

**ICANN Transcription
GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP WG
Tuesday 14 June 2016 at 1600 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP WG call on the Tuesday 14 June 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.

The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-nextgen-rds-14jun16-en.mp3>

Operator: ...your recordings have started. You may now proceed.

Michelle DeSmyter : Great, thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening.
Welcome to the GNSO Next Generation RDS PDP Working Group call on the 14th of June, 2016. 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. So if you're only on the audio bridge today please let yourself be known now.

Stuart Clark: Hello. It's Stuart Clark.

Michelle DeSmyter : Thank you. And I'd also like to remind all participants please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Also keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.
With this I'd like to turn the call to Chuck Gomes.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much. And welcome to everyone for this call of the Next Gen RDS PDP Working Group on Tuesday the 7th of – excuse me, Tuesday the

14th of June. Sorry about that. And you can see the agenda in front of you. In a moment I'll entertain any questions or comments on the agenda. But before I do that does anyone have an SOI that has been updated?

And while we're waiting for that, was there someone who said they're not in Adobe? I thought I heard someone but wasn't sure.

Stuart Clark: Yes, that's myself. Stuart Clark.

Chuck Gomes: Okay Stuart, thanks. And, Stuart, you know to speak up if you want to jump in so feel free to do that. Okay? Appreciate that. Okay, I'm not seeing any hands or hearing...

((Crosstalk))

Klaus Stoll: Yes, Chuck, it's me, Klaus.

Chuck Gomes: Who was that?

Klaus Stoll: Klaus. Klaus Stoll.

Chuck Gomes: Oh Klaus. Okay. And you're not in Adobe either?

Klaus Stoll: Yes, I'm on Adobe and I raised my hand.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, do you have an update to your SOI?

Klaus Stoll: Exactly.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, please, and communicate it.

Klaus Stoll: Okay, thank you. I just wanted to let you know that I updated my SOI on the ICANN webpage. I'm not longer the manager of the Global Knowledge

Partnership Foundation, also I have no financial or contractual arrangements with ICANN. I would like also, in the interest of complete transparency, let you know that I'm the sole member of the Brokers Group registered in – limited – LLC registered in Germany and in Virginia. Thank you very much.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Klaus. Is there anyone else? Okay, not hearing anyone or seeing any more hands we'll go on then. Any questions or comments on the agenda? Okay, then let's just jump right in to a brief update on Tasks 7 and 9 of our work plan, which are Community Outreaches 1 and 2 starting with Outreach Number 1. I believe there's been only one submission so far that came in some time ago, that was from the SSAC.

Does anyone from any of the SOs, ACs, constituencies, stakeholder groups or other groups, have any questions about Outreach Number 1? And if you have a status on how your group's response is going, this would be a good time to share that. I can tell you that I believe the Registry Stakeholder Group will have their input on time. Note that input on that first outreach is due the 16th of this month, which is Thursday.

Even if your group doesn't have any – very much input in terms of the questions that were asked there's one question, if it hasn't already been answered, that we certainly would like every group to answer and that's the name and contact information of a liaison or liaisons for your group. And if those of you who volunteered for Outreach Number 2 are able to do on an ongoing basis that's great. But please let us know in that regard.

Okay, Lisa or Marika, do you have anything to add on outreach Number 1? Not – nothing from Marika. Okay, thank you very much. And so that's – let me put David on the spot and ask him if there's – an update with regard to the NCSG and the two constituencies in the NCSG. David.

David Cake: I can say that the – Farrell has distributed the document to the NCSG but we don't have any feedback as yet.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you.

David Cake: ...the NCSG. And the NCSG, NCUC and NPOC are all aware and...

Chuck Gomes: Good. Thanks, David. All right, not seeing any other hands, let's go on to the next agenda – or the next part of the agenda item which is Outreach Number 2. Now over the weekend...

Woman: Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Chuck, I believe there is one hand.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, I should scroll back up. Thank you very much. Tjabbe.

Tjabbe Bos: Yes, thank you, Chuck. Can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Tjabbe Bos: Okay. This is Tjabbe Bos for the record. I just wanted to say in relation to this agenda item that currently a proposal for a reply to the outreach message is being considered by the GAC. We have set a deadline for tomorrow for written comments and are currently monitoring possible comments. So hopefully will be in time for the deadline with a response from the GAC.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much; that's very much appreciated. Glad to hear that. All right, regarding Outreach Number 2, as I started to say a little bit ago, the – a message was sent out to the people who volunteered to be liaisons for

Outreach Number 2 over the weekend. If any of you that volunteered didn't receive that please let us know.

And hopefully all of you are – have already started. And I've seen some of the messages that have gone out and appreciate what's happening with this outreach. And this is basically – Outreach Number 2 is simply to see if any others in the community have any other suggested requirements that we may have missed in our list of requirements. And so thanks for facilitating that and if there are any questions or comments on that please bring them up now or on the list.

And thanks, Alan, for responding to Marika's comment in the chat. All right, again that one will go until our meeting in Helsinki. And in both sessions in Helsinki, the cross community session, and the working group sessions, there will be opportunity given for additional requirements to be added. So – and the agendas will be designed to facilitate that along with other things. So appreciate everyone's help on that.

The next agenda item then is the planning for the Helsinki meetings, in particular the cross community meeting, which will be on – later on Monday afternoon in Helsinki. And again there will be remote participation for those who cannot be there in person. Hope you'll join remotely.

And our task today is to refine our planning a little bit more on that meeting. And we have some slides that are still a work in progress that we're going to go through, and then we're going to focus on a couple of those slides in our session today and seek out some volunteers. So as the slides are coming up here, now I'm going to go through these slides really quickly and so if – and then we'll come back and focus on 2 in more detail because some of the – keep in mind that this slide presentation is a first cut at slides we will use in the cross community session in Helsinki, okay?

So the – I'm going to – to give an overview of what we're going to present very quickly in Helsinki, let's just do a quick overview of the slides right now so if you could go to Slide – the next slide please.

And I'm going to move fairly quickly through the slides so – and not – this group doesn't need them so there's – you can see the agenda, there are five items on the agenda. Go ahead and next slide please. And the – not quite that – go back to 4 please. Okay give people a chance – no okay one more – go forward. There we go.

