

**ICANN  
Transcription  
Next-Gen RDS PDP Working group  
Tuesday, 26 September 2017 16:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-nextgen-rds-pdp-26sep17-en.mp3> Adobe

Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p35s9vi2lbl/>

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/amfwAw>

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

Michelle DeSmyter: Great thanks, (Cal). Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the GNSO Next Gen RDS PDP Working Group call on the 26th of September, 2017. In the interest of time there will be no roll call; we have quite a few participants online. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room, so if you're only on the audio bridge today would you please let yourself be known now?

Great thank you. Hearing no names I would like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I'll hand it back over to Chuck Gomes.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michelle. And welcome, everyone, to today's call. Does anyone have a statement of interest update, please indicate so in the Adobe since it looks like everybody's in Adobe. Okay, not seeing any hands, please remember if you do have any significant changes to your statement of interest to update on the - update it on the GNSO site and to let us know.

All right, our first agenda item today is to complete deliberation on original registration date. Originally, the leadership team was going to postpone that

but the information that the small drafting team sent back and the discussion that followed appeared to us like we may be fairly close to dropping the original registration date as several people felt like any value that we would get from the recommendation that came from the small team probably wouldn't be worth the effort that it would take and the value that would be achieved.

So keep in mind that that group did not recommend that we include the original registration date as defined by the EWG, but they did recommend the possibility of considering a counter of known previous registrations, different from the current one if there are any. So what we want to do now is just open it up for a few minutes and see if there's anybody who disagrees with dropping the whole idea, not only of original registration date but the counter as recommended by the small team?

And again, I want to thank the small team for the good work and great discussion that they had and the good report. Thanks to Andrew for sharing it with us last week.

Anybody object to dropping that data element or some form of it as recommended? I think you're right, Andrew, I didn't either. And I actually extended an invitation for anybody who wanted to, to please do so. All right, well, I'll wait just a few more seconds so that I don't rush it too much. Certainly see some support in the chat, no opposition in the chat and so - yes, Lisa points out to me that maybe Paul defended it some, but I also saw Paul ask - Paul Keating ask some questions in terms of the value as well.

So all right, so that said, I don't know how we can conclude conclusions like this, whether we put that as an - I guess it's an agreement - an agreement to drop the original registration date as defined by the EWG and any other variations that were discussed regarding it. I'm sure the wording can be done better, but Lisa is typing something in there.

So very good. So thanks again for the small team that did the work. We'll use that technique again if we have volunteers who are willing to do it and represent different points of view. It saved a lot of working group time at the same time the working group in the end gets to weigh in.

All right, let's go on then to Agenda Item 3 and let's bring up the results of last week's poll. As you can see you have scrolling capability and there were 23 people who responded to the poll. Thanks to all of you who did. For Question Number 2, pretty strong results, 86 - almost 87% agreed; three people disagreed and their comments are in the chat unless somebody particularly wants to discuss any of the comments further or discuss this item further, we will go ahead and add that to our list of agreements in our rolling document.

Any questions or comments on that? Okay, going then to Question Number 3, it wasn't quite so clear in Question Number 3 which is whether or not we've sufficiently justified the minimum public data set to be disclosed publicly. And there were, as you can see, seven people who disagreed; 15 who agreed, so we're not going to suggest that we add that to our list of agreements. There were some pretty good comments made.

If you notice the ones in yellow they show some suggestions for wording it differently. And you might want to look at those. We could come back to those later or in the case of - the suggestion in Number 2 is to actually add one. And we could still do that. Keep in mind that we've focused on certain purposes that were proposed by the EWG. We're not restricted to those so what Nathalie suggested is still a possibility and when we come back to users and purposes that would be a good time for that so let's not forget that one.

And Paul made a good point I think about the purposes. And his might be able to fixed with an edit but it could also be fixed with adding one but we'll come back to that later. Any discussion that anybody wants to enter into on Question Number 3 or any comments that anybody wants to suggest or add verbally?

Okay, that said, we're moving really fast today so let's go onto Agenda Item 4. And I want to let everybody know that the final independent legal response to our questions, the memo from Wilson Sonsini - WSGR as we abbreviate it - was received. And it will be distributed to the full working group immediately after this call.

