

**ICANN
Transcription
Next-Gen RDS PDP Working group call
Wednesday, 21 September 2016 at 05:00 UTC.**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-nextgen-rds-21sep16-en.mp3>

Attendance wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/XQK4Aw>

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

Coordinator: The recording has started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you so much (Jason). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the Next Generation RDS PDP Working Group Meeting on Wednesday, 21st of September 2016.

In the interest of time today there will be no roll call as there are quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room only. So please remember to sign in with your first and last name.

If you are on the audio bridge could you please let yourself be known now.

Beth Allegretti: This is Beth Allegretti. I am on the audio bridge. Hoping to be on Adobe at some point.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you so much Beth. Anyone else?

(Lawrence): Yes this is (Lawrence) (unintelligible). I am on the auto bridge only.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. It was noted also. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And also please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

With this I will turn the call back to Chuck. Thank you Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much Nathalie. This is Chuck speaking. Welcome everyone to our call today. Does anyone have a statement of interest update?

Okay it doesn't sound like there are any so we will go on to what is our main agenda item today. Yesterday Lisa distributed a draft RDS statement of purpose, Version 4.1 for the working group to comment on.

And that is our main purpose tonight although we will as Agenda Item 3 allow time at the end to make sure we start Agenda Item 3 which will be a beginning discussion of the triage possible requirements list that was distributed a week ago or so.

We are clearly not going to get through that today. We probably won't even finish our statement of purpose but that is what we will spend most of our time on the statement of purpose.

So the draft statement of purpose is in front of you in Adobe. For those that are not in Adobe hopefully you have it in front of you since it was distributed to the list yesterday.

Note that the draft in front of you is indeed a draft as agreed in the call last week. The leadership team tried to take into consideration all the contributions that were made last week on our list and draft this statement of purpose.

It doesn't include absolutely everything that was contributed but there were reasons for that and we are happy to discuss those if you think something critical is missing.

Now my plan on this although I am open to suggestions to do it differently. So please raise your hand or speak up if you would like to see us do it a different way.

Is to go through this draft fairly deliberately paragraph by paragraph or item by item and welcome questions, comments, suggested edits. And edits can include deletions, additions and we will discuss those.

Now as those of you in Adobe at least can see we only have about 18 people plus staff members on the call. So we will certainly not try to finalize this. But hopefully we can come up with some edits that we will redline and put out to the full group on the list and continue working on it in our call next week.

So does anybody oppose to going through this in detail paragraph by paragraph, item by item?

Okay so let's take a look at the first paragraph. For the sake of the two people that are in – excuse me on audio only. I will read the statement or the paragraphs or the item before we discuss them. Just in case they do not have it in front of them.

So the statement starts off, the statement is intended to define the purpose or purposes of a registration data and registration directory service for generic TLD domain names.

This statement is grouped into two categories. Number one, overall goals for the statement of purpose and Number two, specific purposes. To ensure that the purposes are understood in the appropriate context a list of prerequisite conditions of purposes is also provided.

So this paragraph basically just introduces the draft statement of purpose and talks about its organization. Now if somebody doesn't like the way it is organized please speak up.

Anything is in scope for our discussion today. So are there any comments or questions, suggestions, edits in the first paragraph?

Go ahead Jim.

Jim Galvin: Just a question. This is Jim Galvin for the transcript. To make sure I understand the overarching statement that is going on here.

But based on the discussion and the meeting notes I would say that we (unintelligible) about access from collection which I think is the distinction that is being referred to here by these two things by the two categories of purpose.

But is this also intended then to say that we are stating up front and presupposing that access is to be granted to the data? You know I mean a lot of what the expert working group had done was to talk about existing uses of registration data.

So I just want to make sure that I understand the intent here is that we are definitely going to allow access to data. And so a good part of our discussion will be about what access is to be permitted as opposed to we are taking off the table the idea that it might be possible to not have any access to the data at all. Would that be correct?

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Jim. It is a really critical question you are asking. And my answer is no. You should not assume that. And I have a follow up. Do you think something or let me rephrase that. By the way this is Chuck speaking.

Do you think we should make a change to it? What in that paragraph implies that to you? So that we can maybe fix that if that is the case.

Jim Galvin: So I think to simply state outright that there are two categories of purposes we are drawing a very clear distinction between a data service and a directory service. And we are also stating that there are specific purposes for a directory service that will be included.

So that is where I am drawing the conclusion from. I accept from you the comment that nothing is absolute in this. So if that is my interpretation I don't – you are just simply telling me that my interpretation does not have to be accepted at the moment.

I don't have a specific change to recommend to you but knowing that there is still discussion to be had about specific purposes I am comfortable with this for right now.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Jim. This is Chuck again. And let me say first of all, I think – I get the impression you are jumping a little bit to the next paragraph but we will hold that for now because we will cover that.

But notice it doesn't say that – the two categories aren't both purposes. The first category is overall goals for this statement of purpose. So it is not intended to include purposes.

The second category is a category of specific purposes and of course we will go through those item by item. Does that make sense Jim?

Jim Galvin: For now yes thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. We can come back as you know absolutely. We may find after we go through this whole statement that we want to come back and even group it differently, organize it differently or change the words we use.

So if there are no other comments we will move onto the second paragraph. Any other comments or questions?

Okay thanks Jim. Again like I said that is a very critical question you asked and I hope everybody understands that including those who will listen to the recording or look at the transcript later.

So the second paragraph then says, note that it is important to make a distinction between the purposes of individual registration data elements versus the purpose or purposes of RDS, i.e. the system that collects, maintains and provides access to those data elements and services related to them.

This purpose statement is intended to focus on the purposes of the RDS as a whole although some overlap may be avoidable.

And this paragraph and others on the leadership team feel free to jump in if you have comments on this. But really it was to make clear what we are stating the purpose for here because as you recall in our call last week, some of our discussions got into specific purposes for specific data elements.

