

ICANN Transcription
GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group
Tuesday, 11 October 2016 at 1600 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GNSO Next-Gen

RDS PDP WG on the Tuesday, 11 October 2016 at 16:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance may be also found at:

<https://community.icann.org/x/JRa4Aw>

The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-nextgen-rds-pdp-11oct16-en.mp3>

Coordinator: Recordings are now connected. You may now proceed.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you so much (Zach). Good morning and good afternoon and good evening to all. Welcome to the GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group call on the 11th of October 2016 at 1600 UTC.

In the interest of time today there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. If you're only on the audio bridge today please let yourself be known now.

Geoffrey Noakes: Hello operator. This is Geoff Noakes with Symantec. I'm on telephone only.

Michelle DeSmyter: Hi. Thanks so much Geoff . And as a reminder for all participants please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and 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.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much (Michelle) and welcome everyone to our call today. First thing I want to ask is if there are any updates to statements of interest? Okay not seeing any hands and not hearing Geoff speak I'll assume everybody is okay on that. You can see the agenda on our - on the right side of Adobe except for Geoff and hopefully he's already seen it.

And so the first thing we want to do just to just take a minute or two we had requested some volunteers to help Greg Shatan finish his - the task he volunteered to do for the EU GDPR and it'd sure be great if we could get a couple of people to work with him. My understanding from Greg as I shared last week is that he has a pretty good start on it but it would really help get that wrapped up. It is a big document but again he's got a good start on it and if we can get a couple of people that would work with him Lisa will also and support the small team and get that one wrapped up. Is there anybody on the call who would be willing to assist Greg getting that wrapped up?

Or if you'd like more information we can arrange a conversation with you and Lisa and Greg later this week. That's a really important document. So it is important that the possible requirements are pulled from it and it'd be really nice to do that before we start our actual deliberations on possible requirements. No volunteers on the 24 people on the call. So anybody just want to explore get more information on it? I know we're all busy probably without exception so but if a few people do it together it will be an easier workload.

Okay let's Lisa and Marika let's put out another request on the list. Oh, (Marina) I'm missing something somewhere so, oh, I should look in the chat

shouldn't I? Thanks. (Marina) thank you very much. I appreciate that. Is there anyone else that would join (Marina) and Greg on that?

Okay then let's go with that for now but let's see if there's anybody on the list after this call that would join (Marina) and Greg and Lisa. I will let you contact follow-up with (Marina) and Greg to get that going and then hopefully get some other volunteers. And let me say right now I am doing this from a public area so there may be when I'm not on mute there may be some background noise. I don't think it would be too bad but just a warning there. You may have heard a little bit just a few moments ago.

Okay so let's go on then to our main agenda item and pull up the document for the statement of purpose for the RDS. We made pretty good progress on the first sections of that. We're going to - and there's a little bit of probably discussion we still need to do on the next to last section and we'll come back to that at the end if needed. But what we're going to do today is start off with the list of specific purposes for an RDS. And you can see the first one in Adobe if you're there hopefully Greg you - I mean Geoff you have it in - on your own laptop or a printed copy or something that you can look at.

We didn't quite finish number one last week and again I'm going to read something, some of the lengthy comments. I'm not going to read but because hopefully everybody's had a chance to do that. But in this case let me read what number one says right now. And some changes were made based on our discussions last week and here's the way it looks right now.

A purpose of gTLD registration data is to provide information about the lifecycle of a domain name as specified by ICANN's diagram of gTLD lifecycles. So that's the way he reads right now and that's a result of work that we did last week. Now there are a few other comments in there from (Andrew) and Rob Golding and Scott Hollenbeck so take a look at those if you would. Andrew is basically suggesting that we don't make this a statement of purpose but instead that we just to make it a statement of fact. If

we did that of course it wouldn't go here. And what he's saying there is accurate I think. But if we I guess the question is whether or not we think of purpose of the gTLD registration data is to provide information about the lifecycle of a domain name?

Rob questioned a little bit this in terms of the way it's worded. And Scott responded to that and so let me just open it up for discussion. And certainly if Andrew is on the call I haven't look to see if Scott is on. Let me look down there. It doesn't look like Scott is on the call but Andrew you're welcome to comment if you want. My question to the group is based on the comments that the three people have put is does anybody suggest that we make any more changes to number one? Okay and let me look and (unintelligible). And Andrew you said that before too I think about not feeling too strongly about it so I remember that and Elaine Pruis's is typing.

Okay. So Elaine Pruis brings up the point that not every TLD has the same lifecycle. For others benefit Elaine Pruis could you talk a little bit about that? Elaine Pruis are you able to talk to that?

Elaine Pruis: Yes sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead and try. I don't know if that's your mic that's causing interference or somebody else but everybody else please mute and I will do that too. Not hearing anything Elaine Pruis. Jim go ahead.

Jim Galvin: Thank you Chuck. This is Jim Galvin for the transcript. SSAC spoke to this issue in its document where it proposed that in a draft data model and I was going to look for the exact reference but I'll just jump in here for the moment. I can find it afterwards and put in the chat session.

But my recollection is that the intent is that there is a lifecycle for the gTLD. Maybe this is something that we should speak to in our discussions when we get into details but, you know, something begins and something ends and

then there's these series of events that may or may not occur. And the idea is that those events may or may not exist. And if you create data or elements that need to exist when that event occurs then that's what you create in your RDS. You simply state that if this event is something that happens in that lifecycle then this is the data that goes with it and how that data is managed and all the rest of the details that go with it or any kind of TLD that doesn't have that event then those elements are simply not required and they don't become part of your particular RDS. I hope that that makes sense. And so I'll try to find any fact records to put into the chat room. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jim. This is Chuck. And I see Elaine Pruis's typing in the chat. That's great and let's go to Mark in the meantime.