And the assignment for everyone is to read it carefully. Now we're even going to give you some time to do that. The - let me say that the responses as far as the leadership team can tell, did not in any way counter anything that the data protection experts said in answer to our questions.

Now just to give a little bit of background that some people may have forgotten or some people may not be aware of because they joined the working group later, all of these questions were developed by a group of quite a few people and then confirmed by the working group, okay? So we used the same questions, other than any typographical errors or things that didn't make sense, for the independent legal firm that we did to the data protection experts before our meeting in the spring.

So we tried to be consistent in that so that it wasn't - we can compare the two more readily. And I also want to recall people's attention to the fact that there were quite a few people who requested an independent analysis of the answers. So we now have that.

And what the leadership team is doing and we've asked for some input to make sure we've done it properly from the small legal advisory team that we formed with some people from different stakeholder groups, to take a cut at it too. What we're going to send, and the plan is by the end of the week to the working group, in follow up to the distribution of the final report, is a list of principles that we have excerpted from the final report.

Now we tried not to do -and I don't think we so far have done any editorializing, not expressing any opinions. We just excerpted principles from both the data protection experts and the independent legal firm that we felt were relevant to our work and could help us going forward.

And what we will be doing, starting next week's working group meeting, is to - we will first of all in advance of that distribute the excerpted principles and sure, Lisa, you can go ahead and display the memo that was sent - the final memo. Now we're not going to - just to warn people though, we're not going to go through it right now. You can skim it if you want. You're going to receive it in a few minutes so it's up to you. Sorry for the side conversation.

But starting next Tuesday, and our meeting will be at the same time, that'll be our first meeting in October, we will have categorized the principles that we pulled from the two sources by our charter questions and look at them in that regard so just a head's up. So again, everyone's assignment is to read - carefully read between now and I would say Friday, the final report - the final memo - from WSGR and familiarize yourself with it so that then when the leadership team distributes the excerpted principles from this memo as well as the data protection experts, it'll make it easier to understand how all those fit.

The - and keep in mind the format that we used before will be the format that we will be using this time. So in the excerpt document there will be three columns; the one you receive hopefully Friday if not early Saturday. The first column - of course they will have the 19 questions that we asked, and under each question there will be three columns. The second column - or excuse me the first column will be the information that we received from the data protection experts. And the second column will be the - will be the information verbatim from - in both cases - from the Wilson Sonsini team.

And then the third column will be principles that we pulled out of either or both of those that we think are relevant to our work. So you'll want to particularly,

after you've reviewed the final report, the memo that you see in front of you now, to take a look at those principles and familiarize yourself with those before the working group meeting next week.

Now with that said, let me first turn it over to anybody on the leadership team to find out if I missed anything or misstated anything and give you a chance to set the record straight. And as Lisa points out in the chat, of course the data privacy expert answers are already on the wiki and the Wilson Sonsini answers will be there shortly.

Okay, so the memorandum on the screen will be distributed to the working group email list immediately after I adjourn this meeting. And it will also be posted on the wiki. Now let me open it up to anyone on the call if you have a question. Greg Aaron, you're first.

Greg Aaron: Thank you, Chuck. This is Greg. So on the list there's been a lot of discussion about the parallel legal review that ICANN Org has commissioned. And it seems like something that we should talk about in our working group if not at Abu Dhabi but between now and Abu Dhabi. There are two kind of parallel streams of work which in some ways overlap or may affect each other mainly with the ICANN Org effort potentially affecting our work down the line.

I think it would be a good idea for us to go over what these two efforts are about and why they're happening and also then figure out what it means for us. I think it would be food for everybody to understand what they are and what may lay ahead and why things are being done in this manner. People have also raised some questions about getting some transparency into the other effort and so forth. So this is something I think that the leadership needs to develop some agenda around for discussion. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. I'm going to put you on the spot which probably comes as no surprise. Would you like to share your view of what that other effort is?

Greg Aaron: Well I think this needs - I could do it ad hoc right now but I think that we - there actually should probably be a presentation about this for everybody so they can also understand what's going on. It's really probably important for the entire group. Now the - I mean, I can explain right now but I think we need to start structuring this because it's really important.

Chuck Gomes: And who do you think should make that presentation?