And certainly those are things that we will cover in our deliberations when we look at possible requirements. But the statement of purpose as written right here is designed to be for the RDS as a whole if there is an RDS.

Alex please jump in.

(Alex Deacon): Yes hi Chuck this is (Alex Deacon). Can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: I can.

(Alex Deacon): Great. I guess I just want to point out what I think is an inconsistency. If you look at the first paragraph which I know you went through. It says, this statement is intended to define the purposes of registration data and the RDS.

Then in the second paragraph it says, the purpose statement is intended to focus on the purposes of the RDS as a whole. So it is both of those concepts, registration data and RDS? Or is it just RDS?

I guess I am confused or maybe not quite understanding it at this late time what the focus of this purpose statement is.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. And let me say I fully appreciate the late time because I am on the East Coast tonight. So I get that. It is a good question. And I am going to ask Elise to jump in on this too because I think the way that is worded was a result of an edit that she suggested.

And I see your point. Note though that it says, I don't think it is specifically saying purposes of registration data. I think registration data and a registration directory service kind of go together but that could be confusing.

But let me ask Elise to jump in and see if she can clarify her thinking in terms of the exact wording in the first sentence.

Elise Lindeberg: Thanks Chuck this is Elise Lindeberg for the record. I do recall actually modifying the paragraph somewhat but I am not sure that it came from me originally.

The way I read it though was that it was trying to point out that there might be very specific purposes for each individual data element. But that the purpose statement was trying to address both registration data as in its entirety as well as the RDS, the system that collects, maintains and provides access to registration data in its entirety.

So I agree that the way that the paragraph is worded is perhaps a bit confusing. It doesn't really get to that point. But I think that was the goal.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Elise and sorry for blaming you for that if that wasn't you. But the – this is Chuck speaking. So would anybody see a problem with deleting in that first sentence a registration data?

In other words, say this statement is intended to define the purpose or purposes of a registration directory service for generic TLD domain names. I assume Alex that that would address your concern. So I would appreciate it if you confirm that that would take care of that inconsistency?

(Alex Deacon): Yes Chuck this is Alex. It would address my concern and clarify things I believe.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Alex. Chuck again. So anybody object to that? And one of the outputs from this call will be a redline version of the changes that we agreed to on this call for full working group consideration. So let me turn to Elise since she has her hand up.

Elise Lindeberg: Thanks Chuck. As I am taking notes and I unfortunately missed the proposal that you just made. Could you repeat it please?

Chuck Gomes: Sure. Just delete the – in the first sentence delete a registration data. In other words, it is going to read like this. This statement is intended to define the purpose or purposes of a registration directory service (unintelligible) TLD domain names. You get that?

Elise Lindeberg: Thanks Chuck. This is Elise Lindeberg. Yes I got that. I would point out though that that change then also would trickle down to the way that the specific purposes are defined.

When you get there you will want to step back and look at that again. Because point one defines a purpose for data. And then point two defines a purpose for the RDS.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So let's keep that in mind when we move forward. And like we said earlier in the conversation with Jim. We may come back to all of these as we move through this and fix that. Again this is Chuck speaking. Jim it is your turn.

Jim Galvin: Thank you. Jim Galvin for the transcript. Another question. I am struck by the phrase, and services related to them. And I am wondering if we could expand a bit on what that refers to?

The sentence makes sense to me up through and provides access to those data elements. But I am not sure what we are trying to incorporate or add when we use the phrase, and services related to them.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jim. Chuck again. I notice we are in the first sentence of the second paragraph here. Let me focus on that. Anybody while I am doing that myself – anybody else have a comment? I see some plus ones in the chat or I don't know if that was to repeat the proposal or to Jim's suggestion.

So I guess obviously one of them is to (Alex') comment and not to this. So I assume the other one was too. So let's look at that.

And provide access to those data elements and services related to them. Jim would you explain again the concern you have with that?

Jim Galvin: Well Elise gave some examples in the chat room. She talks specifically about who was or for example, in our who is kind of service.

I think for me, you know, I would prefer that we not have this phrase, and services related to them. I am thinking that those things like who was or who is are over and above and beyond the basic purpose, the basic system that we are intending to have here.

Not that I have an issue with the who was service but I want to be careful that we are not adding to things which are – I am going to jump ahead here a little bit.

I mean we are starting as we look down below, you know, with this lifecycle of a domain name and the management of that registration. Well it is not clear to me that these extra services that are certainly related but they are over and above and beyond sort of the basic service which is within our remit.

Well let me say that differently. Within ICANN's remit or within the remit of a lifecycle of a domain name and its management.

Just concerned about opening a door too broadly that isn't part of the core or basic set of things that we should be concerned about. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jim and I am going to pursue this a little bit further with you. This is Chuck again.

So let me ask you this question. So if we were to decide in our deliberations that certain services were included then it would – am I correct that we would want to provide access to those services otherwise we wouldn't offer those services or propose that those services be offered.

And before I ask you to respond Jim. One way to deal with it would be, and provides access to those elements and services related to them if any.

And I don't know if that addresses your concern or and then I will go back to my first question is if the working group made a recommendation that there are certain services associated with the data elements.

Am I correct in assuming that we would need to provide access to those services otherwise they wouldn't be there. So go ahead Jim.

Jim Galvin: So thank you Chuck. I like that suggestion of adding if any. I also want to go into the chat room here and I see what Alex is writing about. Maybe put that phrase in square brackets as just an indicator to ourselves to come back and revisit it after we have gone through some of the more specific purposes.

And I would like to suggest that at least for the short term here we do both. What you are suggesting Chuck and what Alex is suggesting. And as a related but separate comment here.

(Andrew) is making the comment about are who is being core in the (FIN) registry. But just so that we are clear here. We are talking only about (FIC) registries here right? Would that be correct also?

