

**ICANN Transcription
Next-Gen RDS PDP WG
Tuesday 26 July 2016 at 1600 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Next-Gen RDS PDP WG call on the Tuesday 26 July 2016 at 16:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance of the calls are posted on the agenda wiki page:

<https://community.icann.org/x/4gqbAw>

The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-nextgen-rds-26jul16-en.mp3>

Coordinator: The recordings are connected. You may now proceed.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you. One moment. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the GNSO Next Gen RDS PDP Working Group call on the 26th of July, 2016 at 1600 UTC.

In the interest of time today there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room so if you're only on the audio bridge today please let yourself be known now. Great, thank you. Also, as a reminder, all participants, to 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 will hand the call over to Chuck Gomes. Sir, you may begin.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Michelle, and welcome to everybody for this call today. Note the agenda in the upper right of the Adobe screen. And it looks like everybody's in Adobe. So if you have any questions or comments on that please let us

know right now. In the meantime, are there any updates to statements of interest?

Okay, not seeing any hands or hearing anyone, let's go on to Item Number 2 on the agenda, the pending assignments. And we have a group that is working on a statement of purpose for the working group, not for the RDS, but a statement of purpose for the working group. And I don't see James in the Adobe room. So maybe – and, I guess I don't see Susan either. Oh there she is. I see her. Okay. People are jumping in as I speak.

So, Susan, can you give us an update on the work of the – on the statement of purpose for the working group?

Susan Kawaguchi: Sure. I can but I think it'd be more appropriate for Alex Deacon if he wouldn't mind. He sent a revised version to the group last night. Alex, did you want to talk about the latest version?

Michelle DeSmyter: Chuck, it looks like Susan's call dropped. Is there anyone else that's on that drafting team that wishes to give a verbal update?

Alex Deacon: Hi, this is Alex Deacon.

Michelle DeSmyter: Go ahead, Alex.

Alex Deacon: Thanks, sorry. Yes, I guess the only update is that I did send an alternative purpose statement to the purpose list last night. I haven't seen much discussion on there. So I think we have kind of two – currently two statements to chew on and to discuss and perhaps come to an agreement on on what a purpose for this group would be. I mean, to summarize the purpose that I proposed, it's mostly focused on what we need to do as a group to come up with a policy that will, you know, guide the future RDS systems that takes into account kinds of the wants and needs of all in the community. And I based

the purpose on a lot of past work including the expert working group. And other docs, which I referenced.

Alan Greenberg: Have we lost Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Sorry about that. I was on mute. Okay, trying to follow our own instructions. Okay so, Alex, I know you probably can't answer this question for the rest of the group but if there's a chance that the group can reach at least rough consensus on a draft statement that can be presented to the full working group in our working group meeting a week from today, try and get it to us at least 24 hours in advance, get it to the full working group at least 24 hours in advance. And if you can't, just let the leadership team know in that regard and that would be appreciated.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Alex Deacon: This is Alex.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Alex Deacon: So this is Alex. So I'll kind of push the team along to try to come to a consensus within the next week. I think, you know, we've been working on this long enough so it's time to get to work and come up with something that we can present to the team next week. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alex. That's much appreciated. Chuck speaking again. So all right, let's then go on to Item 3. And we're going to spend considerable time on Item 3 on the agenda and that has to do with the triage approach that we...

Lisa Phifer: Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Apologies for jumping on you. This is Lisa Phifer speaking for the record. Just before we move ahead from pending assignments I just wanted to note that we do still have some pending assignments on – for people that had volunteered to extract possible requirements from some key input documents. And I think you all know who you are. But if any of you find that you are unable to follow through with that assignment and you need us to find another volunteer to cover that document please do let staff know so we can close out that extraction process.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa. And my apologies for forgetting that. Let me just add to what Lisa said. This is Chuck speaking again. That we're getting hopefully fairly close to starting deliberation. And if some of those tasks are not completed that could slow our work down. So anything you can do if you volunteered to get that wrapped up would be much appreciated. Thanks, Lisa, for keeping me straight on that. Did I miss anything else in terms of pending assignments?

Okay, did you have something else, Lisa? Thank you.

Lisa Phifer: No, Chuck.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: All right, now going to Agenda Item 3 and the triage approach. Again, thanks to Lisa and Susan for all the work they did on that. And then new thanks to Stephanie for a tremendous amount of time that she's spent on it as well. And she sent a new proposal that doesn't negate what's already been done, but rather I think complements it. And so far on the list, as I have seen, there's been only positive feedback on that.

And, so let me turn it over to Stephanie, not to go through the whole document because it's been out there for people to review, but it gives us a brief introduction to what she proposed. Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much, Chuck. And Stephanie Perrin for the record. Those of you who were on the late, well, for North America, late night call a week ago, you will know that I had a lot of questions about how we were categorizing things. And obviously this is (unintelligible) ready approach as Susan and Lisa described, to try to help us sort. However, I think it's important because depending on how we use it, it could possibly sort things for future members of the group, folks who haven't been around for this stage, possible years of work.

So maybe we should focus on it just a wee bit more so that it takes into account the logical categories of the actual possible requirements. And this is supposed to be sorting the possible requirements into logical searchable groups, if I have got that purpose clearly in my head. So that's what I did. I went through it and there's nothing magic about my logic.

I just went through it and tried to look at what Susan had come up, which are, indeed, important terms. And make sure that they were all at the same level, if you know what I mean, in other words, at some point we've got a function and then at other points we would have words that relate to a particular function, which is a lower degree of a hierarchy.

So I came up with new functions, put all of the existing groups into it, not in the function headings. And offer it for comment. I think it'll work. And if – and as I said on the call last week, and will continue to say, I'm no expert at spreadsheets, they terrify me. But I'm pretty sure that we can just keep keywords that people are fond of and add new ones by putting a keyword column onto the spreadsheet.

