting ourselves again back to that definition of self whether that's ICANN, ICANN community, registries, registrars, whatever you want to define yourself as here in this context, why are setting ourselves up to be an active participant in this purpose. You know, what is the foundation and motivation for that purpose?

And I think that if we - I mean, I'd like some discussion about all of that for all of these things. You know, if we can come to some reasonable articulated position for that and document it, then, you know, I'll be happy with that. But absent that, all I see happening here is we want this because we've always had it. And I want to jump that line. I want to cross that hurdle. So thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jim. Alan, it's your turn.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I really think we're spending a lot of time talking about what are effectively semantics at this point. I thought when we started this thing we came up with the reason we collect it and then we also listed a relatively large number of potential uses, some of which we may bless, some of which we may say are not appropriate.

If the reason for collecting the data ever disappears, then one of the acceptable uses may pop up as the next one as that's a reason. And I'll give an example, not related to certificates. If we didn't collect certain data that is currently essential for carrying out the UDRP process, which is an official ICANN policy, then we might have to collect that data for that purpose if we weren't already collecting it for something else.

So although that is a discussion we would have to have that is the reason we're collecting the data is no longer needed, do we now need - need to collect it because of the UDRP? And the answer may be yes and maybe no. But it becomes semantics at that point that once we have the reason for collecting it and the acceptable uses, there's not a lot of difference between them unless the reason for collecting somehow evaporates and we don't - no longer have a reason for collecting and we need to come up with one or abolish collecting it. Other than that it's semantics.

And again, I think we are spending a lot of time talking about something which isn't going to change the outcome of anything we're doing. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Alan. And Greg, is that an old hand? Okay, so I made some comments a few minutes ago about the use of the word "collection" and terminology, semantics as Alan said here. All I can say is bear with us; be a little bit patient. The conclusions we're reaching right now on collection of thin data you can think of, I believe, as kind of interim conclusions based on the polls.

Once we get further, and we get beyond collection and we talk about access and storage and display and we get beyond thin data, we may come back to some of these interim conclusions we're reaching on collection of thin data and change our conclusions. So I think all of us are going to be a little bit more comfortable as we get down the road several months and are digging deeper into this. So if you're not happy with the semantics, if you're not happy

with things right now, be patient because it'll get clearer and we'll have to refine our wording better, and I hope all of you will help on that.

Let's go to Comment 3 just briefly, "While I acknowledge that some CAs use domain registration data and Whois services for confirmation purposes, I need to note that it is not the only way to perform this task."

Now my reaction to that was I'm not a CA expert so I'm not the one to determine whether there are other ways or not, but I assume there probably are. Is the RDS easier and is easier a legitimate reason? I don't know. But if there are other ways of doing things, do we eliminate it? Do we not need something for the RDS? We don't need to resolve that right now, but I'm just pointing out that we - that we - there are lots of other ways to do lots of things. Law enforcement can get some of the information they need other ways.

Does Whois or an RDS make it easier? Is being easier legitimate? Does it help us? Does it make it safer? Those are things we're going to have to delve into as we move forward. And let me stop gabbing and see if anybody else wants to comment on Comment Number 3.

Okay let's jump down to Number 2 - Question Number 2, again, the results were pretty strong in terms of yes. But it wasn't - there were two people who disagreed and probably some who disagree who didn't respond to the poll. I just highlighted one comment here, "This data should - could also be requested from the seller prior to the purpose." So that's kind of similar to what I just said in Comment Number 3 and Question Number 1. That's another way of getting it so maybe this isn't essential thing of an RDS if they can get it other ways.

Jim, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: Thank you, Chuck. Jim Galvin for the record. I just, you know, feel compelled just to go on record to, you know, repeat my comment about this as I did to the last one. I have no problem with this being an appropriate use of data that we happen to have but, you know, this being the purpose of RDS collection I just don't understand why this is, you know, the right way to do it. And, you know, this comment here sort of points that out, there are other ways of getting this data. So, you know, why is the RDS the right way? Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jim. And I think as we move down the road in our deliberation, we're going to have to decide whether or not - if we take the approach of the Expert Working Group a purpose-based approach, that's, in my understanding, really why we're spending so much time on purposes. And that'll become, I think, more important to nail down later on. Whether we've worded it right now or not, we probably haven't.

But now if we decide to not go the approach that the Expert Working Group did, and basing this on purposes, then maybe it doesn't matter. But I just point that out as a - as to why we're focusing on purpose. And it may not be purpose of collecting thin data but purpose is going to be, if we - at least test and evaluate the recommendations of the Expert Working Group, we're going to have to talk about purpose. And hopefully this - what seems like a waste to many right now will come back and be useful later as we proceed. Any other comments on Number 2?

Number 3 then is - I'm sorry - in trying to stay up on everything I'm not watching the chat real - it doesn't look like there was a lot - there is no new chat lately so that's good so I haven't missed anything. So Question 3, academic and public interest, let me just quickly skim those thoughts - the ones that are highlighted and we'll talk about them all at once.