Okay so the first agenda item, go ahead. And this slide will be completed later. So obviously before Helsinki. Go ahead. And Agenda Item 2 then, go on to the next slide. And this is an important slide. Now again, I don't need to go through the detail on this slide. This is a quick view of our work plan and where we are so the items above where we are we've finished and where we are and with the link to the slide. Notice it's showing Phase 1 which we will be in for a while.

And let's go to the next slide. The near term opportunities for early input. Again, most of you all know all this so I don't think we need to take time to look at it but this will be information provided to those in the session. Next slide please.

And then Agenda Item Number 3, go ahead. And here is where we're going to invite input from – especially from visitors in the cross community session, okay. And again, the middle bullet, as you can see, provides a rationale for why this is important to people. And the last bullet is important. We really want anybody who's interested in the opportunity to voice their concerns and input in this cross community session. Go ahead to the next slide.

And this one here, again, none of you need the – need me to go through this. There's a very quick recap of all 11 questions. The five – first questions are – each have a box of their own and then the cross cutting questions covers the

other 11 questions to give a very quick overview. Now keep in mind, before I go to the next slide, that what we're trying to do in this session is make it mostly interactive.

And so because there will be people there that aren't up to speed in our group we're going to give them some background information, as you've seen on this slide, and others, but we're going to cover that fairly quickly while still letting them ask questions and addressing their questions. Go ahead to the next slide.

So and we're going to come back to Slide 12 so let's go to Slide 14. Okay so here – this is a really important part of the slide deck because here we're going to actually give the visitors in the group an opportunity to make their own suggestions and comments. Go ahead and go to Slide 15. And notice that 14 was just a repeat of the earlier slide.

But we'll keep that up so that they know – they can address this particular question. This is an input slide. And we are – we as the leadership team are still working on how to do this if we can enter suggestions from the audience live on the screen we will do it. Otherwise we will use flip charts and whatever means we can to record the suggestions of possible requirements from people in the audience. We'll of course also let them ask questions about various things in this process.

Next slide. Okay this one, and I believe – at least this has been talked about – we're going to actually have red and green cards in the room so that we can do quick surveys of the audience in terms of whether they support something or don't support it. And in particular even though we as a working group are not going to get to start trying to answer this question until we get through the first five questions and the requirements associated with those, we will give the audience a chance to just tell us where they're at very quickly on this.

Next slide. Next slide. So Agenda Item 4 then. One more slide please. Okay so you can see the next steps here. And we'll talk about our working group meeting, which will occur the next day and that it will be open to everyone, not just working group members or working group observers. And we will let everyone participate. Next slide please.

Go ahead. One more. So we will put links here so that people have things to follow. And then I think we can go back to Slide 12 please. Now the purpose of that was just make sure all of us have the context of what we're talking about. And Marika pointed out to me that we may just use a show of hands, which will be fine, for the agree and disagree so that we can kind of keep people involved and see where the audience is standing. So thanks for – Marika for pointing that out to me.

And as – Steve, you asked a really good question. It's not a vote, first of all, let's be clear about that. We won't be taking votes. In fact, we'll be – probably won't be taking votes in the group. We may do some polls to take the – like Marika says, take the temperature of the room or of our working group later on. But they won't be votes. It's just – there's a couple purposes for it, Steve.

Number 1, trying to keep people involved, okay, get them to think and respond. And we'll qualify it to let them know this is not a vote. It's just, you know, where people at in the room on this and make it – making it very clear that the working group itself won't even start to reach consensus on that big question until we have finished our deliberation on the first five – on the requirements associated with the first five questions. I hope that answers your meeting.

And any polling we do in our working group meetings would be the same thing so they won't be votes. They won't have any significance in terms of ultimate decisions of the working group. And David said it right there. And Scott brings up a very good point. And you might want to emphasize this to your groups in response to the second outreach message, the informal one.

The requirements document right now is 110 pages long; that's going to be pretty intimidating.

So if people want to just ask you, as a liaison or anyone from one of the groups you're in, if a particular requirement has been covered you can check for them or just have them do a quick skim of the requirements. If somebody wants to submit one and they don't have time to go through the 110 page documents we're going to accept it so let's make it as easy on people as possible.

So – and as Lisa points out, we're going to get to this a little bit further in these slides. So let's look at Slide 12 here.

Alan Greenberg: Chuck, it's Alan. Can I get in please?

Chuck Gomes: Oh I'm sorry, Alan. Yes, you can. I've been so busy reading chat, I forgot you your hand up. Go, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I put a message in the chat saying my hand was up.

Chuck Gomes: I missed it.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. A few slides ago when you had the red and the green, the question was, if I remember correctly, and it doesn't matter exactly, is a new generation RDS needed for your data? I really would like to make sure that we have some clarity. New generation RDS is essentially a buzzword. We've all seen examples in technology where everything under the hood has changed and the name stays the same. And other cases where virtually nothing changes but a new marketing name is added to it.

So no new generation RDS is needed for anything. We can revamp the hell out of Whois and changes to internal completely and still call it Whois if we chose. So let's make sure when we're asking questions like that, I think what

we're really asking is do we need a substantial, I'll use the term "rewrite" that may not be the right accurate – the right word – a redesign of Whois to be able to function in the world we're moving into. Whether we call it Whois Mark 2 or new generation RDS. So let's make sure when we ask the question we're asking the right question and not just relying on buzzwords. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. Appreciate that. And of course our charter gives us the questions to ask whether they're framed perfectly or not, I'm not sure. But one of the basic questions we have to ask is, is a redesigned, whatever that means, needed or could we modify the existing system? That's a question we will have to address at the end of the first part of Phase 1, which is the first five questions.

Alan Greenberg: If I may have a follow up?

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Alan Greenberg: I understand that is what is in the charter, and those of us who have spent a large part of our lives designing systems, know that you can go about things in various different ways. And I think the question it's asking is, do we need a major redesign to do it properly as opposed to do we need a new name. And I just want to make sure when we ask people for – that we ask people the right question even if it's not exactly the right words in our charter. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. And of course we will be trusting all of you to make contributions in the cross community sessions. We want you to be as brief as possible so that we can focus on getting input from the visitors that are there, but feel free if we don't adequately communicate that we will say it properly so feel free to jump in if you're able to attend that session. So and others as well.

So lots of things in the chat. Kathy, go ahead.