So this particular document is not complete. I promised the leadership team that I would come up with actual, I'm just scrolling down here, descriptions of my headings to make sure they're clear. And you will notice under them, if you cursor down to Page 11, instead of having one letter – one letter groups and then two letter groups that are different, what I tried to do was sort things into – well let's look at goals. And then other key letters that corresponded to subsets of the goals such as transparency, differentiated access, authoritative data, I put as subsets of that because they're separate goals.

So I did that tall the way through as best I could. And obviously there's different ways to sort this but I think Susan's keywords had already isolated most of the sort of logical clumps. So it was just a question of reorganizing and possibly renaming in the odd place. So that's what I did. I think that's about it. As I say, I've committed to providing descriptions here and possibly pull out some keywords, although I think people should put their own keywords in. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Stephanie. Appreciate that. This is Chuck again. And let me outline how we will try to discuss this today. First of all, I'll open it up for questions of Stephanie in particular, questions to make sure you understand what she's done, not discussion in terms of pros or cons, support or not.

And then secondly, we'll talk about whether there are any – if people want to express support they can do that. It's not necessary for everybody to verbally express your support, you can do it in the Adobe room by just putting a checkmark. And I'll call for that when we get there, a green checkmark will show, or if you have a – some concern you can do the red X.

But in case of concerns I'd like you to at least raise your hand so you can express what they are. Now, before I open it up for questions of Stephanie, let me say that don't worry too much about nomenclature. On the leadership team yesterday we talked about this. And one of the things we will need to fix

is the nomenclature for the groups that Stephanie identified and the ones related to keywords, okay?

And we may call – we kind of like the term, taxonomy for what Stephanie did, because I think that's kind of – pretty much what she did. And probably just use keywords instead of the term "groups" for the keyword column.

Now, with regard to the identification of them, we probably want to use a different nomenclature for the taxonomy. We don't want to use A and AA and AB and so forth for both of them because that'll create confusion. But let's not get hung up on that today, that's a real easy fix, for example, for taxonomy we can use numbers, 1, 1.1, 1.2, etcetera, whatever we want to do just so we don't have confusion so don't get hung up there. But now let me open it up to see if anybody has any questions of Stephanie in terms of what she's proposing.

And while you're raising your hands, let me emphasize what Stephanie said, and what we've said all along on this, is that don't look at this as a done deal. We will – whatever direction we decide to go, we will improve upon it as we go. So if this gets us started, great, as we're working through it and doing deliberation, we'll find things that we can add and we can do that, and that's one of the main things with regard to the nomenclature that we have one that's easy to add new items to.

Okay, does anybody have any questions of Stephanie? And please note the comments in the chat supporting that. Any questions? Okay, not hearing any questions then let me just – okay, Susan, go ahead.

Susan Kawaguchi: Hi, Chuck. Actually I don't have a question but yesterday we worked on sort of describing what those keywords meant, just a little – so Lisa helped me create a document that really just sort of it's a brief description of what I meant by, you know, whatever consent or purpose or, you know, any of those keywords. And also went through Stephanie's questions in her document

and, Stephanie, I didn't respond to all of those. But – or didn't take all of – didn't get to all of them I guess is what I should say.

But there was one you questioned the use of access violation and so we went back, we looked at that, you had suggested abuse. So and actually just did a search for abuse in all the possible requirements and did determine that was something I sort of missed. So we're going to change access violation to abuse and add all of those into, you know, label those as such as a keyword.

So hopefully – and we can send the document out later to the group. But hopefully the document will help others understand sort of my thinking and where these, you know, that these were pulled – the keyword terms were pulled directly out of the language for the most part in the possible requirements.

But sometimes it was an evaluation of like of my own of, you know, this possible requirement is really getting to this point. It's talking about this topic. So hopefully that document will be helpful moving forward. But to me this is all a, you know, this work is ongoing, it's going to change. And then adding Stephanie's next level of grouping things makes complete sense to me. To me it was just the next step that we needed to get to. So thanks, Stephanie, for taking it there.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Susan. This is Chuck again. And, Fabricio, to your question, certainly the leadership team thinks, and Susan just confirmed that, that it can work with the work that's already been done. And so it really complements what's already been done is what we believe.

And so – and again, we may refine it as we go if we decide to go this direction. But let me let Stephanie jump in.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks, Chuck. Stephanie Perrin for the record. Yes, in answer to Fab's question, I mean, what I tried to do was take the categories that Lisa and

Susan had come up with and slot them into the new headings, which, as I say, are kind of like they're a logic map of how we look at the requirements because, let's say, how many requirements did we have?

People were saying 900, I don't think it's quite that high. But how do we sort them into logical groups? That's what I was trying to do. And the existing categories, then that is an Excel spreadsheet function, to simply slot them into the new categories. I can't imagine myself how we can have two different naming functions going on at the same time, what my solution for that, for the work of keywords that people feel are really important, but in my view didn't quite make it as groups to sort the requirements in, because they were too fine detailed.

And you will see in my critique of the groups basically there was a lot of ones, this is too fine grained to be a category in and of itself. If you like the words, fine, put them in a keywords column and then a document that has been grouped according to the groupings will list keywords so if you're looking for your favorite keywords, we all have ours, don't we? Then you can search in that column and sort out the documents and you'll know what category they fit in. Does that make any sense at all?

Because for instance, consent, which Susan mentioned a minute ago, is going to be used in contracts, although it isn't now, but it is a (unintelligible) of data protection law and it might appear in two other areas. So if you want to search under that word then you search in the keyword. But the purpose of taxonomy that I came up with is to be able to look and say, okay, how many documents did we identify that have, say, legal requirements in them, for instance? And then you will get them all.