"One never collects data solely for the benefit of potential researchers."
That's probably true. "It should not be mandatory and strong justification needs to be given. It would, first, have to be established what constitutes

DNS research and why this data would be needed. It is not a purpose benefitting the domain owner. Research in this context is too abstract.” Any discussion on those comments or on the results for Question Number 3?

Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. And I can't remember where I even mentioned this but it was something that I had thought of in passing. Some of the registries it might be more of an issue with ccTLDs but I know they're not the only ones who do this, do get a little bit upset when people start trying to reconstruct their databases as they would see that as an infringement of their copyright. So that's - the only issue I can possibly see with any of this.

Again, we're talking about thin data. There's nothing in it. There really isn't. So I can't get excited about it. I can't get upset about it. I don't see it as an issue. Once we start talking about thick data then my reaction and my answers to a lot of questions, like these, would be potentially quite different.
Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. Anyone else? Jim.

Jim Galvin: Thanks, Chuck. Jim Galvin for the record. I'll just say ditto in the interest of time.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: That was concise. Okay. Anyone else before we move to Question 4? Question 4 then is - has to do with regulatory and contractual enforcement as a purpose for thin data. And I just - there's just one comment highlighted there, "Only if there is legislative requirement for the collection and storage."

This one puzzled me a little bit so if the commenter is on the phone it'd be great to talk about it further, if you don't mind exposing yourself.

The - are we talking about, I mean, does there have to be a law for everything that's in an RDS? And which jurisdiction? And of course we have the capability for gated access so we can customize it by jurisdiction so that's an ability we have now that we didn't have several years ago.

But just kind of puzzled me if there has to be a legislative requirement for anything that's in the RDS, I don't know that the domain name or - does there have to be a legislative requirement to have a domain name? Do domain names have to be legalized? I don't know. This one just kind of threw me a little bit. But I may be missing the point and probably am. So, Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Can I just say kind of pretty much ditto to my previous comment? We're talking about thin data. There's very little of any value or any use in there. I don't understand the comments that were made. I would understand and I would have totally different response if we were talking about thick. We're not so I don't get it. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. Anybody else? Going to Question 5, "Confirm criminal investigation and DNS abuse mitigation." And of course this is, I think, going to be a high interest session topic of Copenhagen. And you can see if you look at the comments there were just three. And the first one part of it is highlighted there. "They might be related to investigators for the purpose of," I'm sorry, I read that wrong. "They might be released to investigators for the purpose of detecting and prosecuting crime related to a Website or electronic commerce activity associated with a domain name but it is not the purpose of collection."

Okay. I don't - any thoughts on that? I don't really have too much on that, I just wanted to call that one out. Michele. Are you going to say "ditto" again?

Michele Neylon: No, actually I'm not.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Michele Neylon: Okay, this data does include both the registry and the registrar so using this data can tell you which registrar is the registrar of record and obviously which registry is the registry involved. Using that for investigating something, yes, that seems logical to me to a point. But beyond that, again, as we're talking about this data it's like I don't care that the people know that we're the registrar of record for a domain name. And I doubt that the registry cares that people know that they're the registry for a domain name because obviously as the way registries work, VeriSign is the registry for all dotCom domain names, whether they're good, bad or indifferent or whatever.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. Jim Galvin.

Jim Galvin: Thanks, Chuck. Jim Galvin for the record. This is one where I especially struggle with this because I like this comment here too. You know, I have no problem from a security point of view with data being used for criminal investigation and DNS abuse mitigation, you know, all of that is entirely appropriate. But I struggle with this very broad and generic term of criminal investigation and I should be collecting data for the express purpose of being investigated and being considered a criminal?

I just think that that's interesting in this case. This one I have a lot of trouble seeing how we could agree that this is a purpose for collecting the data.
Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks, Jim. Going on to Question 6, I should look at - the chat's still quiet, okay. Legal actions and the comment Number 1, "Data is not collected for this purpose, it is released for this purpose." And here I think we're getting into semantics and terminology and maybe it's not worded really well but I

just wanted to call attention to that point. I don't disagree with the point, that's not why I highlighted it. But I wanted to call it to people's attention. Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. And I think, you know, getting back to kind of the semantic or whether we're only talking about semantic type of question, in trying to think about purpose for collection, purpose for use, whether use is different from purpose, kind of the question is why and when does it matter? And what purpose, so to speak, will we put the issue of whether something is a legitimate purpose versus whether it's a legitimate use but not a legitimate purpose?

And can something that we know is going to be used that way not be considered a purpose for which it is being collected if we acknowledge that it will be used for that purpose? It seems like we're - it only matters if we're going to try to make something of this. And if it is a purely semantic distinction then we're all breaking our brains for no reason.

If we are going to say that something that's only a legitimate use but not a legitimate purpose is somehow devalued compared to something that's both a legitimate purpose for collection and a legitimate purpose for use or in fact we might say something can't be a legitimate use for - legitimate for use if it's not legitimate for collection, then this becomes a critical distinction but it also becomes a bit of a proxy battle for other discussions.