Marc Anderson: Thanks Chuck. This is Marc Anderson for the transcript. I just want to, you know, agree with Elaine Pruis. She raises a good point. For the - for new gTLDs for the first round of new gTLDs ICANN, you know, had a process for applicants to specify a gTLD lifecycle if it differed from the, you know, ICANN's well I guess I'll call standard gTLD lifecycle document. And so I think we have to, you know, allow for the possibility that, you know, not only do we have current gTLDs with different lifecycles but we will most certainly will have the possibility of future rounds coming up of having, you know, different or nonstandard lifecycles.

But I think this purpose statement could just be shortened to account for that, you know, about the lifecycle of a domain name and end it there. It doesn't have to be as specified by ICANN diagram, just any lifecycle should do it. Thank you Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay just trying - I was getting off of mute on my cell phone. It's a little bit harder and slower so thanks Mark for that and thanks Elaine Pruis for your comments in the chat. My suggestion on this I don't think we need to make a big issue out of this but I think we ought to just modify the wording something like as specified by ICANN's diagram of gTLD lifecycle understanding that

there may be some variations in lifecycle -- something like that. So and if somebody has better wording go ahead and put it in the chat or raise your hand. That'd be fine. But I'm glad you brought that up Elaine Pruis. Any other suggested changes to number one?

Okay let's go to Number 2 on the Adobe. Scroll down a little bit please. There we go. And then as far as we can on two. I know we won't be able to see all the comments because there's a lot of them.

Now there were some really good comments on number two quite a lot of discussion. And I - and I'm going to let because there are so many comments I'm not going to read them so I apologize Geoff since you're not in Adobe but hopefully you have access to the comments so you can do that, take a look at them. But in reviewing those several times I tried to take with several people said, Mark and Rob and Scott in particular and to make a statement that I sent around to the list earlier today. And I don't know if it's possible, I don't know that comment because it was just before this meeting didn't get put into the - oh it is there. Well thanks. It's on the screen. Okay thank you very much. (Steph) does such a great job.

So I noticed I don't know if this captures what everybody was saying there or not but I was trying to do rather than starting from scratch and trying to wordsmith on the call to throw something out as a possible way of bringing the thoughts together. I have no idea whether this does it or not but I would like to throw it on the table to see if this is on the right track. We can of course modify it. We can totally reject it but take a look at that. So Geoff for your information what I suggested for Number 2 was a registration data service purpose is to manage access to information about registries, registrars domain names and domain and name servers for gTLDs.

So the first thing I'd like to do at least two of the people that made suggestions are on - or I guess maybe only one is. Mark may be the only one that is on the call. But I mean what do people think? Mark go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Thanks Chuck. This is Marc Anderson. I - yes I like your proposal and I think it captures the spirit of it certainly. One point I'll make you mentioned registries in the, you know, provide or purpose to manage access to information about registries, registrars domain names and name servers. I'll just point out, you know, today there's no, you know, there isn't information about registries directly. You know, that's not to say it can't be - it can't provide information about registries. I'll just point out that today it doesn't so that's at least not a purpose today. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Mark. I hope I'm not on mute and I'm talking. Okay so I see Greg Aaron has his hand appeared. Greg go ahead.

Greg Aaron: Hi Chuck. This is Greg. Yes as he just mentioned there isn't any registry information currently in the system and I'm not aware of any efforts to add it. The word manage - the term manage access is interesting because it implies that we would move to something different than we have now which is open and unfettered access. Can you scroll back up to the original definition?

Woman: Thank you for your patient...

Greg Aaron: Yes the inclusion of authorized parties was in the original was also a sticking point. I think it implies too much at this point in the conversation. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Greg. And of course we took that that's not in there anymore by authorized parties. Now Mark your suggestion was is to provide information instead of saying manage access. Is that a better way to word this? I think Rob said - I used Rob's wording on the manage access. And in fact I think Scott used Mark's formulation talked about access to information. So is that a better way to word it so you can see the live edit was made on my proposal there. Registration data service purpose is to provide information about registries, registrars, domain names and name servers for gTLDs so that's a

new version there. And let me let - assuming that that's an old hand for Greg I'll turn it to Mark.

Marc Anderson: Thanks Chuck, Mark again. I guess I'll just note that, you know, my - there was an awful lot of discussion, you know, after I had proposed my text and there's also discussion in the chat, you know, pointing out that, you know, managing access to information, you know, could mean, you know, could mean, you know, could still encompass, you know, open, you know, and completely open management policy. So I think there's, you know, maybe additional discussion on that. Thank you Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay Mark. Steve Metalitz you're up.

Steve Metalitz: Yes thank you. This is Steve. I - my question to you Chuck was whether the omission of any referenced to information about registrants and this was intentional or inadvertent?

Chuck Gomes: Yes that's a good very good question. It certainly wasn't intentional on my part Steve. I can say that. But you raise a really good point. Of course it's easy to add registrants in that list of entities so that's an easy fix. So noticed that it's been added there. And thanks for putting the proposal up at the top of the screen next to the one that was there before. That makes it a lot easier to compare. Back to the issue of Greg - oh, go ahead Greg.

Greg Aaron? We're not hearing you Greg if you're talking. You may be on mute. Okay is that an old hand Greg? I don't know what's going on there but let me go ahead and continue.

So is there a preference or I mean there was some good discussion in the chat that there is some management of access and management of data in the RDS, don't know if we need to get too detailed at this stage. Does anyone have a - let me use the polling mechanism or not polling. It's not really a

polling mechanism but if you prefer to provide information would you put a green checkmark in the Adobe please?

If you - okay nobody did as far as I can tell. So if you prefer manage access put a green checkmark in the chat and I'll come to you in just a second Rob. So nobody really has preferences one way or the other. Rob let's see if you can break our stalemate here?

Rob Golding: Well okay so I was just before I voted on something I wanted to know what all my choices were.

Chuck Gomes: Well I only gave you two but we could I'm sure there were many others but...

((Crosstalk))

Rob Golding: Okay well yes I mean that was before. I mean you might want to run that test again because we need to hear them all.

Chuck Gomes: Well I...

Rob Golding: Right.

Chuck Gomes: ...I haven't heard any others right at the moment so that's - I gave you the two that have been proposed. Do you have some others? So I was just using the two versions that were - the two suggestions that were put forward in the discussion on this. It's open to others. I don't necessarily have one - an additional one myself but if somebody has one that they think is better that's fine.