And I'm sure we're missing some categories because I basically did not sit down and think of other categories. A few, obviously, came up to my head but, I basically reframed what Lisa and Susan had already done. And as they said, you know, it's hard going through all these documents and coming up

with everything so that's my rationale there. So the answer is, a very long yes, I think it can be done but I wouldn't want to set up two parallel systems of numbering and naming.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stephanie. And let me – before I turn it to Lisa – this is Chuck – just say that I reached out to Stephanie yesterday and she responded and she's going to work on some definitions of the taxonomy categories, in particular the top levels ones, the A, B, C and so forth. Some of the others are kind of self-explanatory. If they're not, we can work on definitions of those too. But she did agree to work on those and certainly other people can contribute to that as well. Lisa, go ahead, please.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. And this is Lisa Phifer for the record. I spent some time yesterday trying to sort through the proposed categories in Stephanie's worksheet and looking at the mappings and trying to make sure that all of the keyword – the groups that had previously been identified got caught. For example, Stephanie sent out an update this morning addressing just a couple of those that either weren't included or were reflected in a typo.

There is one still missing and that's the one on – it's internationalization, not (internalation), I think, it was a misspelling in the original group key. But it's all possible requirements related to translation and transliteration of registration data, so we'd need to add that.

One of the things though, that I found in looking at the mapping and looking at Stephanie's comments on the original groups is that it's really a different perspective on the groups. For example, whether data elements should be broken out in terms of where – what the data elements pertain to. In Susan's groups she had some groups for contact information versus the information that a registrar provides. And in Stephanie's taxonomy she looks at a little bit differently, sort of more characteristics of data elements, you know, are they for contactability or are they for accuracy, as possible requirements for accuracy, etcetera.

So I really felt that the mapping, while a great starting point, really reflected two different perspectives on how one might want to sort the list of possible requirements. And so I guess my suggestion to this group might be, if you like this taxonomy approach that Stephanie has come up with, that we try to follow through on her mapping and give you a mock-up of what the two approaches look like side by side so that you all can decide do you want to maintain, you know, different – two different kinds of approaches to sorting the information, or whether you want to choose to go just with the taxonomy.

Now when you do go just with the taxonomy you will lose some granularity as Stephanie herself noted, there were some possible requirement groups that are much more granular than the categories listed here. But the flip side is also true. I think in the taxonomy there'll be an opportunity to make this more granular. For example, under potential uses there's only a few that are listed here and I think probably this group would end up identifying more as it went on.

So going through that exercise of actually applying this taxonomy and seeing if we can look at the result and the actual mappings and see if they make sense would probably help us take the next step forward.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Lisa. This is Chuck again. So a question for you, Lisa, it seems to me we could start with the taxonomy that Stephanie has proposed, and on particular elements of the taxonomy where more fine-grained breakdown is needed, we could move to the keywords. Would that not be possible?

Lisa Phifer: Personally, I think so, yes. I think that having a spreadsheet in front of you that allows you to do both will, you know, will either prove that that's helpful or show that it's just a duplication. But you really have to try it before you know the answer I think, it's – I tried taking a few examples and tried to reach a conclusion myself and I frankly found it very hard. It's – there's just a lot of different possible requirements and some fit really nicely, some don't.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa. Chuck again. Go ahead, Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, I'd agree with Lisa too. I think it's really valuable for the working group members to actually not just look at that – at that higher level grouping and go back to the possible requirements. I think it's – I don't think it's an either/or. I think it's let's use this grouping and then look at the possible requirements that fit in there and – and review those too. I think we're going to have to be going back to that spreadsheet on lots of occasions.

And in some cases, I think, you know, Stephanie's grouping of things was based on her – or her interpretation of my keywords, which may not have been the same, which hopefully the document that we worked on yesterday may clarify a few things. So, you know, because every word can have several definitions.

And, you know, so I think we're just going to have to do sort of a mind meld and, you know, make sure we're talking about the same things instead of having two different definitions of the same term and going in different directions.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Susan. This is Chuck. So for Lisa and Susan I have a question for you. Okay, so I heard what you said, so what are you suggesting as a next step to accomplish what I think both of you said?

Lisa Phifer: Chuck, this is Lisa. I'll take a stab. I think Susan has already been working on definitions for the keywords. It would be helpful if Stephanie can provide definitions for her categories. And then as staff, I would be happy to try to attend to the spreadsheet a column or multiple columns for categories. And I'll get back to that in a second – that applies the mapping that Stephanie gave.

The reason I'd like to have the definitions is because I think in some cases the mappings might be imperfect and I can at least flag that for review by this group as I create that spreadsheet for you all to look at. That would give you a chance to sort of test out this methodology, see if it works, see if you like this taxonomy itself or if there's – as Stephanie says, she's taken, you know, the next step in trying to provide a logical structuring but others may have some feedback on that structuring as well. Having a spreadsheet in front of us that does it allows us to review, see how well it works and if it needs to be further augmented.

I said I wanted to circle back to adding a column for categories. Certainly can add one column for categories, but as I thought about the way in which this would be used, it actually may end up being more useful to have a column for each of these top level codes in Stephanie's taxonomy. So a column for goals, which has values of transparency, differentiated access, authoritative data and accountability, and may have others in the future. A column for functions, which has values for search and query, authorization, compliance, and again, might have others in the future.

If you do that you have the ability to look at what are really orthogonal categories in this taxonomy. For example, you might have a possible requirement that talks about a goal, describes a function and then maybe has an element of something else on this list. If you don't have separate columns for that it becomes really unwieldy to have those combos represented and make them easily searchable.

The flip side, of course, is you end up with in this taxonomy, about 13 new columns. But it might make the spreadsheet more usable. And we could show you what the two approaches would look like and get feedback on which is actually more usable going forward.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa. Chuck again. Susan, go ahead.

Susan Kawaguchi: And just one more point. And, Stephanie, I'll respond on the list to this. But there was a couple of questions in your document where you were asking, you know, why was this even included or, you know, you didn't understand that being relevant or – I can't – I didn't pull up your question. But one of the things that came to mind as I was going through your document is there was no critiquing or pulling out of requirements – possible requirements in that list and saying, no, that doesn't seem relevant to me.

If it had that keyword in the wording or seemed to point to a certain concept, I included it. I didn't leave anything out. So there may be some value judgments about oh, does this possible requirement really even fit within the scope of what we're doing, you know, I mean, that rationale and sort of decision making was not done at all in this path through the – all the possible requirements. So what might not have seemed logical is included, because it was submitted as a possible requirement.