Kathy Kleiman: Yes, can I ask staff to set back the slide that we're looking at to the one with the vote on it, the one with the green and the red?

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Kathy Kleiman: Thanks. And I'll pause until we do that. Great. Okay so I'm going to follow up, Chuck, with what Alan was saying because I feel like we're in a game of the blind man and the elephant on these terms. And I don't think we're bound anymore by the words the charter gave us. I think it's our time now to define them knowing that these words, next generation RDS, are vague and ambiguous and depending on whether you're technical or policy or legal you're going to be coming in with a different perspective and interpreting it differently.

Is it a technical redesign? Is it a legal redesign? What do these terms mean? So I'm with Alan. I think it's time for us when we're asking questions that we know in the working group raise issues that we've discussed for months, we – we don't pass on that ambiguity, that we start helping people understand the nuances, you know, do we have to introduce words here a little bit and some of the new capabilities of the Whois so that people understand what the additional capabilities are versus what the next generation might be if it's a spin-off of that or something completely new.

We're dealing with a lot of stuff here, and if we just – again, if we just keep passing, you know, moving the ambiguity down the track I'm not sure how useful the input is. I think it's our time to define these terms. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Kathy, this is Chuck. You're absolutely right. It is our time. And we're a ways from doing that. But we're heading there. I want to call everybody's attention to the way this is worded here. This is not wording from the charter. It's wording that's focused on the audience. "Is a next generation RDS needed to support your gTLD registration data and directory service requirements?"

It doesn't say the community; it says – in other words, we're focusing the question on the audience and what they understand is their requirements. Now the working group has a much broader task than that, this is just an interactive question for the – directed at the visitors in the room. Okay?

But, again, and let me point out, we're going to have 85 minutes in this session. We're booked for 90 but we have to get out of the room five minutes early so the next session can start. So we have 85 minutes and we're not going to be able to go into depth with a lot of the issues and the nuances that all of us are very familiar with. And that are very important. But it'd be really easy for us, as a working group, in this 85 minutes, to monopolize the session and advocate for our points of view and do lots of things and even have our own debate.

But if we do that we'll leave the audience behind and so we're trying to take advantage especially in this cross community session to really emphasize audience participation. Now hopefully out of this we will get input that will help us in our working group session the next day and in the weeks ahead. But please keep that in mind on this. We're going to try really hard not to monopolize it with working group discussions but rather to facilitate audience participation.

So Holly, go ahead.

Holly Raiche: Yes, I was just going to say perhaps it would be helpful if somewhere in the slides either to have the EWG report that actually starts to list the data or, my favorite document, SAC 054 that just has a list by that – the registration cycle that does list the sort of information that we're talking about that may help the audience. Just a suggestion but that would answer Kathy and Alan's suggestion, at least help in the understanding – what data we're talking about.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Holly. This is Chuck. I have a concern about getting into that much detail on one area of questions that happen to be the data elements. The – again, if we do it on that one and don't do it for any of the other four primary questions, we're going to run out of time way before we cover what's on the agenda. But if others think that's doable and still stay within our timeframe I obviously will support it.

But my concern is we're not going to be able to get into too much detail without using our time up and not covering very much at all. And we're going to have to take fairly high brush strokes, I think, in a 85 minute session and allowing plenty of time for interaction. And especially even getting into the specific documents like you say, the Expert Working Group and the SSAC report that you referred to.

So okay let's go back to Slide 12 please. And very quickly, what are the possible requirements, an exercise that we will hopefully be wrapping up at least for consideration of that in Helsinki, and then a couple questions there. Again designed for discussion to engage the people in the room who are not working group members, "Where does Whois fall short today? What requirements should a new RDS policy satisfy?" And we'll be capturing all these things and then able to use that information as we get into detailed deliberation.

This is not a deliberation session but we're trying to engage those who are visiting our session that are in the room or online. The second bullet there, we're looking of broad spectrum of real life examples, and want them to share their own views to inform our future deliberation. Okay, this is not our deliberation time. It's a time to get input from those who are not a part of our working group.

Third bullet, excuse me, we're going to have working group members, just a few, share some examples. And the next slide will get into that a little bit more. And then we want to leave adequate time for different examples. So

we're going to ask the volunteers, that we're going to seek in just a minute, to keep their examples to a minute, very brief example of a requirement to avoid repetition and distribute examples across our charter questions, especially the first five charter questions.

So let's go Slide 13 then. And you can see that that slide and this one will be – not look the way they do now for the cross community session. These two slides are really designed for our meeting today to help us organize ourselves for that meeting. And so you see some examples here that are given, taken from our input documents, and I think Lisa is the one that did these, just as examples.

So any deficiency in today's Whois policies or implementation that you would like to see corrected? And of course we're going to want the audience to respond. But here's an example, Whois lacks mechanisms for access control, integrity and confidentiality. So we would ask for a volunteer to share – it doesn't have to be this example but these are examples. And notice it's – it was – this one was taken from RFC 3912 and relates to privacy and gated access both, so two of the questions.

You can look at the other two examples yourself, one of them on data accuracy, one of them on users and purposes, one of them on data elements and from different sources. So these are – these are just given as examples and so what we'd like to do, as you saw in the last bullet on the previous slide, is get some volunteers, maybe five volunteers or it doesn't – five is not a magic number, but pick out some good examples that cover the spectrum of the first five questions and come from different sources.

So what I'd like to ask now that we – is there anybody who would like to volunteer to be one of the working group members in the cross community session to pick an example and share it? Now just to let you know, before you volunteer so I don't put you on the spot after the fact, what we're going to

ask you to do is to prepare your example, requirement, in advance of our working group meeting next week.

And we'll go over those next week and allow feedback and interaction so after our meeting next week we'll pretty much know the – we'll have a good idea of what examples will be shared and who will be sharing them in the working group session. Now it's not absolutely essential but it'd probably be helpful if it's people who can be there in person.

So any questions about what we're asking for with regard to volunteers? And I appreciate what's going on in the chat and Lisa's response to that, that's great. Holly, go ahead.

Holly Raiche: I was just going to say I'm looking at what Lisa said and I think if what staff does is look at the suggestions that have been made in the chat as well as what is on Slide 13, I think we're starting to really expand the notion of what that data is. So I'm sure somebody between Carlton, Kathy and I, will make sure, but I'm almost putting my hand up to say I'm – I'd really like to be involved in what goes up on a slide and it may just be for me to say the slide would be something like SAC 054.