Chuck Gomes: As far as I know, yes. This is Chuck. There is a consensus policy that has been approved that all registries would be (FIC). So assuming there is no change in approved consensus policy and I am not suggesting there would be. That would be correct.

I am just looking at the chats here.

Jim Galvin: Anyway just going back to – combining your comment and Alex I think would be fine for now as we continue through the rest of this purpose statement.

Chuck Gomes: And this is Chuck. Thanks Jim. Is there anybody that objects to that? So what we would do is at the very end of that sentence we would have a comma and then add if any.

And we would put in brackets and provides access to those data elements. Excuse me we would put in brackets, and services related to them.

So let me since I misstated that at first. So what would be in brackets is, and services related to them I believe. I am not seeing any objections. Let me check the chat.

And Michele I am not sure we are assuming that they are treated the same. I don't think that we should assume that. So I am curious why you think we are making that assumption. And again if there is some language in the draft statement that implies that assumption maybe we should fix it.

Oh you want the – and Jim you want the if any – that is right. The if any would go in the brackets. That is a good point because it wouldn't apply if we didn't do that. Good point Jim thank you. I see that in the chat.

Okay I am trying – I am looking at your question Holly. Why is the registration data collected by registrars under the RAA not covered? Or have we missed something? Well my first and I welcome other responses for that and Michele I will come to you in just a second.

Why is – so first of all, keep in mind that our recommendations in this working group could end up being consensus policies which could change the RAA. In the sense that registrars and then it would also affect registries would be required to follow any new policies.

So we can't necessarily judge our work by the current RAA. Registry and registrar requirements may change if and when we recommend consensus

policy that is ultimately approved by a GNSO council and finally the ICANN board.

Holly let me – while you are thinking about that I would like you to make sure that my response made sense. But let's go to Michele because he may have something to add here.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Chuck, Michele for the record. I think this thing about the (FIC) versus (FIN) we shouldn't really get into that. I mean in the context of discussing a policy around this RDS we are ignoring and not looking at (FIC), (FIN) and all that.

Ultimately I believe RDS will replace all of that when it comes to the registration data directory. So I would tend towards avoiding any discussions around (FIC) versus (FIN) because ultimately a domain is a domain and the registration data for us should be the same no matter what type of registry is running its part of the service. That's all thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Michele and I think that is right. And at the same time. This is Chuck speaking again. I don't want to scare people that we are one of the things that may come out of this are issues like that that people are counting on. But I think you are right in terms of that.

Holly go ahead.

Holly Raiche: Thank you Holly Raiche for the transcript records. I think what I am hearing from both you and Michele is we are talking about data not necessarily who collects it. But it is about what is collected, who is accessing the data.

And if we are talking about the data independent of whether it is registry or registrar I am assuming that what this working group comes up with based on what you said is this will cover what is collected by the registries and therefore by the registrars.

In other words, are we doing that kind of higher level look at the data or are we confining this to discussions about registries and missing something that the registrars do under the RAA or as part of their relationship with ICANN?
Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Holly. Chuck again and I welcome other comments. In fact what I will do is let Michele jump in first and then I will follow up.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Chuck. Michele again for the record. Holly I can understand why you are asking the question. I think in some respects you are probably framing it correctly. I mean ultimately – take for example a domain expiry.

The definitive answer to the question about when a domain name expires can depend on who you ask. Whether you are asking the registrar or the registry. But something like say the name servers of a domain name, the registrar might collect that data from the registrant or somebody else. But that data ends up in the registry level.

Now we know that. You know that. But I means as far as an average person is concerned, they just want the damn thing to work. So I mean all we actually care about is what are the main servers of the domain whether that data is coming from one place or the other. As long as the correct answer, why would it matter?

Holly Raiche: Okay.

Michele Neylon: And the thing is - I mean just the other thing...

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Michele Neylon: ...as well as - be wary of getting into too deeply into which data a registry has or which data a registrar has because as we've said repeatedly, as a registrar

I was - I would have access to a whole load of data about my registrants and about their domain names. That is way outside anything that I would ever give to anybody unless they produce court orders or something else.

I mean there's a, you know, there's a ton of data that we would have. Same way registries would have access to a ton of very sensitive data about things. But they're not going to give it to somebody else.

So, you know, the thing you have to be careful is, you know, are we - we're talking about data that is required for things to function that may be requirements under various contracts.

But don't - but you wouldn't want to end up in a situation where data that currently is not being pushed anywhere outside of the silos where it's meant to be rather than getting pushed somewhere else if that kind of makes sense. Sorry. It's early in the morning...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Half asleep.

Holly Raiche: Not for me.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Michele. I want to follow up with that Holly too -- this is Chuck -- and point out like we talked very early in our working group discussions there are -- and it's in our charter, et cetera -- there are other efforts going on that impact registration data and registration directory service RDAP, the work going on with RDAP, the thick Whois implementation and so forth.

So while we're doing this work, there may be things happen - that happen and are approved that will change some of the things we know today. They may stay the same. But we shouldn't assume that they necessarily will because there are efforts happening in parallel to ours that in some cases it's

quite likely that they will complete their work before we do and it may impact this.

So thanks for the comments in the chat as well Holly in that regard. And (Maxim), I don't think we can assume that anything's going to be the same as we know it today.

If we were going to finish our work in the next few months, that might be a safe assumption but that's not going to be the case. And so I definitely don't think we should assume this (in the) - that privacy and proxy services work the same way like now. They may.

But again, I think we have to be careful about making any assumptions in a period of several years that will probably take this forward (a group) especially when you consider all phases. A lot of things can happen.

And we need to do our work in such a way that first of all we're responsive to other things that - other decisions or recommendations or policies that are approved. But at the same time recognize that it is a moving target in that regard. Okay. Any other...