Chuck Gomes: And this is Chuck. And that's something that we could certainly identify in our deliberation as well. But I hear what you're saying so that just because it was listed as a keyword doesn't mean we're going to bless it in a requirement so. Okay, Stephanie, go ahead, please.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. Let's be clear here, and I didn't want to get into the nitty-gritty here of what we're doing. But the fact is we have a massive pile of what, for lack of another word, I would call of research data, that we have accumulated. We asked everybody to find all the documents that were relevant and put them in. And then we asked them, and I did explain this in the document but I suspect lots of people haven't had time to read it.

And then we asked them to sort out possible requirements without really a detailed structure about how to decide what's a requirement and what isn't. and the requirements that come out of the documents are what the document

is basically we picked out the important elements that might be construed as possible requirements.

But as we can see from the discussion on the list this morning about whether in the use cases we should operate in the field of the possible, the desiderata, or in the field of the real, the field of what the EWG proposed or the field of what we have now in the Whois, that's just an enormous scope here. So we have a pile of data, it surprises me at all that we could come up with a framework now to kind of frame it into types of requirements.

So that's what I tried to do. And this does mean to say that I'm putting a value judgment on what Susan and Lisa have pulled out as keywords, just as whether or not they're important enough to be an element in a framework. That's why I think the keywords are going to be important in one of the things that I recognized in going through it is we're going to have to go back and make sure that all the potential requirements were pulled out of the documents.

Because we didn't actually go back and do a critical look at whether someone summarized a document and missed anything. Because there's things missing here. And I know they're in some of the documents. That's a massive amount of work. We need to leave this open ended so that we don't all have to drop tools, go back and look at all the umpteen hundred documents and umpteen hundred requirements.

So it needs to be kept fluid. I would hate to – whenever I heard the words “close this off” I hope that doesn't mean you won't get a chance to say oh, you know what, we missed a requirement later on. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Stephanie. Chuck again. So I need some clarity myself, and hopefully this is helpful to others as well. I've heard the term “category” used, and I don't know what category means. Certainly we used “group” before. I think we've kind of changed that to keywords. And Stephanie's taxonomy is

another term. Lisa, could you talk a little bit about what you mean by category in contrast to taxonomy or keyword?

Lisa Phifer: Sure, Chuck. This is Lisa Phifer for the record. Yes, we obviously need to settle on some nomenclature here and then stick with it. When I referred to categories I was trying to use the – Stephanie's lingo for what we see in this proposal as a list of names. And she has really a two-tiered – what I see as a taxonomy but two tiers of categories. So goals of a system would be one category on the first level and then transparency would be a category on the second level. We don't have to call that the category if we don't want to but that's what I was referring to.

And I just wanted to really quickly acknowledge Stephanie's concern about closing off the list. I don't think there's any attempt to – or intent to close all the possible requirements list at any point during our deliberation. When I talked about closing off the outstanding assignments, that was to make sure that those possible requirements – the sources of those possible requirements had identified as really important all got included in the list. So it was not to close the list itself but to make sure we got those possible requirements in there.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Lisa. Chuck again. And I think I've said many times too that we're never going to close it off. At some point, before we send something to the Council, at our first deliverable to the GNSO Council, we're going to have to have an agreed to set of recommendations at that point. But even after that, the Council or other members of the community come back and say, I think you missed this. And there will still be opportunity – there's probably really not a fully closing off until at some point the Board approves anything that might be recommended down the road quite a ways.

So, Stephanie, is that a new hand? Oh thank you. Okay.

So is there anybody that has – and by the way, I'm not – I don't want to ignore the discussion between Sam and Kal that's going on in the chat. I – and I assume the rest of you have seen that. You probably heard me last week express concerns about spending so much time on our organization and getting it perfect that it takes us months to get to the actual deliberation. And obviously, I have a lot of reservations about spending too much time there. So I'll just say that with regard to that discussion.

Now, is there anyone who has serious concern about the direction we're going? And I realize it needs some more definitions. Stephanie has already agreed to providing some definitions of the elements of the taxonomy. And, Stephanie, if you can do it first at the top level, the A, B, C, D, that would be great. And it sounds like Lisa needs that so that she can work up something for the whole group to review between now and our next meeting and in our next meeting. So that would be helpful.

Is there anybody that has concerns or further questions about the direction we're going? Please raise your hand if you do. Okay so it seems like there's a reasonable comfort level at the direction we're going.

One thing I'd like a little bit of reaction to, probably from Stephanie and maybe from others as well, I note as I go through the top level of her taxonomy, the A, B, C, down to M, that some of those relate to the framework for the whole working group.

For example, the use of data, you know, C, is certainly I think related to Question Number 1, users and purposes that goes across all three phases actually. And then technical requirements probably could be correlated to the system item in the questions. And so forth. So some of those relate to – and then implementation which is – I saw it a minute ago, oh, cost – cost is certainly one of the 11 questions, relates to cost.

And so there's some mixing of the framework issues in with the taxonomy.
And in other cases they're kind of new elements of that framework.
Stephanie, can you comment on that at all in terms of the intermixing of those elements?

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, thanks, Chuck. Stephanie Perrin for the record. The thing is the way I looked at it because basically I saw what Susan and Lisa had pulled out as keywords coming from certain requirements because some granular and others were much less granular, they were like a principle that would appear in a requirement.

So it seemed to me, and that was my basic criticism last week, was well, before we pull out keywords, because you can have thousands of keywords, we could all pick our favorite keyword, mine would be anonymity, you know, and I know it exists in several documents and if it isn't in the requirements that means I have to go back and reframe a few requirements so that my word pops up. That's not a – that's going to see a pretty recursive process going on if we all discover that our words aren't there.

So what I tried to do was group into logical, okay this set of requirements, what do they speak to? Do they speak to an affirmation of the overall goals and purposes that we have for RDS data? Are they documents that relate totally to an analysis of the legal requirements?