My only reticent on that is Jim Galvin is the one (unintelligible) and could probably better explain the data than I could. He's got a far more technical background than I. So if he hasn't got his hand up then my hand is up.
Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thank you, Holly. And I'm just checking. I don't think Jim is on the call either. So...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: So – oh there it is. Okay oh it had moved up. I had scrolled down and he raised his hand so I totally missed it. Thanks, Jim. Go ahead.

Jim Galvin: Just raising my hand because Holly mentioned my name and you were looking for me. But, sure, I'm happy to stand up in any way that – if they're selected I'm happy to speak for the items that are selected if we choose items from SSAC doc. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks, Jim. And, Holly, I have a question for you. This is Chuck again. How will what you're suggesting facilitate the visitors that are in the room in sharing new possible requirements? Go ahead.

Holly Raiche: Yes, thank you very much. The – I think my concern is that if you look at the RAA and the information that must be made public it is not all of the information that's actually required just to process a domain name from really from the beginning to the end. And even just going through the lifecycle, and the SAC 054 has a really nice kind of graphic that says these are the stages and at this – at each stage, there is particular information that's required, just to manage (unintelligible) and without going into a lot of technical detail.

What that does is to say there's more information than just the traditional Whois. This is how we, as the technical community, manage the detail and manage the domain name system. So it gives a much broader picture than just the traditional notion of what Whois. Now I would be very sort of careful not to go into a lot of detail, but having that sort of overview does highlight that there's a lot of information that is needed just to make the process work. And some of it is part of the traditional Whois. But there's other information. And that's what's made clear in SAC 054.

And of course as I said in the email this week, a lot of that – all of that information is covered elsewhere but it's just brought together in that nice little table that's easy to understand and probably encompasses for people's minds how much data is required just to manage the process. I hope that answers your question.

Chuck Gomes: I'm not sure it does but let me pursue it a little bit further. This is Chuck again. So, Holly, what would you propose as an example requirement for the audience? Would you propose showing that table as an example of a requirement?

Holly Raiche: I would show something like the table. And, you know, somebody like Jim is there just to say, well, we need to manage this sort of information, because some of its technical and some of it is just personal information. Some of that information is personal information and sensitive. Some of that information isn't. And one of the big tasks for this group is to identify the sort of information that may be subject to a lot of requirements.

So, yes, the table is just – it's an easy way into understanding there's a range of information that is required. And without going into a lot of detail because a lot of the audience is, including myself, is not going to be aware of all of the technical requirements. And it's just – it's a way into understanding I suppose the information requirements at every stage of the management of the domain name.

Chuck Gomes: So would you be willing to volunteer to provide this possible requirement for – with regard to the data elements?

((Crosstalk))

Holly Raiche: ...as people like Scott and Jim don't laugh at me, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Oh laughing is healthy.

((Crosstalk))

Holly Raiche: I'll call on them in the audience.

Chuck Gomes: I know that neither one of those two guys would laugh at you. But, yes, so that's good. Let me let Lisa jump in.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. This is Lisa Phifer for the record. And just a – to clarify, before our Marrakech meetings, some of you may have noticed it, some of you may have not, but we had – I think it was just three slides that were an, you know, automatically rolling display before our meeting started. One that showed the components of the Whois system, one that showed an example Whois record, I think it was conceptual, and then one that showed an actual Whois record filled in.

And so what I had been suggesting in the chat was that we start with that and expand on it, maybe give some examples pulled right out of 054 to show additional data that some entities collect because of course not everybody does collect the same additional data that's not published through Whois today.

But some additional examples from SAC 054 and then, as Carlton suggested, maybe just kind of highlight some of the elements there that are PII's. And but the concept was to have that rolling display occur before our session even started so that everybody sitting waiting for the session to start would have that sort of mental picture of what it is that we're talking about. And not necessarily present that level of detail during the session.

Now that doesn't mean that maybe some people would not like to volunteer to present specific data elements as potential requirements, that would be, you know, up to them and great to add to the conversation. But my suggestion really was in advance of the session rather than presenting those very detailed slides during the session.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Lisa. So in reading – and, Carlton, I want to respond to your comment. Because I'm getting the impression that we're mixing up our working group efforts and deliberation that are ahead of us, and what's going

to happen in this cross community session. We're going to let the visitors cheat a little bit and get ahead of the game in some of those questions because we're not going to have an in-person session with them again for, you know, four or five months.

But what I'm hearing you say, Carlton, is that we first – okay, you say we first address the policy question at the broad level before we go to asking what should be collected, validated, and we're back to a discussion we had for quite a few days several months ago. And we as a working group have to do that. And we have to decide what we're going to do first and we're going to be talking about that in Action Item 11, okay?

But we cannot expect the visitors in this room to deliberate at the same level that we are going to be able to do because we've been working on it for months. Okay? And in 85 minutes we can't bring them up to speed and ask them to deliberate in the same way we will. What we really want, I think, from this session, is to hear from the community where they're at so that we can respond to their questions in terms of where we're going and use their input as it fits as we get into our detailed deliberation.

Don't expect the cross community session to be a working group meeting. It's not. If we make it a working group meeting we're going not lose the audience. So – and we're all learning in terms of how to do this new meeting format. But please don't think of this cross community session, the session on Monday afternoon, as a working group meeting. We want the working group members there, but we're going to focus on the visitors that are there.

And then the next day we will have a working group meeting and we will – that will be a working group meeting when we will be debating as working group members and maybe even doing some deliberating, okay? While at the same time allowing participation from the visitors.

You know, crowd-sourcing is kind of a good term, Greg, I think. So the – and Lisa put a link to the face to face session that's in there. I'm just looking at what you wrote there, Steve. Hang with me a second. Yes, you're right, Steve, I think. So please understand what the purpose is here. And in fact, Thomas Schneider from the GAC sent something out to the SOs and ACs with some suggestions for what the cross community sessions should be.

And I thought he was pretty much on target on a lot of those things. And what we're trying to do is make this interactive with the community. And if we try to get down into the weeds in this session we're going to lose people and we won't have enough time to give them the full background that they need.