Holly Raiche: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Holly. Appreciate that. So any other questions, comments, edits about the second paragraph or we can just lump the first two paragraphs together? Note that Lisa is putting those in the -- Lisa or Marika, I'm not sure who's doing it -- is putting them in the notes over on the right in Adobe.

That notes your comment Jim. And (Maxim)'s agreement with that. Okay. Chuck still speaking. So let's go to the overall goals of this Statement of Purpose.

So as I think I pointed out at the beginning, this particular section is not intended to state purposes of an RDS but rather to state the goals for this particular Statement of Purpose. Okay. So please understand that.

I'm looking (Fabricio) at your comments so bear with me a second. And Andrew's comment as well. I don't - if you want to add to what you're saying in the chat, please raise your hand or speak up. Okay.

So the first Item A in the overall goals to the Statement of Purpose is to set unambiguous boundaries for RDS policy requirements and RDS consensus policies.

Does anybody disagree with that as a goal for this Statement of Purpose or would you modify it in some way? There again, lots of good discussion in the chat. I'm not going to try and read it all because there's a lot unless I see something that really jumps out as important.

I apologize to those that aren't in Adobe. But if I was to try and reread everything in the chat, it would really slow us down, so. And again, our task is pretty significant in itself without opening other issues that have already been dealt with in other forums.

Now what happens in those other forums may impact some of what we're doing. But there's no intent to open up to do the work that's been assigned or in some cases completed by other groups.

Okay. No - okay. We have some hands. Sorry about that. I was focusing on the chat. Andrew, go ahead.

Andrew Sullivan: Hi there. It's Andrew Sullivan. I'm just going to assume that the hotel network hasn't collapsed. The point that I think we were chasing in the chat that is important because it follows from Jim's earlier question about services related

and so on, that we have a distinction that is maybe not totally clear from the text because it's created a little bit of confusion so far.

That is what we're talking about is access to data that's in the registry. And so there are two - there are two consequences of that. One of them is, you know, what data you can see given that the registry has collected it.

And then there may be a second implication, which is, you know, registries should not collect certain kinds of data. But anything that is outside of this question of data that's already, you know, in the registry under collection policies that are either implied from the work that we do or else already implied by other policies.

None of that is - none of that is potentially the scope of our work. I think that that would limit the boundary for these related services, which Jim was concerned about.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Andrew. This is Chuck again. And just one qualification to what you said. I think it's important that we would qualify what you said by saying registries and/or registrars. It's possible that any registration data would be identical in both. But it's also possible at the end game that it might not be the same in both. So that's the only qualification I'd make to what you said.

Andrew Sullivan: Yes. So I'm sorry. You know, I'm (unintelligible) and so I regard all of these repositories, which is actually what they're called in the registry.

Chuck Gomes: A registry. Yes. Okay. Got it.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Got it.

Andrew Sullivan: But in fact we call them repositories for that reason.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Andrew Sullivan: What we're talking about is access to repository data.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Good. That covers it. Thanks. Okay. So no objections to the - to Item A under overall goals for the Statement of Purpose. No edits so far. Again, all of these are going to of course come back to them. We're going to put it out to the whole list.

So let's go to B, which says a second overall goal for this Statement of Purpose is to establish minimum criteria for RDS policy requirements and RDS consensus policies. Is that a legitimate goal? Do you agree with it? Disagree with it? Would you change it in any way?

And this is Chuck still speaking. I'm pausing intentionally to allow people to think about it because I suspect since it's only been out there for 24 hours or so, maybe less, for somebody to - that you may want to reflect on it. So please excuse the pause while we allow thought and people to - thank you (Daniel) for your comment in the chat of agreement.

Okay. Certainly I'll pause longer if people need more time. But let's go to C, which is the third overall goal for the Statement of Purpose. And by the way, we can add to this list.

The Leadership Team doesn't necessarily think that we covered all the goals. But based on last week's discussion and so forth where we came up with these. Let's go to Alex before we go to C.

Alex Deacon: Actually I had a few additions so maybe we could do C and then come back to me.

Chuck Gomes: Would you prefer doing it that way?

Alex Deacon: Yes. I'm happy to do that. No...

Chuck Gomes: Okay. All right. So C then, the third one that's here, is to describe why specifically and explicitly an RDS is needed. And then it has a parenthetical there to see specific purposes below. And Alex, do you want me to hold off then on your edits before we - and allow discussion on C specifically or do you want to jump in now?

Alex Deacon: Whatever is easiest Chuck. I'm...

Chuck Gomes: I'm comfortable either way. So why don't you just go ahead and then - and we'll continue our discussion on C and all three of them in fact after your suggested edits.

Alex Deacon: Yes. So I think (Thad) put this in the chat earlier. But I was reading the transcript earlier this week in last week's call and I - the comment from Steve Metalitz was a good one and we may want to consider adding the criteria that he listed into this overall goals for the Statement of Purpose.

And just to summarize, I think the three criteria that Steve mentioned were that whatever statement we agree to must be such that it could be readily communicated to registrants. That was one.

The other one was must be sufficiently clear to establish a relationship between the purposes of the RDS and the proposed use of data. And then the last criteria he mentioned was that the RDS is going to have many purposes. There's not going to be a single purpose.

So I think it makes sense to add those criteria to this list in addition to the three that are there already. They think those - especially those - the point about a statement that could be readily communicated to registrants and the

statement that sufficiently clear to establish this relationship between the purpose and the proposed use of data are important ones.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Alex. This is Chuck. Now look down at the prerequisite conditions for each RDS purpose. And I think we need to delete D out of there. Correct me if I'm wrong. But I think that's just a minor edit that's needed in that next category, the prerequisite conditions for each RDS purpose.

But I think you'll see what Steve shared last week there - do you think that would be better placed in the overall goals for this Statement of Purpose...

Woman: (Yes).

Chuck Gomes: ...or do they fit in the prerequisite conditions?