And if I can pull it up to a high enough level then I can put one category of legal requirements – I mean, I don't think there were actually documents there that – I'd have to check – but let me go out on a limb and say there weren't documents that related to intellectual property legal requirements but yet we have release mechanisms that are referred to. So does that logically fit in there under legal requirements and then the subcategories of the different law.

When we talk about this new category, that was internalization but is not internationalization, how do we sort that? Is that a property of the data? Is it a property of the system? I would put it up into a technical requirement that it has to be able to manage that technical capability.

Well, Fab, I understand, everything is subjective and I said that last week. But I don't think you can call this attempt to bring it up to higher categories subjective. There was not a logic in the previous framework. It was keywords. And you need to come up with a logical framework to sort requirements.

So I'm happy to debate this at a higher level in terms of an academic coding mechanism, but this is a lot of data. And if we allow a keyword column then it doesn't discriminate against anyone wanting to pull out one word. But as I said last week, if you're going to have one principle in a set of legal requirements then you have to name the other eight, you know, and that's a problem.

So these are high categories, which I will be happy to describe this afternoon. I'll put some description on the category. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stephanie. Appreciate you doing that. Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. Again, Lisa Phifer for the record. I think that we all know that there are literally an infinite number of ways that you could slice and dice the set of problems, or issues that need to be addressed by this PDP. The process framework working group took a crack at that when they gave us the three phase approach with the list of 11 charter questions.

I don't know that Susan was necessarily aiming for that with the keyword groups but of course they were intended to help us sort this in different ways as well. And I think what Stephanie has provided here in her coding scheme – and I'd hesitate to call this a framework just to avoid confusion with the

process framework. But what Stephanie has produced in this coding scheme is another way of slicing and dicing.

I think we have to acknowledge that different people have different ways to look at this set of issues that are in front of us. And we can't just pick one but perhaps we've picked enough after we apply this. And then have several different ways of looking at the pile of data that's in front of us to move into deliberation. And I think that should be our goal is not is it perfect, but is it enough.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Lisa. Chuck again. Now I'm going to ask what to me is a really critical question. And that is okay, so how, assuming we're able to pull all this together, and I think we will with the taxonomy from Stephanie and having the keyword possibility as well, how would all of this help us in our deliberation, keeping in mind that the first three question areas that we decided to focus on were users and purposes, privacy and data elements.

So how would this taxonomy, and supplemented by the keywords, help us start our deliberation? And continue with our deliberation once we get going on that? Is that an old hand, Lisa?

Lisa Phifer: Old hand. Apologies.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So if I want to know, okay, so it's time to start deliberation, how will we use this taxonomy and the keywords, to help us do that? For example, if we want to talk about users and purposes, okay, how would I use this organization that we're working on, to deal with that? Keep in mind that our main purpose was to – we've got this very large list of possible requirements and so the whole idea of all this triaging was to help us in an efficient way go through the requirements rather than just doing 1-800 plus requirements one at a time.

Any thoughts on that especially – okay, Stephanie, go ahead, please.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks, Chuck. And I hate to monopolize the microphone but I think one of the things when you start sorting on this, if you're not finding requirements under a key category, for instance, I pulled out the category of risk. There are no keywords that are applied because they didn't really show up in the key area.

I know that there are documents wherein different stakeholders describe their risk if this doesn't happen. And there are definitely risks to various parties in the multistakeholder community, depending on how we sort out Whois. The fact that we haven't got those pulled out indicates a deficiency in the requirements that we have pulled out, in my view.

We had a debate this morning about support for dissident groups in use cases. We had a provision for anonymity in a registration in the EWG report, there are many other documents that should refer to anonymity, one of them I'm sitting on and haven't digested yet. If that isn't showing up as a potential requirement, then we've got – we've got an issue and we need to go back to it.

Lisa has put in the chat that there's a charter question on risk with its own table of potential requirements. There were several charter questions things – and I mentioned this in the critique of it, I don't quite understand why some are included and others not. So it's not as if potential requirements having to do with risk don't need to be digested when we're talking about the three elements we're talking about, particularly privacy.

So that's – these slices are difficult to contextualize the way we're slicing and dicing them. And I think that's inevitable but we need to spend a wee bit of time talking about how we may be missing things. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stephanie. Chuck again. Karnika, your turn.

Karnika Seth: Yes, I – everybody, I just want to focus on this (unintelligible) now users could be (unintelligible) contracted parties, be they a registrar, it would be anybody who is (unintelligible) it could be many different stakeholders. So do we not mention all of them here (and see the data elements as well) and the purpose along with it? It's very important for us to do that because if we don't do that then we are not able to focus on who wants (unintelligible) and why, that's I think the (unintelligible).

So I wanted to understand, Stephanie, when she mentioned contracted parties, would she maybe mentioning all these stakeholders here (unintelligible)?

Chuck Gomes: Well, go ahead, Stephanie, since it was addressed at you.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, for contracted parties – Stephanie Perrin for the record – I meant contracted parties in the sense that ICANN talks about contracted parties, you know. So registries, registrars, and the new group of privacy proxy service providers. They're going to be contracted parties too (unintelligible). So I didn't know where to put potential contracted parties. Are we going to be contracting parties to be data verification, the EWG report refers to all kinds of potential systems that don't exist yet.

And they're not – I can't remember actually, did I include them under contracted parties? I don't think I did. In terms of potential users, what I tried to categorize that as potential – potential uses of the system, I can't remember what letter I gave it. But the actual use of the data. Since we're focusing on the data I talked about the use of the data.

Karnika Seth: Please, Stephanie, just to, you know, add one more clarification I wanted, trademark owner could be various people, assignees (unintelligible) licensees. I think we're going to be (segregating) each of these and explaining the user category where will probably make us, you know, look at the rights and how (unintelligible) add value here. I'm talking in terms of the

example you (unintelligible) now, the scenario which I also (put forth). I think it's very crucial for us, (let's hear from you).

Chuck Gomes: Stephanie, this is Chuck. If you want to respond that's fine.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, Stephanie Perrin again. I'm not quite clear what you're looking for with (unintelligible). Do you want a separate grouping for users? In other words, a heading that is called Potential Users? Because...