So I've got one volunteer so far. The – Holly. And she's going to develop one for data elements. Is there a volunteer for the other of the five first questions? And it can be a combined one too. We have a volunteer for the purpose area for users and purpose. How about for – okay, Jim, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: Yes, so I'll take a stab at making some suggestions for user and purpose and pulling it out of our list and seeing where we go with that.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jim.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yay.

Chuck Gomes: And the examples on the screen are just to show kind of what you have to produce, okay? A requirement, a reference if there is one, and then the connection to the question on the first five questions. Okay so we've got two volunteers now. How about a volunteer for privacy and data protection? I know there's nobody in the group that cares about those areas.

Kathy Kleiman: Chuck, this is Kathy. I just volunteered for that in the chat room.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay, sorry. Okay good. Okay so we've...

((Crosstalk))

Kathy Kleiman: I've never heard the topic in my life but, you know, I'll give it a shot.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, okay good. Good. And keep in mind this isn't going to be an opportunity to advocate, and I'm not saying this because Kathy just suggested it, but I want us all to remember, this could be a time to show examples. And what we're going to then do is say okay, what requirements do you – you in the audience – think are important? Now they'll duplicate some of the ones we had and that's okay. But they may come up with some new ones too.

So we've got – what about gated access? Anybody that wants to give an example of gated access? Thanks, Carlton. Appreciate your willingness. Sorry you won't be there. And Michele I don't think is on the call. He wasn't earlier so we won't volunteer for him. Anybody for gated access? Now we don't have to cover all five, but we would like whoever is doing it to be able to present your – to come up with your – send it to the list before our meeting next week and then go – and then we'll discuss it and make sure everybody is clear on what's going to happen in the session in Helsinki.

Okay. I'm just looking – and if we cover the big three that's probably okay. I think you're right, Kathy. The – so it looks like they're trying to volunteer you, Scott. Are you going to be – Scott, are you going to be in Helsinki? I don't even know. So he's not so he got out of that one easy, didn't he? So all right well let's go with those three. If we get another volunteer, and let's have an action item to see if there's a volunteer for the other two areas. If there's not covering the big three as examples I think is fine.

And then so we're looking for volunteers on gated access and what's the one I'm missing right now of the first five, accuracy. Accuracy is the other one. Thank you, Lisa. Okay, I don't want to spend any more time on this. Three of

you have action items for our call next week. Now remember our call next week is going to be at Holly's time.

Holly Raiche: Yay.

Chuck Gomes: So it's not going to be a great time for some of the rest of you. And if for some reason you can't make that time please get your input into us in advance of that meeting. Everybody should get their input in in advance so we can do that. All right okay this took quite a bit of time but it is important we get ready for that meeting there.

So I want to move us on to the next agenda item, which is the starting on Task 11. And we have a document that we've bounced around a little bit, not too much, on the leadership team in terms of answering the question in Task 11 of our work plan, which is how are we going to reach consensus in deliberations?

Now first of all, and I guess we don't want this document – we're going to go through – the first thing we want to do is review what the charter says about the rules of engagement. And the – is it possible to post Section 4 of the charter to just do a quick review? Sorry for not saying that first, but that's the first action item on this little one page plus document that was up there.

So Section 4 of the charter talks about how we're going to determine consensus in the working group. Now it's pretty clear in terms of how we ultimately determine consensus in our final report. But we need to expand on that a little bit and see okay how are we going to apply that or can we even apply that in our deliberations when we get into step 12.

So hopefully the section – and I'm not going to read Section 4 of the charter. All of you can do that. But it's pretty clear in terms of how we ultimately reach consensus. But we're going to have to do a lot of work before we get to that point. So the charter is a bigger document so I assume that's the problem

here. Let me talk to it without it before it comes up on the screen if it doesn't come fairly quickly – okay here we go. So scroll down to Section 4 in the charter if it's up there. Got a copy of the charter here so let me just start talking to it instead of wasting time here.

Okay so Section 4 is the rules of engagement. And it defines what full consensus means, what consensus means, what strong support but significant opposition means, what divergence means, sometimes called no consensus, it talks about minority views and so forth. And those of you that have been in the GNSO in a GNSO PDP in the past have – are familiar with those kinds of things.

Now it recommends that the following method for discovering consensus. And what level of consensus we would designate in the working group. So the first item there, and sorry to read without you being able to see it but I don't want to just take up too much time here. So the first step is after the group has discussed an issue long enough for all issues to have been raised, understood and discuss, the chair or co-chair – or co-chairs may make an evaluation of the definition and publish it to the group for review.

The second step, and everybody has scrolling capability now so use that so I'm down to what's shown at the bottom of the screen, right there is where I'm at right now. I just did Item I, lower case Roman Numeral I. And then 2 says, "After the group has discussed the chair's estimation the chair or co-chair should reevaluate and publish an updated evaluation."

Step 3, "Steps 1 and 2 should continue until there's an evaluation that's accepted by the group. And then in the rare case a chair may decide that the use of polls is reasonable," and they give reasons for using polls and the same things I said earlier with regard to voting apply here.

Now, and there's some cautions about using polls in there. Notice the paragraph at the bottom of the screen right now where it says, "Consensus

calls should always involve the entire working group.” Please note that. And there are procedures about that, how to go about if somebody objects to a decision that was made and so forth. And we’re not going to read all that. You may want to read it if you’re not familiar with it.

Going to Step 3 then, scrolling down a little bit. I guess I should do that, huh? I’m looking at my screen thinking everybody’s looking at the same screen and that’s not the case. So Step 3 is just an appeal step and so forth. And then there are a couple notes that are important.

Now any question – well it’s probably not very fruitful to even ask for questions on the charter right now. Let’s go back to the document that was up previously. I want everybody to just be familiar with this. You can look at the charter directly yourself. But let’s go back to a document that the leadership team wants to make some suggestions here. And we’d like, in our next half hour, to see how far we can get in terms of an agreement, in terms of an approach.

So follow with me as we go through this. So we did a very quick review of the charter, Section 4. Our suggestion, as leadership team, is that we plan on producing at least two initial reports for Phase 1. Now for those that aren’t familiar with the GNSO PDP procedures, normally there’s one initial report at the end. Just in Phase 1 we think it’d be helpful to do two initial reports. And after initial report is published, there’s a public comment period. And then the working group finalizes the – produces a final report.