Greg Aaron: I think the leadership should - of this working group should take on the task of putting that together.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Obviously we're going to depend on a lot of other people because we're not insiders on that other effort and as a lot of people have already commented, the transparency hasn't been super great, so we would be dependent on a lot of other people to do anything...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Aaron: True.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Aaron: Absolutely. Absolutely. I'm just saying I think the - this is a task for the leadership to organize and figure out how to make it happen.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, we can do that. Do you want to share a few comments in terms of your perspective?

Greg Aaron: So the other process is taking place largely because ICANN itself, ICANN Org is a data controller. It has data in its possession including about ICANN participants who receive travel support, all kinds of things. It also is in the position of telling the registries and the registrars, through the contracts, what they can and cannot collect and display as far as registration data.

They're trying to solve the very immediate problem which is the GDPR. This is a belated effort to figure out a solution in advance of the 2018 deadline. So they're getting a legal opinion and they're talking with data commissioners in Europe, and they're going to try to come up with a solution that can be implemented not only by ICANN Org but also registries and registrars at some point before the middle of next year.

One of the things that's underway is a legal review from an outside legal firm. And then there's going to be some sort of a - some guidelines that will be issued by ICANN Org basically saying this is how to comply. That'll be an important thing for this working group to understand because we're trying to understand some of the very same things.

It will also play, you know, some de facto policy basically in place. It will tell the registries and registrars what to do or how to comply with their - or how ICANN expects them to comply with their contracts, which could lead to some significant changes in what data is published, for example.

At the same time, we're charged with, you know, trying to figure out some of the exact same things. People have - on the list pointed out that we have, you know, some overlap here; some people have also pointed out that there's not a lot of transparency about what's going on in the other effort. This is the working group that's also charged with figuring out some of these things, at the same time we can't figure those things out on the deadline that the other group is trying to work on.

So I think our group needs to figure out in the short term what's going on and then we also have to understand long-term the implications for what's going on. So I'm - at this point I'm going to mute myself and maybe other people can talk about what they see.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. This is Chuck. And everything you said is pretty consistent with my understanding as well so I think you did a good job on that. And there has been discussion on the list, somebody already pointed out in terms of ICANN's transparency on this other efforts, but there are also other efforts going on related to Whois so it could be useful to have an update of all of them, this one in particular because it's really alive right now and does have a short fuse. So the leadership team will follow up on that. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. To be clear, I wear a number of different hats. I'm a member of this working group, I'm also the interim Chair of the RDS Whois Review Team and I'm one of the people that ICANN Org recruited to collect data and to put together their use matrix. And...

Chuck Gomes: Alan, just to interrupt you there. And that's related to the effort that Greg was referring to, is that correct?

Alan Greenberg: That's correct.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks.

Alan Greenberg: The initial part of the process in looking at how to address GDPR.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. I just wanted to clarify that for others...

Alan Greenberg: Yes, okay sorry.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...who may not know. Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: I wasn't trying to confuse. And as Chair of the RDS Review Team, we are also asking ICANN Org to come and tell us what's going on. But I want to make something really clear and we seem to be waffling back and forth.

ICANN has - and its contracted parties - have an issue that has to be addressed. There are significant penalties that no one wants to pay; they're very significant. And therefore we, collectively we, need to decide what to do.

The simple answer is let us shut down Whois, let us stop moving data across national boundaries for escrow and for other things like that, and fine, the problem is essentially solved. It generates another set of problems that, you know, I think many of us do not want to see us go there. So the question is, can we find a way forward and that's the effort that is going on related to the GDPR.

It is an effort that is badly crippled because we have no choice but to use the existing Whois mechanism. This group has not delivered its product yet, nor it is implemented, nor is that likely to happen by next May. So what they will come up with, if anything, is not necessarily our answer. And I disagree with Greg on one thing, I don't think ICANN is going to tell the registries and registrars what to do; ICANN very explicitly does not give legal advice to its contracted parties, and says that at any opportunity.

So I think there will be input and people will have to make their own decisions based on whatever comes out of this process, but they are crippled in only having Whois as it is today and we cannot make major changes in the next three months.

So this group may well learn something from the decisions taken in the GDPR resolution or attempt to resolve GDPR, but that's it. It really is a separate effort that's focusing on today's Whois and today's laws and potentially today's penalties. But they may well come up with some ideas which are usable in our future world, which will likely have a lot more capabilities and flexibility than anything Whois has today.