((Crosstalk))

Karnika Seth: Sorry to intrude. But let me say risk – I found these categories mentioned not comprehensive enough because when you say trademark owners they could be segregated into licensees (unintelligible), sub-licensees. It could be various, you know, stakeholders in the same category.

Similarly, when we say risk there would be other contracted parties, some (potential), some present. So it's important, I feel, to mention all of them here and then discuss use cases and talk about the various (questions we have on privacy and data). I don't know Chuck will really, you know, lead us on this but I'm very looking forward to his view on this as well.

Stephanie Perrin: It's Stephanie again if I could respond?

Karnika Seth: Sure.

Stephanie Perrin: The problem is – for every word that you put in here you could subdivide it into many, many, many subcategories and just ask our technical people how they'd like to subdivide some of their technical issues. So I deliberately tried to keep the number of barrels here very, very limited. Under contracted parties if there are umpteen more contracted parties you can list those precise names under keywords and search on them. But they would be

keywords for that group or that whatever we're going to call these basic headings.

This is a structuring aid; it is nothing more. And I think the whole problem with coming up with a coding system for the massive research data is if you subdivide it down too far it doesn't really work as a coding system anymore because you might as well look at all the different documents, if you see what I mean.

So it's how do we come up with slices that can help us come up with a basic group, say, all legal risks, for instance and – or all legal requirements, and see which documents (unintelligible). Because...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Please remember to identify yourself even though we know who you are.

((Crosstalk))

Karnika Seth: Karnika Seth. There would be still be another category of risk to government.

Chuck Gomes: So let me – this is Chuck – let me jump in here.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: All of these things that you're bringing up, Karnika, I think are possibly be included. Don't look at this list as excluding things that you don't see specifically here. When we start identifying users we will – we need to include all of them, including governments and so forth. So without spending anymore – I want to move on from this but let me let Greg jump in here. Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Following on the discussion we're having – Greg Shatan for the record. You know, right now this heading is risk, it's not users. And actually in looking through this I see that there is Heading C, potential use of data, but there doesn't seem to be a major heading for potential users of data. And that seems to me to be one of our kind of major categories that we should have here.

Risk is kind of a different – risk is a different major heading and, you know, we can divide risk up by the, you know, the actor, but I think we need something, you know, entirely apart from risk that would be a major heading that would – to cover potential users of data which is really separate from potential use of data. Obviously interrelated but not the same thing.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. This is Chuck. Stephanie, do you have a quick response or is that an old hand?

Stephanie Perrin: Sorry, Chuck, old hand. Stephanie Perrin for the record. But I was just typing out a response to Greg. If people think that we have requirements that talk about potential users in a meaningful way then we can pull that out as a group. I agree that a lot of the documents talk about potential users but I'm not sure that we had the requirements and I couldn't identify any of the groups that Susan and Lisa had pulled out as being about the users themselves, you know?

Although I agree with Karnika that law enforcement talks – in their documents talks about law enforcement so they are definitely actors there. So we need to, I think, close this discussion off and figure out whether it's a useful way to categorize and carry on with the work. I think we've reached agreement on it and I promise I will get some description added this afternoon.

Chuck Gomes: And then – thank you, Stephanie. And once you do that then Lisa has promised to show a couple scenarios in terms of this that we can talk about on the list and then next week. But I want to point out that some of you have

already observed is, is that this exactly the concern I was trying to express last week. We could spend months trying to get this thing perfect, and I don't think that's a good use of time. I think it's, you know, and we're going to end up after months there still being disagreement and so forth of getting it right.

We will need to be thorough and make sure we include every possible issue and concern and deliberate on that. But let's try not to get – spend too much time on this. Our next steps are to – Stephanie is going to provide some definitions, Lisa is going to take a crack at reorganizing the triage picture here, including the possibility of showing the major taxonomy items as columns and see if that helps us.

I want all of you to think about, okay, how does this really help us? In the end, if it doesn't help us in our deliberation on the long list of requirements then we haven't accomplished the task we need to.

That said, I want to move on. And I'd like, Michelle, if you can pull up the why discuss the RDS use cases. And if we have time we'll try to start discussing one of them, but I want to make sure everybody understands what the purpose of discussing RDS use cases is. So that's not the document I wanted, it's the why discuss RDS use cases that I sent around this morning to the leadership team. If you can pull that one up. But let me go ahead and start doing that.

Now some of this I said in the email exchanges on our list. That's the one. Thank you. So I want to go over this a little bit to make sure – keep in mind that – and the first paragraph talks about this, that in our face to face meeting in Helsinki is where we – along with other things like the working group purpose statement, we decided to look at some use cases, okay?

And the discussing use cases is designed to help us prepare for our actual deliberation. We're not going to do deliberation when we discuss the use cases, but hopefully it'll affect the background and help us all to get a broader

perspective of the variations in terms of needs, uses, data elements, etcetera. You can see the long list of things that discussing use cases might do as we do that. I won't read through those bulleted items. And notice the last bullet, so it's not intended to be all-inclusive.

Again, let me emphasize, as the paragraph that starts with "Notes" says in the middle of the page, the intention is to prepare us for deliberation. It's not to start deliberation. So it'll hopefully be an educational exercise so that when we get into the deliberation we'll be able to refer back to things from the use cases.

Now, I want to focus on the two qualifications at the end of this document, okay? And you'll recognize some of this stuff as things I said on the list in response to some of the discussion that was going on.

Please understand that drafting a use case for a working group discussion, does not imply that any described users or purposes should be permissible or that all referenced data elements should be published in the RDS or even just stored in the RDS. Use cases, you know, can identify things that shouldn't be allowed. And if you go to Number 2, our goal is not to establish a complete set of all possible use cases but rather to get a sampling of hopefully some use cases that cover different situations that give us a general picture of some of the types of issues.

And our objective is when we talk about use cases, the objective is not to fix them and make them perfect or even modify them but rather instead to talk about the issues that they raise so that we can think through some of those issues as we're deliberating on specific potential requirements.