So what we’re suggesting, as you can see in 1a(i) there, after initial deliberation on the first five charter questions, that’s work plan steps 12a, 12b, and 12c, and the general requirements, work plan 12d, and the fundamental questions, which was in that presentation that we had some discussion on, that’s step 12e, then we would – that would be the first initial report is what we’re suggesting.

So after we've deliberated on the first – all the possible requirements for the first five questions, and the fundamental question and the general requirements, we would produce an initial report and this will entail some changes to the work plan, adding a step 12f and I thought this morning early that probably another one too we'll have to do, not only have that – add a public comment period in there as well.

And then a second initial report, when we finish all of Phase 1. And so let me pause now – let me pause there, just at that. Now don't worry about how we're going to reach consensus yet. Let's make sure we're on the same page with regard to Step 1a. Are there any objections to going with two initial reports, that would mean two public comment periods in Phase 1, and then in each case we'd come back with a report after the initial report.

Any objections or questions about that? That will be somewhat variation in terms of the fact there's usually one on initial report, but I think it's going to be really important that there be public comment at least twice. And of course there will always be opportunities. We'll have – people can give input through those of you who are representing groups throughout.

Okay going then to Step 1b, we're suggesting, as leaders, that we forgo formally determining consensus on individual possible requirements using that charter method that we reviewed, until after public comment is received and analyzed on the first initial report. So in the interim, we would try to – and I'm on B(i) there. In the interim we'd try to reach rough consensus on possible requirements and communicate that in the first initial report. In cases where that is not possible we'd describe the level of agreement and/or disagreement in the first initial report sufficiently enough to allow for public input to help guide the consensus process.

And then some ways that that description could happen or given – we could say this requirement was supported by all, it was supported by most, it was

supported by many but also objected to by many, things like that so those aren't in concrete but you get the idea, I hope.

And then C, analyze and respond to public comments using the public comment tool and any other methods we want to use. But the public comment tool is one that's been used in the GNSO. And then, D, taking into consideration the public comment, then we would formally determine consensus on the possible requirements for the first five questions contained in Charter Section 4.

Okay, I went over that fairly quickly but I think thoroughly too. Does that make sense? Does it not make sense? Are there questions about that? Is this an approach that the working group can support? Would you modify it in any way? I threw a whole bunch of questions in there. And Ayden, don't worry about – those were just examples supported by most. We can decide when we get to that point what we want to say. But thanks for asking that.

Kathy, go ahead.

Kathy Kleiman: Great. Thanks, Chuck. Kathy Kleiman. Yes, I think we may be asking too much. I would recommend we focus on the big three, user purposes, privacy, data elements. Because I can't even imagine asking people to talk about gated access before they know what elements are in there because gated access is all about what you're trying to guard.

And until you know what you're trying to guard, you don't know who you want to let in, you don't know under what circumstances. So I think we're asking impossible questions. And I would – as we have focused I would have us urge the public to focus because otherwise I think we're giving them too much to do. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Kathy. Great input. And I'm going to probe a little bit further so hang in there with me please, and feel free to just respond when I ask you

questions. This is Chuck speaking, okay. The – okay so now the work plan already has us doing 1, 2, 3 before we do 4 and 5, okay. But are you suggesting that we do an initial report after the first three and get public comment on that before going to 4 and 5? Keeping in mind that the work plan already has us doing the first three before doing the fourth and fifth one. So let me let you respond.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay, Chuck, I assume that's a question to me and everyone.

Chuck Gomes: It is.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay great. Could you remind us what the fourth and fifth elements are just because we don't have it in front of us.

Chuck Gomes: That's the gated access and accuracy.

Kathy Kleiman: And accuracy. I would. I would have us go forward with a public comment so that we can have – on the first three so that we can gather around what is – who are users, for what purposes do we want this data, what are the privacy frameworks and laws we believe are involved here for the Registries and Registrars and ICANN? And then what are the data elements that we're converging on. Yes, I think 4 and 5, I think accuracy and gated access rely on the information of – the information – the input from those three. So, yes, I guess I am recommending that we start with the big three because otherwise it's just too many variables, too many possibilities.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, and I have no opposition at all to what you're suggesting. I just going to try to get us to nail it down in terms of specifics. So if the working group, and I'm going to poll – I'm going to ask for comments, pro and con, in just a minute, but so this to me would mean then we would have at least three initial reports and comment periods in Phase 1, okay, we could change that later. Keep in mind our work plan is live, okay, it's dynamic. Okay.

So we could easily change this to do that so there would be – we'd cover the first three in that kind of rough consensus thing. We would do an initial report, Number 1, and public comment period, and then we would do a final report on those first three. And then we would, after that, do Questions 4 and 5 and then at that point after another initial report, so it would involve three initial reports, three public comment periods.

I don't think that's unreasonable considering how much work we're going to put into all of this in the coming months. So let me ask those of you who are in Adobe if you could just check the green checkmark if you agree with that approach. Okay, we've got several that clearly agree.

Is there anyone – and I'll pause a minute because give people a chance, okay so – and I'm not counting, okay, I'm just looking for a sense of the room. This is not a vote. Okay. The – so okay you can clear you agrees. Okay. If everybody'd do that please.

Now if you disagree or may – if you really disagree with the approach, and I'm going to give some other options in a minute so I know it's not clear cut, agree and disagree, but if you just totally disagree with this approach, would you put up a disagree mark in Adobe? And those of you that aren't in Adobe if you want to just speak out your agreement or disagreement, feel free. But do the red X if you disagree. Let's see if we have anybody that disagrees with the direction that Kathy is suggesting. Okay. I'm not seeing anybody that totally disagrees. And pausing a little bit. I see a hand went up there. Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. And this is Lisa Phifer for the record. I'd just like to I guess call the group's attention to the original request for the PDP from the Board which did ask the group to look at both accuracy and access as part of the – as part of this PDP. So of course, you know, we have to get to it whether we get to it in the first round or not.

But one of the things I wanted to point out is that the process framework actually put accuracy – excuse me – gated access in between identifying users and purposes and looking at data elements precisely because we thought it was important to decide whether all data would remain public before trying to go any further down the data elements line. So that was the importance of having at least the high level recommendation on access be made as part of, you know, the early parts of the discussion.