I don't want to spend too much time on the call waiting for alternatives but let me allow 30 seconds or so to see if anybody has a - an alternative. A discussion's going on in the chat on the - that there is some management of information and so forth. Jim go ahead.

Jim Galvin: Thank you Chuck, Jim Galvin for the transcript. I do think that this is an important change and I prefer manage versus provide because provide would seem to suggest a commitment to actually execute and give the service manage in my view the choice of that particular verb would suggest that there's an opportunity for rejecting that if that's appropriate. I mean nowhere - well there is in the two in the way if they are talked about, you know, providing it to authorized parties but you need in some way to allow for some decision process to occur here.

And I think that if we just say provide information then it seems to suggest there is no decision process on the backend. And that's why I prefer managed. I don't know if that helps this discussion at all or your request for references but that's what's on my mind. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks and notice that Alan put a green check mark there agreeing with that. I think it may help. That's a good point you make. So and so any other thoughts on that? And I note that Stephanie's not on but I think Jim you're doing a good job addressing some implied things that Stephanie would probably be pointing out as well. Rob go ahead.

Rob Golding: Yes I - you know, I don't want to get too buried in the semantics here. You know, when I thought of that I actually thought provide was more generic so it really is the way the language strikes you as the reader versus I think the intent because provide doesn't necessarily mean provide everything. It just means you need to provide something probably provide - you could provide nothing depending on the circumstance so I, you know, I'm almost ambivalent between the two as a result because I think we were - we may be getting a little deep in the semantics. And I realize the semantics are important so I'll just leave it at that. Rod Rasmussen for the record by the way.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Rob, Chuck again. And okay so let's do this because I don't want to spend much more time on this on the call. So let's leave it at using is Jim's

suggestion. Let's put that and manage access as was in their first and then in parentheses put provide information.

And now back to Mark's comment on registries the should - is there any problem leaving registries in there? Hopefully not. He made the point that there really isn't any there but we don't know what's going to be there. We can always come back and take registries out later if we need to.

So and we can come back and all of you think about the choice between manage access. Of course one of the things we could do we could actually say manage access and/or provide information but there's various things but again I don't want to belabor this one too long. Mark go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Thanks Chuck. This is Mark. That seems like a pretty reasonable compromise. On the registries point, you know, I would suggest that the opposite it would be easier to add it back in later if we identify a use case for it. But I'm not aware of us having any requirements or use cases identified for that currently. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Mark, Chuck again. Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you two points. If we're using the term provide information then we definitely need the manage access. If it's provide the RDS that includes managing. So it depends on what the subject of the provide verb is whether we need the other or not. Certainly it doesn't hurt.

In terms of registries if you presume that one of the possible implementations and without commenting on whether it's a nice one or not is to put everything in one honking big database. Then registries are one of the components because for any given entry we need to know what registry it's associated with. If it's segmented like it is today then clearly the registry is implicit in the address you used to get the information not the - not as a data element so thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Alan. So a question for you. This is Chuck. Are you okay with the way it's worded in red there in Adobe the manage access and/or provide information for now?

Alan Greenberg: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And is anybody opposed to moving removing registries for now? Okay not see anyone okay. So let's move on then. We'll remove registries for now. We can always add it back in later and let's go then to the next specific purpose of RDS number three. And we scroll down to number three. There it comes okay. So Lisa go ahead and jump in.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks Chuck and Lisa Phifer for the transcript. I just want to point out that you I don't think addressed Steve Metalitz's question about whether you intentionally omitted registrant information from that Number 2?

Chuck Gomes: We added registrants didn't we? I thought registrants was added? Well I can't...

((Crosstalk))

Lisa Phifer: I can't see the text so I'm not sure.

Chuck Gomes: Yes can we scroll back? Sorry for having to scroll back and forth but if you go back up...

Lisa Phifer: Yes thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Yes it was added in but thanks for checking, appreciate it. Okay let's go back to three. Now would it be better to give everybody scroll control and as long as - then everybody just needs to stay with us if we do that? Might help

because it is helpful sometime to scroll back and forth for individuals. Let's try that giving everyone scroll control.

Man: It's a shared screen Chuck. We can't do that.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, thank you. So all right so Number 3 says to enable contact with registrants, registrars' registries and proxy privacy service providers associated with the generic top level domains for specific policy defined purposes. Now one of the things as I looked ahead to the other requirements after that change that we just made in Number 2 it seemed to me that the rest of the purposes that are listed kind of fall under that manage information, manage access or provide information theme. So even in Number 3 the information that is provided or the access that is managed, you know, one of the purposes is to contact registrants' registrars, et cetera, and maybe even proxy privacy service providers depending on what's in the RDS.

So but maybe for now we don't need to worry about that particular aspect so let's focus on this particular purpose by itself or right now and take a look at the comments there. I never did see anything from (Fabricio) on the - on what his thinking was a couple weeks ago. And I think we already deleted for the specific policy defined purposes. Oh no it's still there for - so Mark do you want to talk about why you suggested deleting that last phrase for specific policy defined purposes?

Marc Anderson: Sure thanks Geoff. This is Marc Anderson for the record. I guess I'm still - I guess I'm hung up a little bit on, you know, the difference between the purpose of RDS and maybe the requirements and the use cases that RDS is trying to fulfill. So, you know, to your earlier point with, you know, with purpose statement Number 2, you know, saying, you know, our purpose of RDS is to provide information about, you know, domain registrations, you know, registrars registrants name servers I almost feel like that's broad enough to encompass these others.

You know, so Number 3 to me reads more like a use case. The use case is be able to contact registrars registrants privacy proxy services, et cetera, you know, to be able to, you know, the use case is contacting somebody related to a generic domain name registration. So I'm not sure that's the purpose of RDS. I think the purpose of RDS is to provide the information.