Now, that said, what I'd like us to do with those things in mind, now you can pull up the use case that Karnika submitted. I think it was the first one besides what were done in our meetings. And by Rod and by Michele. And if we can pull that one up, I'd just like to open up some discussion in the last

part of our meeting about this particular use case. Keeping in mind that we're not deliberating now, but what are the issues that this raises? What are the questions that this raises?

And let's just brainstorm a little bit on this particular use case. And talk about it so we get a flavor for one particular use case and the issues that it raises that we'll have to consider when we start deliberation. And, Karnika, I'm glad your hand is up because I'd like you to just not read through this use case but if you want to make a few comments about it that would be excellent. And you may be on mute if you're talking, we can't hear you. In fact, it looks like you're on mute. Okay.

Karnika Seth: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Karnika Seth: Karnika Seth. Excellent. I think it's a wonderful (unintelligible) putting across the (unintelligible) and it's very easy for anybody to understand what we are really aiming at, that are the requirements, why we need this. In a law enforcement perspective any registrant, if he wants to, you know, file a (unintelligible) against an infringing domain holder (unintelligible) look at the (unintelligible) and find out about who is the owner of the infringing domain.

In that case (unintelligible) there is not verified it becomes (unintelligible) to sue the person or even to serve them legal notices through the court process. a number of cases due to the inaccuracy in the Whois data, the notices are not (unintelligible) the respondents. That's a practical data situation which we are facing in the courts and I'm sure it's not just in India but (unintelligible). So this is what this example use case really aims at.

(Unintelligible) could be different (unintelligible) infringements, there could be identity theft scenario, why a legal action needs to be lodged, it could be (unintelligible) crime when a legal action is supposed to be initiated how do

we get to the person who owns the domain. So that's two important users, it could be a private party; it could be a court assistant investigating officer who needs to know the contact details of the holder of that domain. That's precisely what this case talks about. Leave it to the (unintelligible) now to discuss all the members can discuss on this. (Unintelligible). Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Karnika. And appreciate that. Now let me open it up for questions or comments, again, not – this is not a critique of this – of Karnika's use case here but rather what are the kind of issues that come up? Now some of these have already been discussed on the list and that's been very healthy I think. So the – so anybody want to comment on this particular use case or ask questions about it or point out issues that we will have to make decisions on later on when we're deliberating on potential requirements.

What Ayden is saying in the chat is probably – will probably be true of just about every use case. But don't worry about that for right now. Again, our purpose is not to critique the use case itself but rather to talk about it, discuss it so that we get a better understanding of various issues. And please watch the chat because there's good discussion going on in the chat, okay? Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. Lisa Phifer for the record. I just had a quick question for Karnika. As I was taking notes I realized that the scenario describes getting information about the registrar. Did you mean the registrar, the registrant, or both?

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead...

((Crosstalk))

Karnika Seth: Yeah, I'm Karnika Seth. In many cases where we make the registrar (unintelligible) we need to know who the registrar is, who exactly a registrant and (unintelligible) also. And that information we can only take from the

Whois. It is which you have to debate on whether that information should be provided, can be used by law enforcement or a private party or not. So certainly we rely on Whois to provide us (unintelligible) investigating agencies also rely on Whois extensively for their investigations. (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Karnika. Stephanie, go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: There's discussion in the chat, for some reason my microphone keeps getting unmuted. I don't understand it. I don't have to unmute it myself, it unmutes. That could be a factor in the echoing we're all experiencing. Anyway, Stephanie Perrin for the record. The reason why I'm arguing to break this up into different use cases is that I'd like to see the actors pulled out. I mean, one of the things that immediately comes up in a use case like this is the authority of different parties to ask for the data.

And that's kind of already set by policies so for instance the upcoming PPSAI will set the policy for onward transfer and opening up, getting data from the PPSAI provider – the privacy proxy provider. So, you know, something that is coming from law enforcement is quite different than something that is coming from a private actor absent a civil action.

So, you know, if our goal in these use cases is to bring up all the relevant detail such as how do we determine whether something is an official request, how do we determine whether someone is authorized or not, that's why I'm arguing for finer grained detail on these cases. I've got different rights under the different scenarios. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Stephanie. Any other comments on this besides what's going on in the chat? Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, thank you. Steve Metalitz. Yes, it's really to pick up on the granularity point that Stephanie talked about. You know, on the one hand I think there's different levels of granularity here. I think that the distinction between a

request that's made by law enforcement, and a request that's made by someone other than law enforcement, is a fairly fundamental one and is going to lead to different consequence and different standards and so forth or very likely would.

So to me it makes sense to do that, to treat those as separate use cases. I'm not – Stephanie is also right that you would have different – you could have different scenarios depending on what the type of illegal activity was even, let's say, in an example in which the requestor is a private party things could be different depending on whether it's a defamation claim, whether it's a copyright infringement claim, whether it's a identity theft claim, as somebody pointed out.

So that could be another level of granularity. I don't know that we need to – I don't know how granular we need to get at that level but it seems to me that in terms of the distinction between different types of requestors, law enforcement or non-law enforcement, that's probably a fairly fundamental distinction for which we need to observe. That's my observation anyway.

Chuck Gomes: And, Steve, this is Chuck. That's exactly what we're looking for here is different observations. And again, referring to a lot that's being said in the chat, yes, we could break these down into dozens of use cases. When we get into the deliberation we're going to have to get down into the different scenarios. We don't need to do it at this stage, okay? We would spend maybe the next year working on use cases if we did that. And I think our time is better spent actually deliberating.

But notice the points that are coming out in this, this gives us a good perception of what we're going to have to do when we actually start the deliberation, including the points that Steve just made and the different things we're going to have to look at. Any other thoughts on this particular use case?

Karnika Seth: I just wonder - Karnika Seth (unintelligible). There have been many instances where (unintelligible) registering a domain is that on the registrant to see that he doesn't register a domain which is illegal or infringing. What about the registrar? I've gone through the – even the UDRP policy and I found that the onus is completely on the registrant, not on the registrar. Now that (unintelligible) investigation. And several times, when the domain is (unintelligible) without any onus on the registrar to register a domain even if the domain is (unintelligible) could be illegal, could be obscene, could be anything. What is your view on that?