Now this group might feel that it's not necessary to answer that question before they get to data elements but I just wanted to share what the process framework thinking was on that.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Lisa. This is Chuck again. Does that sway anyone's view on this? And let me ask you a question, Lisa, because you were involved in all of this and all the history with it or most of the history with it, at least with regard to leading up to this working group. Do you think the way that we're looking at it right now would really prevent us from considering the data accuracy and so forth even while we're considering the first three? It seems to me we could still consider those issues without formally doing it like we would in a – after the first initial report. What's your thinking on that?

Lisa Phifer: One of the things that process framework suggested that all of the questions be considered at once as opposed to trying to take them piecemeal was that everyone has a different way of looking at this problem. And some people feel that they can't answer, you know, certain questions unless they look at other questions as well and sort of make a judgment based on the whole package, you know, how are we leaning on privacy, how are leaning on data elements, how are we leaning on users and purposes and also, you know, how are we leaning on whether everything is still public.

So to answer your question, Chuck, I don't think it prevents the group from doing that if you limit your first report to just the three questions that were suggested. But I do think that it will be important for some people to feel that

they have answers to the – or, you know, at least a feel of how the group is leaning on the other questions before they can, you know, really weigh in on those three.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thanks. So what we will do on this, unless there are objections to this approach, is after this meeting, and we're going to go through the rest of this document that's on the screen, after this meeting we'll send out a revised version of this and ask for feedback on that. And our goal will be next week in our working group call to try and finalize this approach. And every time I use the word finalize I kind of cringe myself because nothing is going to be in concrete until we finish all our work. So when I say finalize at this stage of the process.

So let's go on then because we've only got about 15 more minutes, I want to get through all of this and get some initial feedback. And then keeping in mind that we're going to want to try and finalize – this will be – we're going to try and finish Step 11 at this stage of the game in our working group call next week if that's possible. And that's what this whole document is about.

So let's look at Item 2 then on this document. Thanks for all the feedback on Item 1. Here is what the – this document suggests that we take the following steps to refine the possible requirements list for all 11 charter questions. Now our thinking is this, we've got 110 page document, or something, of possible requirements. And I'm sorry I got on the wrong screen on the chat. So I haven't been watching that.

But the – we think it'd be really helpful – and Greg Aaron in fact made some good suggestions. So what we suggest before we actually get into deliberating on individual requirements is that we triage the list of possible requirements to ensure that they are in the correct phase and modify the list accordingly so that applicable – and in cases where we think things that are now listed as possible requirements that really are elements of Phase 2

policy or Phase 3, implementation, that we put placeholders for those in those other phases.

Now this is what Greg Aaron commented on a few weeks ago and suggested. And so the – and so we would, first of all, refine the list so that we move those that are really Phase 2 and Phase 3 items into placeholders for future work, okay, in the other phases.

Now, there's several ways we could do that. As you can see in Item 2a(2) there, we could have staff and/or the leadership take a first crack at that, and then get review and approval and input by the working group. So would – I mean, does the – what we need to decide is, is that okay. I think if we try to do that in working group meetings it would take us several weeks just to get through it. And I'm not sure that's the best use of our time. I think the best use of our time in the future is going to be deliberating.

So but is there any – anybody bothered by the fact of having staff, for example, take a first cut at that and then present it to the full working group to refine and modify? Anybody object to that approach? Is there anybody that objects to doing the triage of the list as proposed by Greg? Okay.

All right, let's go to Step B then. And the next step would be then to identify similarities and interdependencies of possible requirements and group them according to their similarities and order them so that any prerequisite steps are covered before dependent ones. Now this is a pretty big step. That's not going to be an easy task.

But this will help us order the – group them, first of all, by similarities, and then within groups prioritize them and prioritize groups as well. Now, we could, again, have staff and/or the leadership team take a first crack at that and grouping them and so forth. And – or we could try and do that as a full working group. Is there a preference in that regard? Do you want staff to take

a first crack at it and then that will speed us along and help us have the discussion together.

And let me look. Okay, confusing because I – I need to catch up on the chat, sorry. I'm trying to do that. Go ahead, Lisa, go ahead and talk while I catch up on the chat.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. This is Lisa Phifer for the record. And maybe this will help with catching up in the chat. I think there might be a little confusion about the process that's being suggested here. So first of all I think both of the items that Chuck is talking about would occur before the group moves on to deliberation, which of course deliberation must happen before the first initial report.

And the two things are triaging to figure out what are possible requirements fall into Phases 1, 2 and 3 and what their interdependencies might be. And then the other thing is grouping similar requirements together. Now note that I say similar, there actually aren't very many duplicates, true duplicates on the list. There are a number of requirements that are tightly related and probably should be grouped together. But, you know, I would hesitate to, at this very early stage, try to condense requirements that look similar that might have some, you know, small differences that are important nuances.

So what's being suggested here is that we do that grouping so the working group could look at everything that's, you know, and maybe in a more organized fashion. And then also divide things into Phase 1, 2 and 3. Now the document that Chuck has up suggests doing the triage with Phases 1, 2 and 3 first, only because that gives us fewer things to group, to be honest.

But both of those things I think are personally I think will be helpful to help the – this working group then focus in on what probably falls in Phase 1 and then be able to see the possible requirements that are at least similar to each

other or tightly related through dependencies. That wouldn't remove anything from the list, it would just organize it.

Chuck Gomes: And thanks, Lisa. I think you're using the word "phase" in a different sense than the Phases 1, 2, 3 of the working group. Am I correct on that?

Lisa Phifer: No. I actually – I'm using the word "phase" unless I mistakenly used it someplace else, Phases 1, 2, and 3 are part of the triage approach.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay, all right, that's okay there.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: All right so Chuck speaking again. Steve, hopefully that answers your question. So what's being proposed here is that before we start deliberation on any of the requirements, we do the triage so that we simplify our list, we – it should narrow it down some. And then we're suggesting that we try and look for similarities and dependencies again, before we start deliberation. And in other words, what we're suggesting is refine the list, and there's a couple steps leading to that.

The triage, and then the getting similarities and then ordering like that. And then we start our deliberation. Now it's going to take a little while to do that, not as long as the deliberation but – not even close – but that's what's being suggested here. So the triage and the grouping and prioritization would happen before we start deliberating on the first five requirements so it would be before the first initial report.

The first initial report wouldn't be published until we've deliberated on the first five – well depending – the first three questions if we follow Kathy's suggestion. Okay? Did – Steve, let me know if that didn't answer your question. Or if anybody else is unclear on what's being suggested. Thanks, Steve. Appreciate that.