So I think it's important to separate the two. Yes, we want to know what's going on, yes we may learn from it, but it really is a different problem because this group was not created years ago and didn't come up with the answer years ago we're faced with a perhaps insurmountable problem that we have to address that we, ICANN, and its parties have to address. And I think it's important to separate those. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. Let's go next to Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Chuck. Michele for the record. I mean, I think a lot of what Alan said is very valid. I also don't think that realistically speaking ICANN is going to be able to quote unquote fix GDPR. GDPR is much, much broader than stuff that can be covered by ICANN contracts and policies. There's a hell of a lot more to it than that.

In terms of, you know, pulling the plug on Whois and all that, that's something that I think some registrars and registries have definitely been considering. But let's just see what happens. I mean, the reality is that if the status quo continues then the likelihood and the risk to contracted parties will go up by some crazy percent and while waiver processes and things like that may or may not exist either now or in the future, the issue - the issue will be when contractual compliance starts knocking on the door because they operate in a completely different timeline. Thanks.

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

Susan Kawaguchi: It's Susan Kawaguchi, and this is not in my leadership capacity, only in my personal capacity. But I'm really frustrated by this and the timing. ICANN had years to do this; GDPR has been in talks for a long time. They knew it was coming so, I mean, that's just a frustration. But the biggest concern is that they have - they have not availed themselves of all the knowledge from this PDP working group.

If they'd come to the PDP working group, come to all of us, and said, "Hey, this is what we're thinking of doing. What information can you help us with and because there's representatives on all of this from all the parts of the community on this working group." It would have made sense to use - to partner with us. And, you know, and I do represent the BC on this taskforce, but, you know, the initial meeting at the ICANN South African meeting was, you know, I mean, they didn't even list out all of the - they had left out all the thin data in their documents.

So it just makes me wonder what their understanding is of how the Whois data is used and all of the practical and the necessary uses of the Whois data. And so - and not just the contractual elements of it. So I think, you know, we've seen ICANN all the - at least from a corporate point of view, a business, you know, company - major business doing, you know, running a major corporation on the Internet. We have seen ICANN favor the contracted parties and not respond or do the appropriate - take the appropriate compliance action that would help protect users on the Internet.

So I'm afraid they're bent or their slant on this - on the questions they're asking the DPA will again favor the contracted parties. And that is what can't be tolerated and that's why we need the transparency of what are they asking the DPAs all around the world because you can ask a legal question in different ways and get different answers. And we just want a fair and balanced analysis of this is all that we're asking for.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Susan. I just - I have seen some discussions on the Contracted Party House side that they're frustrated that they're not being involved just like I've seen the same frustration from you and others on the Non Contracted Party House so I don't think ICANN team doing this, and I'm not talking about the team on this call, has made anybody particularly happy in this effort. But thanks for sharing. Stephanie, go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much, Chuck. Stephanie Perrin for the record. And it's often a broken record in my case. I do think that there are solutions to this problem that could be reached, but for ICANN to attempt to deny that it is a data controller, strikes me as just more of the same. The fact is ICANN sets the rules so it has to be at least joint with the registrars and registries. They are the compliance mechanism so to - and you lose your license if you're not in compliance with the RAA.

So I'm a little discouraged when I hear rumors - and again, we complained on the list about the lack of transparency - but I'm a little discouraged to think that ICANN is ducking this. So as Andrew said on the list, I don't think there's any point in beating the dead horse of how we got where we are. But the question is how can we move forward effectively in the next six months?

And I just want to point out to everybody that the risk with the GDPR is the same rules that the data commissioners have been telling us we were breaking for the last 18 years and not a whole lot of change except the repercussions - the 4% - and the ability for the end users, as represented by civil society, to sue the data commissioners for not protecting their rights.

And that is reinforced by the European Charter of Rights because they have a right to effective enforcement under the charter through a data protection commissioner's office. And the question I am asking is, why on earth have the data commissioners not moved before now to force ICANN to back off and allow minimal data protection rights?

So if - this is why I'm a little worried about the approach that ICANN may be taking to solve the six month problem. If cutting deals with data commissioners and persuading them that their real purpose in life is to gather data for law enforcement and fighting cybercrime then they're walking themselves into a lawsuit at the court - European Court of Justice. That's all I'm saying.