Alex Deacon: This is Alex. I guess I had missed that. I see them now. Thanks for pointing those out. I don't know. I think my gut feeling is that they seem to be overall goals versus prerequisite conditions for each RDS purpose. But I guess I need to take a second look now that I see them and I...

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And go ahead and do that. This is Chuck.

Alex Deacon: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Another question I have for you while you're thinking about it is are - how would you - if they're overall goals for the Statement of Purpose itself, how would they be incorporated into that section on overall goals for the Statement of Purpose? Would you add them to one of the three things that's there? Would there be new items added? And how would they be worded in that way?

Alex Deacon: This is Alex. I think I would first just copy and paste them and drag them up to under C. So I would add them to A, B and - to that current three as they are. As I said, I think I need to take a second look at that. But again, I...

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead. Take some time and look at...

Alex Deacon: ...I believe - Yes. I believe they're more overall goals than they are specific to each RDS purpose. (Unintelligible)...

Chuck Gomes: So if we took five under prerequisite conditions and just modified it slightly maybe taking out the word help, so then the - an overall goal for this Statement of Purpose would be to easily communicate the purpose of the RDS to registrants and others because the registrants have to be told what the purpose is for collecting the data.

And I don't think that works. That doesn't sound like an overall goal for the Statement or Purpose. So it probably needs to be tweaked more than that. So if you can think about how to do that.

Alex Deacon: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Because that doesn't sound like an overall goal to me. It sounds like a condition or an objective for the RDS itself but maybe not a goal for the Statement of Purpose. Anybody else want to jump in and help with that? Let me watch the chat because I haven't been watching it.

And yes. Thanks Lisa for - I didn't see that earlier in the chat. She saw the same thing I did on five and six. So Lisa, is that a suggestion of - it looks like you're making a suggestion as an additional goal under the overall goals. Is that correct? Okay.

So we can - anybody object to adding I guess it would be a D depending on what we do with Alex's suggestion. We can worry about what the letters are

later. But so let me just look at - trying to keep up with the chat and - so Lisa, if you could jump in audibly, I think that would be helpful.

I know you're probably taking notes. But it says - when you say move from - what are you moving - suggesting moving from prerequisites to overall goal? Could you jump in audibly please?

Lisa Fuhr: Sure Chuck. Lisa Fuhr for the record. I understood what Alex was suggesting is that we move Points 5v and vi - move those from prerequisite conditions up into the overall goals section.

So my suggestion was to delete V, which is - it helps to easily communicate the purpose of the RDS to registrants and others. Delete that from prerequisites and then add as a Letter D under overall goals to communicate the purposes of the RDS to registrants and others.

Chuck Gomes: Without the following part because the registrants have to be told what the purpose is for collecting their data?

Lisa Fuhr: Yes. I think that's rationale for why that might be a purpose...

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Okay.

Lisa Fuhr: ...or a goal, right. But the - but it's not the goal itself.

Chuck Gomes: So before pursuing your text comments, Alex, okay. Good. Yes. I was going to ask you Alex - you answered my question. So that will work. So we'd move the first part, the main part of small Roman Numeral V there and make it D under overall goals and just delete the word helps.

So it would be to easily communicate the purpose of the RDS to registrants and others. So any objection to that move? Thanks Andrew for joining us as

long as you could. That's appreciated. I'm also in a hotel room and but my connection seems to be pretty reliable so far, so.

All right. Alex, do we need to do anything else with your suggestion there or does that cover it in terms of what you were suggesting regarding Steve's input. Go ahead.

Alex Deacon: Yes. Well this is Alex for the record. I think again I would suggest that we also move what (laying) on the screen Roman Numeral VI, V-I, to overall goals. Because I think again it's a blanket statement that applies to all purposes that we've yet to discuss.

So it, you know, I would suggest that we move Roman Numeral VI up to the overall goals section and I think it just needs to be tweaked a little bit. Helps to -- what'd I say -- to - maybe we will change it to say to establish sufficient relationship between the purposes and the uses of RDS, make those plural.

Chuck Gomes: Any objections to that move? So that would become E under the overall goals and we would delete it - Item VI - what is now Item VI - Roman Numeral VI under the prerequisite conditions. Holly, go ahead.

Holly Raiche: Is that - Holly for the transcript record. Is that something that is a goal that we have or is that a goal just for the Statement of Purpose? My understanding is we're talking about the Statement of Purpose. Is that what we're going to do or is that VI really a description of what this working group is hopefully going to do? I'm just - I'm not clear if that's a new purpose for the Statement of Purpose - our Statement of Purpose.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. It's not - thanks Holly. It doesn't totally sound to like a goal of the Statement of Purpose to me. But I could be wrong. But I think it's a good question you ask. Let's jump over to Jim; see what he has to contribute.

Jim Galvin: So thank you. Jim Galvin for the transcript. And I like Holly's question. I - the comment that I really wanted to make was I - at first I was thinking I didn't mind moving this up. But I didn't want to pluralize purpose and use, which is something that Alex suggested.

Chuck Gomes: (Yes).

Jim Galvin: I prefer that they be singular. I'm concerned about, you know, opening a door her for things, which we'd be focused - everything else has a singular Statement of Purpose. So not clear to me why we would suddenly be pluralizing those things up above.

But I think after listening to Holly's question, I'm not sure I'm inclined to move V and VI up. That's an interesting distinction about the goal of the purpose versus the goal of the existence of the purpose. So I liked your question and not sure I have an answer at the moment.

Holly Raiche: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jim. This is Chuck again. So I'm glad you spoke up in the whole idea. So we obviously have a difference of opinion with regard to whether we should move V and VI up to D and E above.

Let me first of all handle what I think is a - is an easier issue. Alex, with - wherever we leave it on VI, you disagree with Jim in terms of making purpose and use plural.