The use case it's trying - by providing that information the use case is trying to meet is facilitating contact with registrants, registrars or the appropriate contact for a domain name registration. So I guess that's where I'm hung up a little bit on this one Chuck. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thanks Mark and let's hear from a couple others. Let's start with Lisa.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks Lisa Phifer for the transcript. I just wanted to point out I think the difference that was brought out in a previous call was that providing information about for example registrants is different than enabling contact with those registrants. You could certainly enable contact without actually providing the name or specific contact information for registrant so I believe that's why three was separate from two.

Chuck Gomes: Oh good point Lisa. Let's go to Alan. Oh I'm sorry Steve I skipped over you, Steve Metalitz.

Steve Metalitz: Briefly yes, this is Steve Metalitz. I agree with what Lisa just said and I understand I agree with Mark also that it's not entirely clear what's a purpose and what's a maybe a use case. But I would say just in colloquial speech that if a registration - if an RDS did not enable or facilitate contact with these entities then it wouldn't be fulfilling its purpose. So I think it is appropriate as a purpose. And I think Lisa has explained why this is somewhat distinct obviously overlapping but somewhat distinct from the one we just looked at. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Steve. Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Two points, on that one I think we're again were confusing a with the, enabling contact may - is not the purpose but is a purpose. So I think that is correct. In terms going back to the original one of is the purpose managing, the purpose is not managing. The purpose is to provide data but it's to provide data according to agreed-upon rules set.

So we can eliminate the word management but I think it is really important so that we don't set incorrect expectations but by someone reading this that if we say it's the sole purpose is to provide information that we note in the same sentence or beside it cited that this is based on some agreed upon rules and that's the management aspect. The management aspect is not the purpose but it is a prerequisite for satisfying the provide information purpose. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: So don't go away Alan because I want to follow-up with some questions. This is Chuck. Now first of all are you saying than that we should leave for specific policy defined purposes in there or something like that?

Alan Greenberg: No well I'm - I was talking about going back to the first one where we...

Chuck Gomes: Number two?

Alan Greenberg: ...left - yes Number 2 I guess where we left management in there. And people are still arguing that the purpose is not management and I'm agreeing but you need to capture the concept that it is managed if you...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: ...eliminate the action of managing.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so let's go back up to Number 2 please on the screen.

Alan Greenberg: I really didn't want to do that but okay.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Alan. No actually it's very good so even though I'm given you a bad time I'm glad you did. So maybe it'll help us resolve that. So what you're saying now -- and this is Chuck speaking -- is that may be managed should not be there. Is that what you're saying?

Alan Greenberg: I'm saying the people who are saying the purpose of the RDS is not to manage it are quite correct. But I think the concept of management or policy or rule set needs to be captured to qualify provide because as Jim said just using the word provide without provide information without any level of qualification may imply to some people that it is there data given right to access all of the information there because that's the purpose. So I think it needs to be qualified right up front that there are limitations.

Chuck Gomes: Okay this is Chuck. And bear with me here so...

Alan Greenberg: And I do my best not to try to wordsmith things on the fly so I'll leave that to others.

Chuck Gomes: I know. The - in this particular case we're going to have to do a little bit of that because...

Alan Greenberg: But Lisa seems to be willing in the chat.

Chuck Gomes: ...it's even harder to do it online and email when you've got 100 different people that are editing. So is anybody - some good points have been made about manage in the chat and by voice. So I think if I understand what Alan is saying is we would remove manage access but and we have provide information about registers, et cetera, but then we need a qualifier. So what would the qualifier be so according to...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes Lisa had some text in the chat. It's just about to roll off though.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Oh I see. I'm way up on the chat. I - because I'm using my iPhone. I happen to watch my phone all the time because it keeps...

Alan Greenberg: I will read it for you. Provide information about something list based on an agreed rule set.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so it's there and it's in red now, so based on an agreed rule set. Anybody object to those edits to provide information about registrars, registrants domain names and name servers for gTLDs based on an agreed rule set. Now one question I have while people are thinking about that what if we come across a case that there isn't a rule for? Do we have to wait then for a rule? Maybe that's a non-issue if we can assume that if there is no rule for something that it wouldn't violate any rules so that may be fine but anybody object to these edits on Number 2? Greg go ahead.

Greg Aaron: I think in the - hi, Greg Aaron here. I think in the context in which we're working rather than using the term rules set we use policy -- same concept. But policy is the nomenclature that we're using in this working group for whatever rules you set.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Greg. This is Chuck...

Greg Aaron: And we're supposed to come up with the policies.

Chuck Gomes: Yes and so I think we can delete the preposition and just say based on agreed policy. Thanks. Okay any objections to this? Okay is anybody object to going back to Number 3? And by the way this is a good thing. I think we're -- we have a better statement now in Number 2 so let's go to Number 3 again.

Okay now Steve, you know, he thinks it's good to have this here and not just assume it's covered by Number 2. So how can - is it worded okay to enable contact with registrants, registrars, registries? We probably leave registries out for now like we did in number two, could be added back in and proxy privacy service providers associated with generic dot level domains and then we still have in there for specific policy defined purposes.

So what do you think? I mean is this one worded okay the way it is? I'm looking at Greg's comment in the comment area. And let's go ahead and let Mark and Greg talk. Mark go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Thanks Chuck. It's Mark again. First let's say Steve and Geoff beat me to one of my comments. He said, "Could use Number 3, same phrasing as in Number 2." I was going to make the same point so I agree with Steve. And then if you look in the comments I previously I suggested rewording the start of it a little bit instead of to enable contact. I proposed a purpose of RDS is to identify and facilitate contact. I had proposed that based on a conversation that was going on in email discussion at the time so that was, you know, in response to some of the discussion that was going on at the time so I think that maybe captures what at least people were thinking at the time in email so I would...

Chuck Gomes: Thanks...

Marc Anderson: ...just making that change and then the change that Steve suggested in chat. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: ...which is that the end right the same change we made in Number 2 in the end regarding policy?

Marc Anderson: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Now I have one problem with that. So identify what? Identify contact, a purpose of RDS to facilitate to identify and facilitate contact. You're not identifying contact. So there's something - there's some fix that's needed there in what we have right now. A purpose of RDS is to identify what and n facilitate content? I don't know if you can help me out there Mark or not but anyway Greg let's go to you and we'll come back to that.