Now whether it'll be successful or not is another matter, but it will be reputationally very damaging for ICANN as a multistakeholder mechanism to run the Internet. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stephanie. Now I want to avoid - this is Chuck - I want to avoid what Andrew said in the chat quite a while ago and hopefully will comment on it again as his hand is raised. We're not going to make any progress just criticizing ICANN and focusing a lot of our energy on what they've done right, what they've done wrong and so forth. I think we are at a point where we can - we have the independent analysis that we requested that many of you requested. We have that now.

We're going to take that and we're going to continue our work. Now we absolutely need to stay in touch with what's going on elsewhere with regard to Whois and RDS. There's no denying that. We will be dependent on that and that may be helpful to us.

But let's not spend a lot of time analyzing and criticizing, let's - we know what we've got, we know that it shouldn't - that this was not the ideal way to get there. But we're here. So let's not spend too much time grappling over that. And we're going to take this independent analysis and the input from the data commissioners that we already received and we're going to use that to speed up our progress. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. Susan used the term "frustration" and others it's not the first time. And there's lots of frustration for many reasons. And yes, we know ICANN could have, should have done things long ago. They didn't. We are where we are. I think we all understand that.

To believe that ICANN should have come to us and said help us solve the problem, sorry, we're not really good at moving very fast here. And I think that would have distracted us from our original job. It's not within our charter. And I don't think ICANN would have gotten anything out of it very quickly. So as

much as I would like to think of us as the font of all wisdom, I can't agree with Susan that this is what they should have done.

But regardless, we need to keep informed. It's reasonable to ask what's going on but I think we need to focus on the job we're here for which is a much longer term and a much more difficult job because we have to do it right for the future which will address laws that aren't passed yet. And I think we need to get on with our work. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. This is Chuck. Michele, you're next.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Chuck. I think we're beating a proverbial dead horse at the moment. The legal review thing that was conducted by an independent third party which goes back over questions that were asked to data protection experts several months ago, will be circulated to everybody within the working group after this call. Hopefully that legal opinion will be picked up by other parts of the ICANN organization and will be fed into this ongoing thing around GDPR that ICANN is conducting and maybe that will help with some aspects of it; I honestly don't know.

So I think, you know, I think people really - we're probably not going to advance anything right now by kind of beating up on ICANN because I think we can all agree that their handling of this, no matter which side you're sitting on, has been far from optimal. So I would say let's focus on actually looking at what has been supplied and then take things from there. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. Greg.

Greg Aaron: Thanks, this is Greg. Yes, I'm not disagreeing with Michele or Alan either. We have one thing right now in front of us that we can work on which is we've just gotten our information from Wilson Sonsini so let's look at that. Yes, there is some long simmering frustration in the community that the various Whois efforts or RDS efforts haven't been coordinated very well. I mean, I would

mention that the - what the ICANN Org has been doing is one of the things they did at Johannesburg was they asked people for use cases.

And our working group had a ton of those on paper but we weren't asked for those. It would have actually been pretty easy to just dump those. And I was a little surprised that nobody asked this working group because this is something we'd spent some time on. And so I would say to Alan, that was a place where we could have contributed without getting bogged down or having to move quickly because it was some work we'd already done.

One of my points is let's communicate perhaps to that in the future coordination, at least some sort of communication and keeping other people apprised of what's going on is important because it failed to happen and we've had these frustrations in the past. And I was a little surprised that this took three months from Johannesburg for us to have this conversation today in our working group.

So if we need to communicate that to people like Theresa Swinehart and others let's do that. In the meantime we've got our legal advice document to look at. And then when ICANN Org receives theirs, we will need to understand it; we'll need to look at that in depth to understand what advice may be similar and what's different and whether there are any other issues in the future that we'll need to think about.

I will emphasize again to the leadership on this call that we're going to need a lot more legal advice in the future and I implore the leadership to think about how we get the funding for that because in a lot of ways we're really wrestling with some legal issues and this is a - this is the place where ICANN needs to have that money available just to inform us and allow us to do our research just as other groups like the EWG have in the past.