Alex Deacon: This is Alex. I guess it depends on where we fall and what decisions regarding the specific purposes of the registration data. I don't think there's going to be a single purpose there I assume. And I expect there'll be multiple purposes. So I'm trying to figure out how that's going to work when we come to that point, which clearly isn't now; which will be at some point in the future.

But again, maybe it's confusion on my part regarding the nuance difference between the goals for the Statement of Purpose and the purpose of an RDS.

Chuck Gomes: And they are two different things. So that's important.

Alex Deacon: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. Note what we did up in the first paragraph at least with regard to purpose. We put purpose with a parenthesis S following it so that we don't presume there's one purpose or we don't, you know, presume that there would be multiple purposes. So it kind of left it open. Would that work Jim for the concern you expressed if we put purpose parenthesis S and use parenthesis S? Or does that not - still - does your concern still remain? Go ahead Jim.

Jim Galvin: Yes. I'm being sensitive to not wanting to wordsmith too much here. I mean I do think that our - there's a purpose - there is our Statement of Purpose, which is singular. And the fact that there might be some specific multiple purposes on the inside, I'm, you know, open for the moment.

I suspect it's probably fine Chuck. As you've said before, none of this is permanent just yet. So there's still ample time for some discussion. And I just want to be careful about that at the moment. That's all.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jim. So let's put the parenthesis S after purpose and use in what is shown on the screen as VI. And now we need to come back to the - whether we move those up to overall goals or whether we leave them where they are or put them somewhere else.

Be very (careful) now. Certainly there are some support for Alex's suggestion in the chat. But Holly questioned it and Jim also questions whether they should be moved.

Let's - can we get some other people to share your opinions on that and see if we can resolve whether to make the move or not.

And Lisa, I think your wording there is correct for what we just decided. Thank you. I see (Cal) typing. Feel free to jump in on audio if you can as well -- anyone.

I can do a little poll if you like. I was hoping to get some more thinking on it before we decide what to do, and we may just have to leave that as an open issue -- which we can do too.

Alex, go ahead.

Alex Gakuru: Yes, thanks Chuck - it's Alex.

I guess what I was thinking is, you know, I'm not at all an expert on Privacy, but I've listened to enough conversations and, you know, soaked in a lot of what Stephanie and us have said. And it seems that, you know, this Statement of Purpose is key to various, you know, regulations/laws/directives -- whatever they're called around the world.

So I think it seems to me that we have to keep that in mind here when we are creating this Statement of Purpose. It's really going to be the foundation of everything that happens afterward.

So, you know, where these things fall, you know, deciding to put them in various sections now, I think we could leave, you know, we could debate these and talk about them. But I think we need to make sure, you know, before we finalize things, that we all have a very clear understanding about what the nuances of these sections are, what they mean, how they affect ultimately how it's going to be used when users' data is collected and eventually used in excess. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Alex; Chuck again. Let's go to Jim.

Jim Galvin: Thanks Chuck; Jim Galvin for the transcript.

So I've been waiting for an opportunity to jump back to talking about Item C in the overall goals and the reference to C specific purposes. And since Alex brought that up, I think this is a good opportunity to do that.

As I had said about up above, you know, we have this question of whether or not we're talking about access to the data and whether that's implicitly included because we do have the phrase in the second paragraph "and provides access to those data elements."

So now I can, you know, I've been thinking about this a bit more and I think now I can articulate what concerns me here.

So the way that this purpose reads, Chuck, is it suggests to me that we have already answered the question that access will be provided.

Woman: Mm-hm.

Jim Galvin: Please correct me if I'm wrong but I was expecting that, you know, during this Phase I that we're in here -- as we are focused on the requirements for the data and directory services, one of the very specific questions that we are to answer in this group is whether data should be accessible for any purpose at all -- in addition to whether there are specific purposes.

And so that's what - and overall, that's one of the things that worries me about this particular Statement of Purpose. It seems to suggest that we've answered that question because we're stating that access will be provided. And we have not yet even begun the discussion of whether that's appropriate or not.

Chuck Gomes: So Jim, let me - this is Chuck. Let me make a couple suggestions that I think might deal with your concerns.

So if we go back up to the second paragraph, what if we were to change that i.e. there in that first sentence to a system that may collect, maintain and provide access. And then in C, we could change it to -- instead of to describe why specifically and explicitly -- and RRDS may be needed.

Does that help?

Jim Galvin: So actually Chuck...

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Jim Galvin: It doesn't for me and I'll tell you why. It's because I think - what concerns me here is I like the separation between, you know, collects and then access. So you've got collects and maintains versus access. I think that distinction is actually quite useful to me, and it seems to be described that way, really, in our charter -- you know, that particularly distinction. And I like the fact that we've made that.

What's important to me is you can't access the data if you haven't collected it. So the notion that I may collect -- and yet I'm still allowing, you know, for the idea that I might provide access -- and just being the logical technologist that I am, that sort of statement doesn't make sense.

I would much prefer that we separate these two things and these two sets of issues.

There's an issue of the purpose of registration data meaning why we collect it and why it's present. And then separately, we have this question of, you know, are we to provide access to it and under what circumstances and why. And I think that those are two different things.

And so now having stepped back and listened to some of the discussion here and looked at some of the stuff that's here, I'd almost prefer that we separate this into two things, and we take all discussion of access out of this Statement of Purpose and make that a separate discussion and a separate document.
Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jim. Okay, let's listen to some others. This is Chuck. Holly, go ahead.

Holly Raiche: Thank you; Holly Raiche for the transcript.

I was going to suggest something different. The system that collects, maintains and provides or denies access to some or all of those data elements, and what that does is open up the possibility of both access and denial of access. And it also highlights the fact that some data elements may be available more widely than others.

Now I guess I can ask Jim, does that deal with your problem?

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead Jim.