Greg Aaron: I - this is Greg Aaron. I think what it's trying to say is to identify contacts and facilitate a contact with contracts registrars and privacy proxy service providers. I had suggested rather than using registrant you use the term contact. Right now we have various kinds of contacts and including registrant and Mintech and they've been there historically for different purposes right? So contact is a generic term. It doesn't exclude the other kinds of contacts.

We also have some ICANN policies that specifically require contact or use of contacts other than the registrant. Like if you're doing to transfer you may need to work with the admin contact. So it's - we're using contact into different terms here. One is a noun and one is a verb which is a little - we need some wordsmithing here. The ideas also that some use cases are that you want to find out who a contact is you may or may not then go ahead and reach out to them establish contact with them. Those are two different things.

So the purpose of RDS is to identify the main contacts and facilitate contact with domain contacts registrars and so on. And it's a little - it's not elegant yet but I think it may be accurate. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Greg. And we could one thing we could do is we could separate them into the two purposes as well and so it doesn't sound so awkward. But that - the words to me, refining of the wording is something I'm less worried about than the content. We can fix that up later. Anybody so what do we - what we have right now - and this is for Geoff who is not in Adobe, a purpose of RDS is to identify domain contacts and facilitate contact with the domain contacts.

Now am I correct and we can leave the rest of that out? We may need the generic top-level domain issue there and the - and we've got based on a great policy at the end. But I'm - am I correct in assuming we don't need the even the proxy privacy service providers because they would be domain contacts for some names? So it seems like and that's been deleted on the screen now so did I get that right?

Greg Aaron: No. I – this is Greg. I would actually leave it in. When people use industry language when they talk about a domain contact they're talking about the specific registrant and Mintech and billing contacts that may be associated with the domain name record. It's a term of art in other words. So I would put the registrars and the proxy providers back in.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I mean I don't have any problem with that. That's why I asked the question but just to make sure we had it right. So it would - let me read it again and for Geoff who's not in Adobe. A purpose of RDS is to identify domain contacts and facilitate contact with domain contacts, registrars and proxy privacy service providers associated with generic top-level domains based on agreed policy.

Now any objections to that? Any additional edits? Okay I - go ahead Lisa.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks Chuck. Lisa Phifer for the transcript. I feel that we're struggling to enumerate the list of contacts that will eventually be identified in policy. And I put in the chat that currently there are actually a number of different kinds of contacts in addition to admin and technical contacts. There are points of contact for the registrar and for abuse and it may well be that the policy that comes out of this working group would identify other contacts. So perhaps just referring to domain contacts here is enough and allow the policy process to actually enumerate that list further.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Lisa. I think you make a good point and this goes against what Greg was saying I think in terms of listing those others but as soon as we start

making a list we're going to leave some out either that exist now or that will exist in the future. So would it be okay - and in fact let me add one other thing that. Do we really need to facilitate contact?

If you identify the content, the purpose of the RDS isn't it really to identify the contact? And if somebody wants to contact them they can. Now by providing the contact information I - you can say that that is facilitating contact and I agree but I don't think you need to say both but that's my own personal opinion. Andrew go ahead.

Andrew Sullivan: Hi. Thanks. It's Andrew Sullivan here. I think that the - I raised my hand because of the suggestion that maybe you don't really need this facilitation contact. But the whole reason that we had the original, you know, white pages nickname Whois was precisely to contact people when there was a problem that with the technical operation of the domain. That's the excuse to have any of this.

And all of the rest of the stuff, the law enforcement things and the domain name lifecycle stuff that is going on top of everything like that that's all stuff that grew because we needed this - the basic function which is I need to be able to get a hold of somebody if their domain is spewing stuff at me such that they're off-line. And I think that, that function needs to be - it needs to be the bottom one because that's the reason that we've got this - the service in the first place. Otherwise the legitimacy of the service at all is in question.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Andrew. This is Chuck. So are you - am I understanding you correctly that you think the facilitating contact is important to leave in there?

Andrew Sullivan: I believe it is yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. That I just want to make sure that I was hearing correctly so okay. Thank you. Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I agree facilitating - you can have you can facilitate contact and have anonymity. So the two are not synonymous. And if indeed we want to say both then they're two different things. And it's unfortunate we again like many things in ICANN we use the same word in multiple ways but that's where we are. But they are two different issues so let's not confuse the two.

Chuck Gomes: Okay that's good. And I – and Greg, you know, indicates in the chat that that - that he's in agreement with that so that's fine. But I think everybody knows by now I will throw things out just to try and get clarity. I'm not advocating - I wasn't advocating for taking out facilitate contact. I just wanted to see if there was some redundancy there. And it's clear that as people pointed out that if there is that's okay and it's needed.

So here's what we have right now. Our purpose of RDS is to identify domain contacts and facilitate contact with domain contacts associated with generic top level domains based on agreed policy. Jim Galvin your turn.

Jim Galvin: Thank you Chuck, Jim Galvin for the record. I just wanted to call out what's going on in the chat room here because I actually support this too. Steve Metalitz wrote in here reminding us about (Vicki)'s suggestion to replace facilitate contact with facilitate communication. So I just think that's a nice change to, you know, avoid any ambiguity here with use of the word contact as a noun versus a verb. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jim. And let me apologize today for not being able to keep up with the chat very well because I'm calling - I happened to call in on my cell phone. My iPhone is terrible at disappearing the screen of the end. Every once in a while there's some noise behind me that I need to mute so I'm focusing on my phone instead of on the chat. So I appreciate all of you helping me on the chat.

Anybody opposed to that suggestion from (Vicki)? Yes I like it too. Was there somebody that was opposed? So I'm hearing my echo right now all right. So

okay are we okay then with Number 3? Anything else? And again we can come back to it as we've done on most everything. That's okay.

All right let's go to Number 4. My apologies for my echo of what I'm saying. I don't know if the rest of you are hearing it. I'm hearing it.