Okay, I'm just waiting for the typing there. So okay. All right, I hope that answered the question. Let's quickly go to Step 3 because I at least want to get through the document. This is going to be a tough one; decide where to start deliberation. In our leadership call yesterday we talked about a couple ways. You know, we had some pretty intense disagreement in terms of what we need to start with. And there's even been a comment or two in the chat today that talk about what we need to do first.

So once we get to deliberation, we've done the triage, we've grouped them, we've ordered them, and show the – by dependencies and so forth, we're ready to start work on the – let's assume Kathy's approach, and we start deliberating on the first three areas, where do we start?

Well, one way to – we've talked about doing that iteratively, not just starting with privacy or not necessarily starting with purpose or not necessarily starting with any particular one but going back and forth as we need to. Step 3 then, and the way the work plan is designed right now is purpose, privacy and data elements are kind of grouped together in our deliberation. But at some point we need to decide what requirement are we going to start deliberating on.

So using the results of Step 2 above, you can see this on 3a(i), we could randomly order the three questions, purpose, privacy, data elements, and start with whichever one comes back and we could rotate that order each time we go to a new question. That's kind of just a random way of approaching it.

Item 2 there then, suggests a different approach because some of the discussion, at least from my viewpoint, has kind of indicated that this whole idea of purpose may – or at least may be pretty fundamental and maybe we should start there or at least in part of the purpose questions before we start going back and forth between privacy and data elements.

And another approach, a third approach, would be to approach all three areas by using use cases and dealing with it that way instead of focusing first on the requirements themselves. So let me be quiet now and entertain discussion. We just have a little bit of time but let's get some quick comments from people and we'll have more time to discuss this on the list and in our meeting next week. Kathy, go ahead.

Kathy Kleiman: Hi, Chuck. Kathy Kleiman. And I think – I think in some ways we have to start with privacy even if we just touch on it and come back. There are definitions of purpose that come out of privacy laws. And so if you just, you know, throw out the term purpose, it means one thing. If you look at it as a term of law or some people have called it a term of art, it means something else. And so I think we'll want to have all of that on the board as we're looking at purposes because then users are also defined under privacy law.

But purpose is the key one but I think we need to extract some definitions so that we can look at the range of purposes because some of them, indeed, are bound by law and requirements. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Kathy. Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. I think as I see it, you know, we're looking, you know, not at legal questions, at least not first, but we're looking at factual questions. Then we can – once we establish the facts we can apply the law to the facts, which is kind of what typically happens. I think trying to, you know, determine it as a legal question first is not the way to focus on it.

You know, we can talk about users and purposes and then, you know, if some of those purposes or users trigger various, you know, legal issues that's part of kind of a synthesis and second level of analysis. So I think it's premature to refer to legal requirements regarding users and purposes before we determine, you know, what users and what purposes we're talking about

as a universe or a pair of universes. So let's kind of take it one step at a time.
Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: So, Greg, if I – this is Chuck. If I understand you correctly, you're suggesting we should start with users and purposes, is that what I heard?

Greg Shatan: I think in terms of starting with users and purposes not, you know, try to look at them in tandem with legal requirements that may be triggered by certain users or certain purposes under certain privacy regimes under laws of certain jurisdictions. At that point you're just kind of getting yourself all tied up in a knot.

So I think wherever we start my point is that when we look at users and purposes we should, as we have been so far, continue to look at the potential universe of users and the potential universe of purposes and then worry about what – once we have those lists, you know, where privacy requirements might be applied to those. But again, let's start by – this is a factual collection exercise first. And a factual analysis. And a number of the analysis, you know, one of the analysis points is privacy law and there are a number of others including a number of other legal points that are not privacy points.

Chuck Gomes: So real quick question, Greg, what do you determine to be factual?

Greg Shatan: Well I'm thinking that a fact like that a potential user type is X, or that a potential requirement is Y. That's what I'm referring to. It's kind of, you know, a bit of, you know, lawyers talk about taking – first you look at the facts, you look at the law, you apply the law to the facts. That's kind of a, you know, simplistic way of – or simple way of looking at kind of a process of analysis. But, you know, looking at the law and the facts simultaneously gets you all jumbled up. So, you know, facts may not be quite the right thing, but I think in a sense it is factual. You know, what users there are and what requirements and purposes they may have. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thanks, Greg. We're out of time but Kathy, let me give you just a real brief moment and then we'll talk about next steps.

Kathy Kleiman: Since we are out of time and we've been on for 90 minutes I'd be happy to continue and make my comments in the next call.

Chuck Gomes: Okay or online, even better so that leading up to the next call we've had some good discussion on this. And that's what I'm going to suggest...

Kathy Kleiman: Okay but let me just say in one sentence that PII, personally identifiable information, normally I would agree with Greg completely but personally identifiable information is a completely different story. And so the law is absolutely critical in the analysis, and again for drawing the definitions of purpose. So I'll do the rest online. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So here's what's going to happen, we're going to revise this document. There won't be much change in Number 3 because we didn't get to discuss that thoroughly. But we'll – if there are no objections we'll modify the Steps 1 and 2 to correspond, especially Step 1 I guess, to correspond to the suggestions by Kathy and get continuing discussion on that.

Please communicate your thoughts on this third item on the list in the coming days so that when we get into our meeting next week we can hopefully start finding a way to get started in our deliberation once we're ready for that. Any questions – anything else we need to cover? I think I already mentioned our meeting next week is at the alternate time, of course messages will go out on that. And Holly, you can cheer again, and anybody else that has these terrible times most of the time.

Okay, anything I missed? Okay, that said, thanks everybody, we actually accomplished quite a bit, I think, and getting closer to next steps leading up to deliberations. So have a good rest of the week. Again, try to participate in the

discussion on this approach between now and then so that we have some good debate online that'll hopefully make it easier for us to zero in next week.

And for Greg and Kathy in terms of the specific suggestions, that starting point that you made, if you can put that in some – in some – in some text that on the list that hopefully people can respond to easily that would be great. Thank you very much and we'll talk with you on the 22nd for most people, some of us it'll still be the 21st, that will be the case for me, late at night – late night – and so we will talk again then and on the list in the meantime.

So we can adjourn the meeting now and end the call.

((Crosstalk))

END