Jim Galvin: I would say that for now, yes, that's helpful. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jim. Let's go to Rod before we finalize any edits here -- for now anyway. Rod, go ahead.

Rod Rasmussen: Hello, this is Rod Rasmussen.

Just - when I listen to what's going on here and thinking about the reasons we're trying to be very careful and parsing things, I tend to agree that there's kind of some primary purpose things and then there's all these other things that are related and the like. And we're trying to kind of throw things in buckets and we're all approaching from different ways.

One of the things that I think that is driving the current conversation being precise though is that we've all become aware that there's this issue around data protection law that has changed in the last 20 years -- dramatically. And that we have to be careful in forming, you know, the purposes of doing things so that it relates back to, you know, being legal for collecting, distributing, providing accesses, et cetera, et cetera under its various data protection regimes.

Is that really - my question is is that our role here? Or are we - so when I say that is at the final end of the day, whatever is actually published by ICANN itself -- the organization -- with respect or was reviewed by its legal team will be what is ever actually backing any sort of RDS -- and because that's the official capacity, right.

And I'm not sure how GNSO or other policy statements actually relate to how the final (unintelligible). So we have our kind of rationale of why we're doing this. But then there's the, okay, we're going this very carefully so we don't run a follow-up data protection law.

Do we even have to worry about that level of refinement at our level or not? And I don't know if there's any of our esteemed data protection colleges on the call that could answer that question. But I pose that as I think we may be getting into the weeds where we don't have to in order to take care of a perceived future problem. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: So this is Chuck. Thanks Rod. If there are any data protection experts or even data protection proponents on the call that want to respond to that, please raise your hand or speak up if you're not in Adobe. And that would be great.

Holly, do you want to jump in?

Holly Raiche: Look, I'm going to listen to Michele first and I think he'll probably cover it very well. He lives under the directive; I only know about it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thanks Holly. This is Chuck. Go ahead Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks; Michele for the record. Thanks Holly.

I'm trying to understand what Rod's question actually was because - I mean, Rod, are you asking do we have to be concerned with data protection concerns, or are you asking for something more specific? (Unintelligible) ramble a little; I wasn't sure what the exact question was.

Rod Rasmussen: Sorry. For me, it's a little late and for you it's early, so that's a bad combo. This is Rod Rasmussen for the record.

Chuck Gomes: Especially with you two guys.

Rod Rasmussen: We usually settle this over bears.

So no, I'm just trying to - I'm looking into this. We seem to be getting very - you know, and I agree that it was being very precise in what we're trying to define as good.

I have the feeling that one of the things that we're trying to accomplish with our Statement of Purpose here is to create what I would call the legal basis for how data protection authorities look at whatever ends up coming out of this.

And so my question is do we need to worry about that part of the language here, or is that really some legal review team needs to do that to make sure everything is kosher at the end of the process.

Does that make more sense to you?

Michele Neylon: Okay, and I think I understand what you're asking.

So first ups, doing something - if we were to spend a, you know, 24 to 36 -- whatever number -- of (unintelligible). Can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: You're breaking up Michele.

Michele Neylon: There's noise coming from somewhere. Can you hear me now? Is that better?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Michele Neylon: Okay. If we were to spend 36 plus months on this and then a review was to state that everything we had done was legal, that would be a major problem.

I think somebody has got a line that's giving a lot of noise. So I'm hearing that and it's not coming from me as far as I know.

So I mean to Rod's thing, I think what we need to be is to become conscience of data protection restrictions and requirements. It doesn't mean - I mean it's - the thing with data protection, it's not so much a question of - wonderful noises now. It's not so much a question of whether the data can be collected or not, it's...

Woman: ICANN RDS call and it is (unintelligible). So what can I do?

Michele Neylon: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Somebody needs to be on mute.

Woman: I was going to leave at 4 o'clock but it's going until 4:30.

Michele Neylon: Sorry. I think, you know, the thing is, I mean, you know, collecting the data isn't as much of an issue; it's what you do with the data under data protection law.

I mean here in Ireland, for example, we are bound by the Irish and European laws, so if we're going to hold onto data for a period of time, we need to have a clear purpose for why we're holding it plus the permission and everything else.

This shouldn't be an issue. It's just if you make assumptions that you can do anything and everything possible under the sun with any and all data that it becomes a problem.

So to kind of answer your question, I don't think it should be a block or something that people should be conscience of. At the same time, some more extreme privacy advocates might try to push for things that just simply aren't going to work because, you know, saying that anonymity is possible -- while that might be something that people might like to have -- I mean in reality, legally speaking it doesn't need to be. That's my own personal opinion. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Michele; this is Chuck. Now I'm going to have to draw this discussion for now to a close for this meeting; not in total, okay. We're going to have to pick this up next week because we want to spend a little bit of time on the triage list of possible requirements at the end of this meeting.

So my suggestion, Lisa -- in terms of Alex's suggested moves -- is that we show those in brackets as a move under Overall Goals, but leave them in brackets under Applied and Fix as well. I'm confident that you can figure out a way to make that fairly clear in terms of a redline version that we'll send to the whole group after this call.

But just noting -- maybe with comments -- that we did not resolve whether the motion happened, and also probably noting something about Rod's comment and the discussion that followed that we're going to have to continue that in our call next week.

So sorry to cut this off but I think we're a ways from reaching resolution on Alex's suggestions as well as Rod's concern and how we deal with that in this Statement of Purpose.

So sorry to cut it off here but let's move to - now, so the action item then for Staff is to send out a redline based on what we did in this meeting for discussion on the list by the full working group and continued discussion next week including where we left on these two issues.

Any questions or comments on that?

Okay, so let's go now to the triage possible requirements. And Lisa, I'm not sure how you want to do this in terms of the slaying. You did a nice job last week of showing some subsets or summary of the triage list because it's huge.