All right so Number 4 says to enable release of accurate. Well we don't need to discuss accurate do we? Everybody's in agreement on accurate I think. I'm being facetious for those that don't know me very well. We've had great discussion on the issue of accuracy on the list over the last week so this is one that it is really important to discuss.

So – and again the way it is worded now is to enable release of accurate gTLD registration data that may not otherwise be publicly available under specific and explicit policy defined conditions. So now I - there's no way of even starting to cover all of the discussion that's happened on list and even reading everything that's in the comments in Adobe right now without taking a huge amount of time. The - just to kind of - I think most of us have read all the discussion on accuracy and where it's fit. Is it the RDS's role to ensure accuracy or is that taken care of is this that a registrar responsibility, is it a registrant responsibility and there's some combination of all of these things?

For the moment let's not focus on accurate, the word accurate. In fact let's leave that out for now. I'm not say we're going to delete it. We've got to decide that. But is there agreement that a purpose of the RDS is to enable release of registration data that may not otherwise be publicly available under specific and explicit policy defined conditions? And we could use the same wording we did up above on two and three in that part. But is there any disagreement with the statement that a purpose of the - of an - of RDS is to enable release of registration data that may not otherwise be publicly available?

Now I think somebody made a comment that whether it's publicly available or there may be other sources for information like for example zone files. They don't have very much information but some information in the RDSes in zone files. So any disagreement from the statement to enable release of gTLD registration data that may not otherwise be publicly available. And it says not so that - it's okay if it is. So are we - okay Lisa go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks Chuck I just want to point out in chat Mark has raised the question of whether four says the same thing as t2o?

Chuck Gomes: Good question.

Stephanie Perrin: Can I jump in here Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin and not on the blessed interface. And if anybody has any tips on this new wretched system I'm all ears.

Chuck Gomes: It's a conspiracy against you Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: I'm convinced of it, absolutely convinced. I haven't been able to participate for a couple of weeks now. Anyway I think that the purpose is not to enable. The purpose is to manage. And to enable implies a positive response. Manage implies it could be negative, it could be neutral, it could be positive. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Stephanie. Is there any objection to changing the word enable to manage? I don't see any okay. All right we have - okay Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes we're back on the previous discussion that we had at length before Stephanie joined. Management is a requirement to be able to know when to release. And that's why the last part of this sentence says under specific, a specific and explicit policy defined conditions so that's the managed part. I

don't think we need to repeat it in the at the beginning of the sentence. It's redundant at that point.

Chuck Gomes: So Alan...

Alan Greenberg: We're releasing it according to certain rules. That implies that we are consciously setting those roles and that's the management part.

Chuck Gomes: So in terms of that Alan what are you suggesting...

Alan Greenberg: I'm suggesting that the word manages not only not needed but I think changes the tone because it says the function that we're looking for is the management of...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: ...as opposed to the making available under certain conditions.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so you would just totally we'd delete the word like that but not that - and enable would be deleted to so it would be to release?

Alan Greenberg: Sure yes, that's correct. Enable is not really needed there because the caveat is the clause at the end of the sentence.

Chuck Gomes: Yes good okay, I've got it. Yes, that's good. All right so any other disagreement with - again we're going to come back to the word accurate okay? But ignoring that for now do we have general agreement? Anybody disagree with that statement and then once we are assured of that we'll go on to the word accurate?

Okay so I'm assuming and again we can come back if somebody thinks of something later. And Mark had suggested that this whole thing isn't even needed because of Number 2 although this talks about release and Number

2 didn't really talk about release although I guess it could be assumed. So what do people think? Is this the famous Number 2 or does it add new value to purposes? Is that an old hand Alan? If not you can speak.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry. That was an old hand. I'll take it down.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Anybody think that - I mean what about Mark's statement? Does this add some new information that two didn't provide? So again for those like Stephanie and Geoff that aren't in Adobe Number 2 - whoops, Number 2 just disappeared. I was going to read it again. Could you go back - oh there. Great okay, so two and four are together now for those in Adobe. For those that aren't so two said this. A registration directory service purpose is to provide information about registrars, registrants, domain names and name servers for gTLDs based on agreed policy. So this and Number 4 then is to release gTLD registration data. So are they duplicative? Are they different enough that they should both be stated? Jim you're first.

Jim Galvin: Thanks Chuck. Jim Galvin for the record. There was a time when I thought that these were different and were providing different functions and suggesting different things.

But I have to say that after the discussion that we have had here except for the fact that we have yet closed on the use of the word accurate and what that means and whether it belongs in this at all I'm much more inclined to think that these they represent conceptually the same thing. At least I can't identify a particular circumstances covered by one and not the other. If anyone has a good example then I might rethink my position but I'm inclined to say that Number 4 is duplicative subject to a decision about what accurate means and where it does or doesn't belong. So we need the rest of the mailing list discussion to close. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jim. Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I believe they are redundant with the exception of the comment that it may be may not be publicly available but that's a function of what the policy says. So although we could add a phrase about some of which may not be publicly available in two I don't think it really is necessary. That's number one.

So I – and in terms of accuracy I always like to play the game of let's use the negative. Certainly we would not be saying the purpose is to provide inaccurate information and therefore I believe we do not judge the accuracy when we release the information. We release the information that is in the RDS according to the policy, according to the rule set. We may have a reference to accuracy when we talk about the side that is feeding the RDS and there's an obligation of registrars and registries to, you know, attempt to make sure the data is accurate. But that's not on the release side.

The release side is rerelease whatever's there. And no matter how bad it may look that's what was put in what we accepted into the RDS. So I don't...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: ...believe accuracy is relevant at all in the release of the data. And other than that I believe two and four are effectively redundant. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Hey thanks. And hold on everybody. We're not going to talk accuracy yet. I'm not there yet okay. Alan jumped the gun a little bit on that.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry.

Chuck Gomes: He made some other - that's okay. You - he - but I want to ask a totally different question and then I'll go to Steve Metalitz. Does otherwise - may not otherwise be publicly available is that even needed? Does it really matter whether it's publicly available elsewhere or not? That's a question that's

running through my mind right now. I don't know what value that adds that may not otherwise be publicly available.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan if I may?