Chuck Gomes: Are you – this is Chuck. Are you asking me my view or generally people in the working group?

Karnika Seth: I'm asking you, Chuck and obviously all the members here, any input.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And could you restate the question for me?

Karnika Seth: Okay. The question was that when it comes to domain name disputes, for example, the UDRP policy, the ICANN policy, puts the onus on the registrant to check before registering a domain if they're registering infringing domain, which infringes by any third party. The onus is not on the registrar to check the legality. That creates a problem. So what is your view on that?

Chuck Gomes: Okay, I'll – this is Chuck. I'll respond to your question but I want to point out that this isn't the – probably the point where we want to get into that in too much specificity. First of all, the – I'm not sure registrars – this is my own personal opinion, okay, this is not as chair or anything else. My own personal opinion is, is that registrars are not intellectual property experts. And so putting the onus on them – and in fact as the trademark people on this call can verify, there is no universal trademark directory, we have the trademark clearinghouse now where we can check for new gTLDs, as to whether or not a particular trademark is registered.

For existing TLDs that doesn't apply. And there's no universal law that applies across all jurisdictions with regard to trademark rights. So my own personal opinion, being someone from a contracted party house, so you're getting my bias, right, and I'll be right up front about that, there is no particular – I'm not sure registrars really have the capability, nor are there resources out there that would help them do that.

Now, a system has been designed for new gTLDs where these kind of things can be identified if people are taking advantage of the trademark clearinghouse and so forth. And of course as they looked at introducing new gTLDs in the future, that's being examined to see if more can be done there. But let me leave it at that because we could get – we could talk for several meetings just on that topic. And let me let Alan jump in.

Karnika Seth: Thank you so much. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I think that – it's an interesting question. I tend to agree with your answers, Chuck, but it's completely out of scope. There is a PDP going on on protecting property rights, and it may well be within scope of that one. I think we need to be really careful. We've spent this whole meeting talking about methodology to reduce – to ensure we don't do unused – unneeded work. We really need to be careful that says we're making good use of the time that we're devoting in this PDP to all the people that are on the calls, and we need to stay focused. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. I can always count on Alan to help me keep the group on focus. And I want that, okay. So it's always nice that I'm not always the one pushing back on things that – either ahead of schedule or maybe not in focus. I'm going to change directions now and what I want to do is – if we can pull up the document that shows the example use cases that people have been – have volunteered to create. And I want to talk about that just a little bit. So it's the – it was an email that Lisa sent out to the leadership team. And I just wanted to show that to the – to the whole group.

We have, I think, 12 volunteers, including the ones that have already been done by Michele and Rod Rasmussen. And these cover a pretty broad spectrum, I think. And if anybody wants – thinks that some area is – might be good to have another use case I would like to ask you to do that by the end of this week if at all possible.

We don't need many more than what we have right here because we're not trying to create an exhaustive list of use cases. As people have pointed out on the chat, the EWG did a – they created quite an extensive list and they probably wouldn't claim theirs is exhaustive.

So – but if we have some from different areas, and we probably won't even try to discuss all of these but we'll do a sampling of them over the next week – meeting or two. And so if you think that there's an area that would be good to add to this list please volunteer to create. Those of you who have already volunteered and are still working on it, if you can get that done this week that would be very much appreciated.

And we'll pick out two or three more to talk about next week in addition to following up with the triage work. And again, to reinforce what Alan said, we really need to get the triage work done and start deliberating so I'm trying to be patient in terms of, okay, let's get it so people are relatively comfortable but we're not going to get it so that everybody is perfectly comfortable. And let's move on and get down to the nitty-gritty work of deliberation and hopefully what we come up with out of the triage work that's being done right now will help us do that in a somewhat efficient way.

So again, take a look at this. If somebody else wants to volunteer for one that's not on here that's fine. Let us know. Let Lisa know so she can add it to the little table of use cases. And then we'll pick a few from different categories that we can talk about on the next week or two.

Now our time is just about up. And – oh, Steve, thank you for asking that question. I probably should have talked about that or maybe it's next on the agenda, it's not on our agenda item specifically. But the response to the Doodle poll for a face to face meeting in Hyderabad was actually quite good. And the GNSO – and that input was fed into the GNSO Council meeting on Thursday of last week.

And so I think – what I heard – I haven't had a chance to listen to the whole GNSO Council meeting recording, but my understanding is they decided to go ahead and have a couple face to face meetings in Hyderabad that would be a half-day each, four hours each. And one of them would be ours. So thanks for asking that question, I should have communicated that earlier, Steve. Appreciate that.

And I see a few other people typing in the chat. Before we adjourn the call, as we run out of time here, we – is there anything anybody on the leadership team, anything I have left out? Our next meeting will be at the same time next week. And we will continue a couple things that we did today. And I didn't see all of Mary's chat before. Yes, okay thanks, Mary, for confirming that on the Hyderabad.

And keep in mind, for those of you who may end up not being able to go to Hyderabad in early November, that it will – there will be remote participation just like there always is. Let's see, what day? Is it the first day that those would happen, Mary, do you recall? Beth asks a good question there. I've seen it but I'm not trusting my memory, it seems like so it's the 3rd of November. And which day of the week is that, Mary? Is that the Thursday, the first day? I don't have – Thursday. So that's the first day of the seven-day meeting. Okay. Thank you for that.

Any other things that we need to cover today? Because I think we're out of time. All right, thanks, everyone. And let's all keep participating in the list like you have been doing. That's very useful. Great discussion. And hopefully

we'll be close next week if not finished with the triaging so we can actually then look at a few more use cases and get moving on deliberation, which is our big task Number 12.

Have a good rest of the week. And the meeting is adjourned and the recording can stop.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you, Chuck. Operator, please stop and save the recordings. Disconnect all remaining lines. Everyone, enjoy the rest of your day.

END