And so I think we need to kind of maybe peel away that issue of why purpose matters, why purpose for collection matters, how we're going to apply these concepts later on. Because in the abstract they do or can sound awfully semantic but when we put them into the concrete we - maybe we could actually understand what we're really talking about. Thanks.

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

Lisa Phifer: Thanks. Lisa Phifer for the record. One of the conclusions that we reached in our leadership call yesterday is that it might be useful to ask the people in the working group who are data protection law experts to give us a bit of an overview on what purpose of collection and purpose of disclosure mean in a generic sense, not applied necessarily to Whois and RDS because this working group is going to have to tackle that. But, you know, why is there a distinction made in data protection laws between purpose for collection and purpose for disclosure? And how are they related to each other?

So we are looking to actually get a little bit of a brief on that in next week's call to help provide that context.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa, for bringing that up. And before I go back to Jim, yes, so we may change our agenda a little bit next week. We will follow up on the raw data issue briefly. But we may actually, because of some of the discussion that's happened and because of having the right people on the call next week, may provide us to pursue that a little bit further. So we may jump ahead to the privacy data protection, which is the third key question in our key concepts that we're focusing on.

We may jump ahead to that next week but later this week we'll alert you. Certainly encourage people to try and participate in our call next week because it'll be important whatever side you're on with regard to data protection and privacy if there are sides, we'll get a chance to have some good interaction on that hopefully next week.

And then hopefully that'll also lay the groundwork for our working group meeting in Copenhagen where we're hoping that there will be some European - taking advantage of the fact that we're in Europe there will be some European Data Commissioners where we can come up with a set of questions that will help us as a working group in terms of dealing with the privacy and data protection law in light of the other things that we're focusing on. So thanks for bringing that up, Lisa. Jim, your turn.

Jim Galvin: Thanks, Chuck. Jim Galvin for the record. I want to - I could just say, you know, ditto my previous comment here, but I want to, instead, shape that as an agreement of the point that Greg Shatan was making. You know, I'm really struggling here with some of the semantics. I think one of the things that I've come around to is realizing the very real distinction between purpose of collection versus purpose of use.

And I think that's an important distinction for us to make here. I'm struggling with why these are valid purposes for collection, even the legal actions now, I mean, I just have to go on record and say ditto my previous comments. I mean, I don't have a problem with the data that we happen to have being used in this way but, you know, motivating me to collect data expressly for that particular use, I'm struggling with why that's the right thing to do. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jim. And maybe we need to call it purpose for us instead of purpose for collection but we'll get there I think as we move forward. Very quickly, take a look at Question 7 as we wrap up today. Internet use, we didn't highlight any of the comments on Question 7. So if anybody wants to comment on it you're welcome to right now before we wrap up the call.

Okay, thanks for the good discussion. And the - before we - I'm not sure we're going to have a poll this week or not. We may not, maybe give you a break but we'll talk about that as a leadership team if there's anything we need to follow up on here, we'll certainly send out a poll quickly if there is but don't be surprised if there's not in this case.

So what our plans are is to record in our key concepts document the conclusions on the seven items basically being that there was a - appeared to be rough consensus on the yes answers. Now should we reword those? We'll talk about that a little bit understanding that the wording will be perfected later on anyway, but if we can think of some ways to word it better we'll do that. If any of you have suggestions if you could get that to us in the next 24-48

hours that would be great in terms of wording because wording has come up a lot in this call so please feel free to make some contributions in that regard. And then the goal - the plan would be to add those conclusions to the key concepts document. That's Agenda Item 3b.

Now, I want to call your attention to Agenda Item 4, you may want to jump up to the top where the agenda is. And you'll see we were planning on next if there was time, going to Question 2.2.1 which was, "What specific purposes should gTLD registration thin data elements be collected?" We talked, you know, the wording of this of course is going to be a problem like we saw today.

But we're probably, haven't totally finalized, we're probably going to jump ahead instead - we're going to - we were going to go to data elements next. I think we're going to jump ahead to privacy and proxy, not in total but just to take advantage of some things that have come up over the last few weeks and have been discussed on the list. So just a head's up. That'll be, I think a pretty important discussion next week. And hopefully that will also begin to lay the groundwork for questions that we may want to ask the Data Commissioners - the European Data Commissioners in Copenhagen.

So I think our - let's - Lisa had an action item with regard to asking Stephanie to respond, and of course anybody else can respond to the problem that's being solved with regard to showing - giving out raw data in some form. And the - certainly our next meeting date is a week from today, same time on the 31st and so keep that in mind. Let me pause there and see if there's something else we should cover today before we adjourn.

I usually miss something so this will be an exception I guess. So okay, well thanks for the participation. Thanks for your patience in all of this. I know it takes a lot if it and there's a lot of frustration. But I still believe we're laying a foundation for when we get into beyond thin data and the term collection that

has haunted us for several weeks now. So have a good rest of the week.
Thanks again and the meeting is adjourned. The recording can stop.

END