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: The only thing it adds is for people who do not understand the concept that the rules that the policy may differentiate between different levels of data. It may add some clarity and insight. But from a technical point of view I think it adds nothing.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thanks Alan. Steve go ahead. Sorry to jump in front of you. Are you on mute Steve?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. Yes can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: My - I wasn't going to get into accuracy at this point either. My question was if you look at two, four and I think if I remember three, we're actually using three different phrases to talk about the kinds of data that we're referring to here. Number 2, says information about registrars, registrants, domain names and name servers. Four says gTLD registration data and then three which is probably a subset of it is about the main contact. So I'm just suggesting that we should probably use the same phrasing for all three of these. And I mean I tend to agree that two and four are redundant but one question that would have to be answered is so we have to list registrar and registrants, et cetera, or do we just say gTLD registration data and if do we need to define that in some way?

I tend to think that the list is not a good approach because as someone pointed out a while back it's not just information about registrants. It's actually

information about the contacts. So domain contacts may be more correct there. But I'm just saying that however we resolve the merge two and four and Number 3 we ought to just make - line them up then make sure that they are consistent. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Steve. This is Chuck. And yes and Marika and Lisa we can probably do that and then decide which way we want to present in terms of making those, you know, it looks like it's happening in two right now about domain context based on agreed policy and so on. But anyway that part now so there's quite a few who think two and four are redundant. Again we're going to still talk about accurate.

So and before we actually eliminate four we'll talk about accurate because maybe the view changes in terms of the redundancy if - or we make a separate statement about accuracy if we decide to do so. So there seems to be - so we will defer the redundancy issue depending on what we decide on accurate. Alan suggested that accurate does not belong here. Let's now get into the accurate discussion and just take off of what Alan suggested. And I'll go to Greg.

Greg Aaron: Thank you Chuck. This is Greg. Let's maybe look a little bit at the history. And I mean my understanding of ICANN policy over the last 15 years is that accuracy has always been an explicitly stated goal and it's been reiterated over time by the Whois study groups, the EWG, the GAC -- a lot of different places over a lot of years.

I'll make a point here that I started thinking about the data that's in Whois in two general categories. One is the contact information. And this is where the I'm sure have the most differences of opinion because, you know, we have these questions of how accurate is accurate? Can it ever be accurate? Do you need 100% -- all those kinds of things?

But then there's everything else. And that includes because we use Whois to determine for example is a domain in the registry or not? That's what you're finding out when you do a lookup. You have the create date, the name of the sponsoring registrar, whether there are name servers associated with it.

And that category of information can and should be 100% accurate and reliable. One reason is that it's coming from an authoritative source. And by that I mean is usually coming from a registry. Whatever's in the registry is authoritative. It is therefore accurate. That information is what - you know, sometimes it's generated by the registrar, sometimes it may be inserted by the registrant like what name servers do you want to use but that's trustworthy information.

Some previous working groups have said that our RDS system has to be accurate. This is one of the reasons why the GNSO had a PDP decided that all registries should go thick because we have situations where registries and registrars are both providing Whois for the same thing and sometimes the information out of those two doesn't match. The information is inaccurate because one of them is wrong. So that's one of the reasons why it was decided that everything should be Thick so we have accurate information. So when we talk about accurate information it would be helpful if we talk about what kind of information you're worried about. I think contact information is one that we need to struggle with most but otherwise we should expect that an RDS is giving authoritative and accurate information about everything else. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Greg. And let me be clear that I don't think anybody is promoting inaccurate information. The question here is not whether accuracy is important but whether it should be brought in and terms of a purpose for the RDS. Those are very different questions so please no one should be assuming that we're minimizing the value of accurate data. What we're trying to determine here is whether accuracy has some part of a purpose of the

RDS of - or registration data services so please differentiate between those two. That is very important. Jim go ahead.

Jim Galvin: Thank you Chuck. Jim Galvin for the record. And being conscious of our time here I wanted to ask also Chuck for a little bit of clarification. I do want to have the discussion about accuracy but I want to know if our goal here is whether or not something about that is going to be included in one of these purposes or if it's going to be a separate purpose?

I'll give you my preferred answer. I would prefer that anything we in saying about accuracy I would prefer it be a separate and distinct purpose that it not be conflated with information that is managed or released or provided or, you know, whatever these two other purposes on the screen turned into. And the moment I'll be conscious of the time not saying too much about accuracy. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: So Jim this is Chuck, just a follow-up question there. So do you think that a purpose of the RDS has something to do with accuracy or may it just be a requirement later? Accuracy can be a requirement that we agree on later but it's not necessarily a purpose of the RDS? I don't know if that made sense.

Jim Galvin: So yes it did make sense to me Chuck and, you know, that's sort of the path that I'm headed down myself. I don't think that accuracy is a valid purpose of the data. I'm trying to, you know, reserve a final decision here and listen to some discussion and watch what's going on. You know, the RDS itself it gets data and it releases the data. It's not clear to me how it can have a role in and of itself in accuracy. And maybe that's just the technology side of me talking.

I see accuracy as entirely a policy issue. And there might be a roll here for what the RDS expects with respect to data but I don't see where it has a purpose and accuracy myself. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jim. Let's...

Jim Galvin: (Unintelligible) anyway.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...go to Mark.

Marc Anderson: Yes Chuck this is Mark. I agree with what Jim just said. I mean he made the point I was going to make essentially. You know, I agree that accuracy is in the scope of this PDP certainly and it's, you know, and there are many measures that can be taken to try and achieve degrees of accuracy. And, you know, I think we'll have some excellent discussions on those.