So Lisa, let me turn it over to you or Marika -- whichever one of you wants to take a lead on the triage list -- and let's get that up there. And we're not going to go through the triage list everyone. We're just - but we asked last week that everybody start to review this, and we fully understand that you may not have had time to review at all. But we hope you will in the next week or two so that we can begin to refine this.

So Lisa, you want to jump in? And I don't know if we want to jump to the question mark items that are identified in the list and maybe talk about those. I'll be glad to let you take a lead.

Before you do that, (VA), go ahead.

(VA): Hey guys, sorry about the music. I was driving at that time (unintelligible), so it looks good. Okay, (VA) for the record.

Now, my question is very simple; Michele pointed it out. And I wanted to just say this.

That if the Whois Data is ultimately available in the public, (unintelligible) (unintelligible) soliciting business at the Registrar level or certain Registry level as well today, then shouldn't the Statement of Purpose impute the privacy issue separately in a separate -- entirely separate discussion as Jim Galvin also proposed earlier that it should be discussed separately, you know -- I'm of this opinion.

And I was under this impression that registrars cannot sum up business based on Whois Data. And (Fabricio) and Michele both tell me that that's not right and Michele does it all the time.

So I don't know. I'm a little bit confused here. And in (unintelligible), Holly also pointed out a question that whether this purposes was to define the Statement of Purpose, I think we haven't visited that question at all. So I'm a little confused here, you know, if you can help me get back on the street. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: We can't spend very much time on this. I apologize for that (VA). I'll let Michele respond if he can do it very briefly, but we're going to have to pick up on that.

So if you could, Lisa and Marika, if you could capture (VA's) question so that we follow-up on that as well as Rod's issue and Alex's issue next week, I would appreciate that.

Michele, can you be very brief?

Michele Neylon: Yes, sure; I'll be brief. Two things; one, the question he originally asked was about selling or trading in Whois Data and saying that was illegal. I mean the reality is whether - I'm not sure whether it's illegal or not anywhere. It might be in some places, but realistically speaking, there's a ton of services that allow you to buy Whois Data and they're perfectly functional and they've been operating in business for years.

I think what you might be talking about is around specific requirements in the RAA. I mean this is something that I've raised multiple times in the past where there's one section of the RAA -- which I think (VA) is referring to where it talks about the registrars obligation not to do this and not to do that and to protect certain data. But at the same time, there's a whole load of other requirements which in many respects can be seen to be in conflict with us.

It's not a simple question, but stating that (unintelligible) we're doing anything with Whois Data that it's illegal, I think that might be a misunderstanding.
Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Michele, and we're going to have to move on now to the - because we just have a few minutes left. At least - I don't think we're going to have time to have any meaningful discussion on the triage requirements.

At a minimum, what the leadership team wanted to do was to reinforce what we asked last week, that everybody should be reviewing this because we're going to have to finalize this triage list so that we can start deliberation. So if you haven't started doing that, please do that.

And let me ask Lisa to jump in. Notice that she's put on the screen some items in the triage list that were questioning whether or not they should even be possible requirements. And as you can see, these are not located in one place.

Lisa, I assume it's not too difficult to just send out these question mark items. People can go back and find them in the full document whether it be using the Excel spreadsheet -- which has not been distributed -- or the Word version.

But one thing I'd like to suggest -- if nobody is opposed to this -- that we talk about these next week after we continue discussion on the Purpose Statement.

So another action item then for Staff would be to send this little subset that's on the Adobe screen right now out to the full working group with a task to review these, to see whether people think that they should remain in the possible list of requirements or not. We're not going to have time to discuss that today, but if nobody objects -- and I'm open to objections -- but if nobody objects, we'll handle it that way.

Lisa, does that work for you?

Lisa Fuhr: Thanks Chuck; this is Lisa Fuhr. Yes, that works just fine. This was a quick and dirty, you know, extract from the spreadsheet to pull out the items that were question marked.

And I just want to underscore, they were question marked not because we were debating whether they should or shouldn't be requirements, but that we couldn't find any relevance to registration data and the RDS specifically. And so that's really the question to someone in the working group see that it is in fact relevant to the RDS and should therefore stay in the list that gets deliberated upon.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much Lisa.

So everyone has an action item then to review these before our next call because the plan will be -- on the second part of our agenda -- to try and go through these and make decisions in that regard as a working group. Okay.

Any questions about that assignment for all working group members? And let's make sure that those not on the call are clear about that request for review of these items.

And again, please continue to review the overall triage list and make sure we haven't left out something, and we'll try to do a more deliberate review of it on future calls so that we can get that ready for our deliberation.

Okay, Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Fuhr: Thanks Chuck, and just one additional request which is those of you who still have outstanding assignments for documents to pull possible requirements from, we do still have about half a dozen documents we're waiting for those inputs from. And because they were flagged as high importance, it would be really helpful to either have those possible requirements submitted, or if you don't think you're going to get to it, let us know and we'll seek another volunteer.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks for that reminder Lisa; this is Chuck.

So note that our meeting next week will be at the regular time. Thanks to those of you who endured this meeting and participated actively in spite of being in the middle of the night for some of you. That's much appreciated. Members like Holly, very much appreciate the ability to do the meeting at a decent time and we need to respect that and give them at least one meeting a month where it's not so bad for them. So thanks to everybody.

I think we got a good start on the Purpose Statement. We obviously have quite a bit more work to do. We will do that. I encourage you to -- once the

redline goes out -- to continue discussion on the list and then we pick it up in our meeting next week.

Is there anything else we need to cover in this meeting before we adjourn?
Okay, well thanks again everyone, and hopefully we'll be communicating on the list and again next week when we meet.

Have a good rest of the day or night -- or whatever it is for you. And at this time we will adjourn the meeting and the recording can be stopped.

Man 3: Thank you. Bye-bye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thanks for taking part and this does conclude today's call. (Unintelligible) of the recording.

END