So I'm glad we had this conversation today. It brought out a lot of things. And I think some of those things are work - and things we need to anticipate now

to make preparations for so we can have, you know, a smooth way to do our work in the future. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. I'm just - this is Chuck - I'm just going to comment on one thing. The ICANN budget process for the next fiscal year, fiscal year '19, will be kicking - is actually kicking off this fall but it really becomes very public in the early part of 2018. So at that point I'm cautiously optimistic that we're going to be even more aware of our legal advice needs and so forth. So let's keep that in mind and contribute to that process as we can.

Stephanie, I think I'm going to make you the last one to comment on this subject. Go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. I put this in the chat and I mean, there's no point in ignoring me, I'm just going to say it out loud. I had proposed finding corporate rules when I was in the EWG. I had also said consent will not work. I think we now have legal advice that corroborates that. I would - I told (unintelligible) this when I saw the legal advice we got on privacy at the time, I've seen a lot of legal advice on privacy and I thought it was appalling so I would urge this working group that we've got to find our own money and get good legal advice with all due respect to whoever gave the opinion that the EWG looking at it was not adequate.

The EWG - the GDPR had already passed by that point. And there was a lot of scholarship out there on what it was going to mean. And so we should have been anticipating this at that point. And we need legal advice on things like actually implementing binding corporate rules on a global basis in a fair way so and a fair and competitive way. So I think we need to make sure that we consider a good process for selecting our firms and making sure we control it. Thanks very much.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Stephanie. And I see the comments in the chat. I think we've anticipated all along that there would be various times where we would need

legal advice and that may become more critical and times in the future. So I think we're aware of that. Lisa, I'd like to call on you to let people know what happened with regard to the use case work that this working group did relative to the work that ICANN's been doing separately.

Lisa Phifer: Sure, Chuck. This is Lisa Phifer for the record. And in advance of the Copenhagen meeting we had a request from Becky Burr asking if we could provide a link to the EWG use cases or any use cases that this working group had developed. And they were provided with links to both the page of use cases that this working group developed last fall, I think it was last September, as well as a link to where the EWG use cases are housed.

At the time of that request that was in advance of forming the taskforce so I can't really speak to exactly what the taskforce did with that information. But just so that the working group knows that we were actually asked if we had any use cases already published that they might take a look at.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa. Okay, thanks for the discussion. I'm going to suggest, after just wrapping up the action items, that we end our meeting early. I thought maybe we could end it a lot earlier, but still early. Encourage everyone to review the memorandum from WSGR in advance of the end of the week when the leadership team will be providing some - a document that includes some principles that we took from the data protection experts and the WSGR team and didn't provide any commentary but as I said early in the call, as far as we can determine the independent legal advice we got doesn't differ from what we got to - from the data protection experts so we now have our independent analysis and we need to move forward.

The action items, of course everyone has the action items to read the final report from WSGR. The leadership team has the task of following upon Greg's request. And let just set, you know, set expectations there. I'm not sure we're going to get something really fast because there seems to be a huge lack of transparency in what's going on but we will pursue that. I'm just

trying to set expectations that it probably won't happen next week or maybe even the week after. But we will - we'll do our best to coordinate not only with what's going on in the effort that Greg referred to, but also in other Whois efforts as they relate to our work.

In the meantime, we want to start moving forward at a faster clip now that we've got the independent answers we asked for. Are there any action items that I left out? Amr, you're usually good at keeping us straight on that. Is it just those two? Of course the leadership team...

Amr Elsadr: Hi, Chuck. Thanks, this is...

Chuck Gomes: ...has an action item to deliver the principles report. Go ahead, Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Exactly, Chuck. Thanks - this is Amr. I was just going to point that last one out but I think you've captured all of them.

Chuck Gomes: And I can tell everybody that I think the leadership team is on target. We're waiting for some feedback by the end of the day tomorrow from the small legal advisory team so the few of you that are on that please get us anything by then so that we have time to turn around a final document and get it out to the full working group.

Okay, that said, is there anything else we need to cover before I adjourn the call? Okay, thanks, everybody. Enjoy your reading. I know everybody is not going to be excited about what you read but we have what we asked for, now we need to take it and turn it into some requirements and fulfill the first - at least for the first four questions of our charter we will get to the fifth one on accuracy too, but get ready to start moving at a faster pace. Thank you very much. At this time I will adjourn the meeting and say that the recording can be stopped.

END