But the RDS, you know, the Registration Directory Service itself just displays the information. Its role is simply display the information that exists whether it's right or wrong, whether the accuracy mechanisms upstream of that have done their job and ensure the data's accurate or if they've not met that goal. You know, either way the purpose of the registration directory service is just to display the data. You know, and so, you know, again I, you know, - accuracy's certainly in scope. I want accurate data. I'm certainly not advocating for inaccurate data I just, you know, I feel the purpose of the registration directory service is just to display the data accurate or not. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Mark, Chuck again. Alan your turn.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I disagree slightly but probably not for an obvious reason. As someone said part of the information in the RDS is definitive. You know, we put information in the RDS about what DNS servers to use and that then gets reflected in how the DNS runs. So it can't be wrong other than without - within the time to live, you know, of flexibility that there may be delays it is by definition accurate.

The other information may be inaccurate and there's nothing the RDS can do. I could - if I moved tomorrow and don't change my Whois entries that information is now inaccurate and there's nothing the RDS can do to know that. So saying it is responsible for delivering accurate data I do not think is appropriate. It doesn't belong there. It may well belong in other places associated with creating the data.

However the one I - part I disagree on is if the implementation of the RDS for instance as has been proposed some massive single data system. And among the responsibilities of maintaining the data is to do regular audits on whether the data looks correct or seems to be correct or whatever. That could be a responsibility we put on the RDS and the RDS operator instead of just on those who supply the data that is to flag that information looks inaccurate. So I don't think we want to preclude that at this point but it certainly doesn't belong on the delivery side. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Alan. Mark it looks like you got a new hand there. And before Mark talks every take a look at this statement that Lisa made, a purpose is to provide an authoritative source of accurate data. I want to come back to that after Mark talks.

Marc Anderson: Chuck, Mark. I'm just going to lower my hand. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay all right. So is there anybody Whois opposed to us in Number 4 realizing that it may just be combined with Number 2? But regardless of that is there anybody was opposed to removing the word accurate in Number 4? I better scroll down just to see if there's any. Okay so let's remove the word accurate again with the full understanding that we're not objecting to accuracy okay? I want everybody to be clear on that.

So now let's talk about now so maybe I think what Lisa's suggesting here and (Vicki) yes we're going to cover it in when we deliberate on requirements,

absolutely. So and you've seen that in some of my email messages in the discussion on accuracy. We're going to get there.

So but let's look at Lisa's suggestion and maybe that's a new purpose. And look we're just about out of time but let's at least start the discussion on that. Sorry about the dog barking in the background. The - nothing I can do about that. It's not my dog.

But the - what about Lisa's suggestion there, a purpose of the RDS is to provide an authoritative source of accurate data? That would be a separate one from Number 4 or Number 2 which we may combine. And I Greg I don't know if you're - it's yes to Lisa's suggestion in the chat. I'm not sure. Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: You know, again I don't see how we can put the responsibility to buy at this point to put it on delivering accurate data. It is what it is. It is authoritative by the very definition.

We may assign responsibility to the RDS provider to do some level of accuracy checking or attempt to identify inaccurate data. But that's an if way down the line. I don't think how - I don't see how we can certify accuracy at this point.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Alan. Let's go to Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Again this is Steve Metalitz. I guess the way I would put it is that if your data is not accurate to some extent -- and the extent will vary depending on the purpose -- if the data is not accurate it can't fulfill the purpose. So even if we don't have accuracy in the statement of purpose it's a condition on being able to fulfill the purpose. So that's particularly true for purpose Number 3 but I think it's also true for purpose Number 1. And there the tolerance for inaccuracy might be even less than it would be in Number 3. So there may be different levels of inaccuracy that could be tolerated but it's certainly a goal to

have - if it's a goal to have accurate data that has to influence our deliberations as to whether the RDS we're recommending will fulfill the purposes that we're specifying. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Steve. So the follow-up question I have -- this is Chuck -- is so is that a requirement of the RDS which we're going to deliberate on starting hopefully not too long in the near future or is it - does it have - does it need to be stated in as a specific purpose of the RDS itself, not a requirement of the RDS because we're going to get there? In other words are you suggesting that we do need a statement of purpose, a specific statement of purpose of the RDS related to accuracy?

Steve Metalitz: No I mean I'm - this is Steve again. I think there have been some good arguments against doing that. But I think we have to understand that accuracy is essential to achieving these purposes. And therefore as we deliberate we may well be pressing for the greatest possible accuracy if we actually want to fulfill the purpose. That's all.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thanks. No you - this is Chuck. You answered my question and we're out of time so I'm going to wrap it up. So I'm going to suggest unless somebody objects real quickly here that we combine four and two into one and it will not contain the word accurate for our next version okay? Now we didn't quite get to all of the ones and we will get to those next week.

And certainly let's keep up the discussion on the list especially look at the rest of the document. I think there's at least one more possible purpose and let's leave Lisa's suggestion in there too as one to discuss a little bit further because we kind of cut that short. There was some argument I think against it but let's - we didn't really give it and I'm not advocating for it. I'm just saying let's include that one for discussion next week.

And hopefully we'll be able to look at the full statement. So everybody if you're not going to be able to make the call next week it's at the alternate

time. Please take a look at Number 5. It'll probably be Number 4 eventually. We'll leave the numbering alone for now. We're going to combine two and four so that there will be one number less here but we'll leave it five for now. And then Lisa's can be six or whatever staff thinks is clearest on that.

Please look at those and especially everyone but for those that can't make the call next week provide your input before the call because it - our meeting next week is at the alternate time. Now I think I've probably run a little bit over. I apologize for that. Anything else that we need to cover before we adjourn? Okay again apologies for the interruptions on my side.

Stephanie Perrin: Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Chuck it's Stephanie.

Chuck Gomes: Yes?

Stephanie Perrin: I do apologize but I have just done yet another downloaded yet another reinstall and I'm desperately trying to see if it worked. Is there any way I could beg to stay on for another minute to see whether this works any better?

Chuck Gomes: Sure. Sure well let's do this Stephanie. We'll adjourn for everybody but don't close Adobe yet and I'll certainly stay on and I'm sure staff will so that we can do some testing. So thanks everyone, have a good rest of the week and the meeting is adjourned except for some testing on Adobe for just Stephanie and me and staff. Thanks.

Man: Thank you all.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you. The meeting has been adjourned.

(

END