

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN Johannesburg
New gTLD RDS to replace WHOIS PDP
Wednesday, 28 June 2017 at 08:30 SAST**

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 recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Welcome. I'm Chuck Gomes. I'm the chair of the RDS PDP Working Group on Next-Gen Whois that is receiving a lot of attention at this meeting for various reasons. We have a full agenda today, and hopefully we're going to cover some new territory.

I want to let you know that those of you who are not working group members are welcome to participate in this meeting as well. We have a mic set up in the back of the room that you can use if you want to jump in to the deliberations that we have today. I want to remind all of you whenever you speak, please identify yourself even if you've spoken already. That'll make the transcript a lot more meaningful for people.

Instead of saying Man or Woman, it will give your name so we know who said that, and that's especially important for those who use the transcript to review the meeting when they weren't able to be here in person. So please remember to identify yourself. When you do that, make sure you talk close enough to the mic so that it's - it can be heard for those remote participants,

and we do have remote participants today as well. So we appreciate you doing that.

The - let's see, is there anything - Terri, is there anything I forgot in terms of the intro? Did I cover it okay? Okay good. All right. We are really hoping that this will be an interactive session. It is a regular working group meeting except the fact that a lot of us are here face to face. So we're going to try and proceed forward and make some - cover some new ground today as we do this.

So the - for those that don't know the leadership team, let me start over here to my right. Amr is one of our staff support team members. Marika. Susan, one of our vice chairs. (Lisa), staff support. Michele, another vice chair. And then I'll introduce the other person later. I'm going to skip him right now, okay, because I'm going to have - he'll get a chance to address us all a little bit later. And then David is another vice chair. So welcome to all of you. We're not going to do further introductions but remember to introduce yourself when you speak.

Okay. Does anyone, any working group member -- this doesn't apply to guests and the working group observers -- but does any working group member have an update to the statement of interest? Okay. Go ahead, Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. I joined the - basically next round PDP - yes, you know what I mean, the subsequent procedures PDP.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. I'll have an update in our next meeting so - but I'll save that till then. So. All right. And I don't see any in Adobe, so we'll move on to the next slide, please.

So I'm going very quickly go through some background for the guests that are here, okay? Our goal in our first initial report, which we're targeting to start

working on at the next ICANN meeting, ICANN 60 in Abu Dhabi, is to reach rough consensus on the fundamental requirements that you see on this screen. And now there's five of the 11 questions in our charter are kind of briefly highlighted in the five top boxes on this slide.

So they cover the areas of users and purposes, who should have access to gTLD registration data and why and for what purposes; registration data elements, what data should be collected, stored and disclosed, privacy; what steps are needed to protect data and privacy; gated access, what steps should be taken to control data access for each user and purpose; and data accuracy, what steps should be taken to improve data accuracy.

Now to date, over the last several months, we've discussed four of those quite a lot, all of them except data accuracy. Now data accuracy has been raised in the working group but we haven't actually started any deliberation on that yet. And our focus has been on what many people historically call thin data. We're now calling that the minimum public data set, okay? Today, like I said earlier I think before the meeting started, we're going to jump in to cover some new ground beyond that minimum public data set, or at least as we define it today.

Now the fundamental question in this first part of phase one that we need to answer is at the bottom of the slide there is a new policy framework and a next generation system needed to address these requirements, the requirements we develop covering those five questions at the main part of the slide there. We will - in our first initial report we will try to reach rough consensus on an answer to that question along with requirements, proposed requirements for those five areas.

Next slide, please. In fact, back that up for me one more time. I think now would be a good time to address the - say a little bit more about privacy. Okay? Many of you hopefully were in the GDPR - I think I messed up the acronym, I often do. The General Data Protection Requirement session that

the ccNSO sponsored yesterday afternoon. I thought it was a great session, really well done and a lot of information. Okay?

In that, (Teresa Swineheart) from ICANN staff announced that there was going to be a task force formed by ICANN to begin to look at some of the existing requirements in contracts with regard to data privacy and data protection. And we have identified a person on our leadership team, Michele, to serve on that task force. I'd like to reemphasize something that (Teresa) said in that session and they're not looking forward to develop policy, what they're trying to do is make sure there's a very complete picture of what's going on now with registries and registrars and obviously registrants with regard to data protection.

Obviously there's a short deadline coming up May of next year. In fact, it's less than a year away when enforcement of that - those regulations in Europe will start. So this is - it's under a time crunch but I want to emphasize that they're going to do their best not to duplicate anything we're doing and, if anything, they may be able to - in case we miss something in terms of our initial review of some of these areas, they may be able to contribute.

But I want to set people at ease. The goal is not to duplicate what we're doing in this working group. And so at the same time, if they contribute something that helps us, we'll take it, right? So is there anything else I need to say about that? Does that cover it okay? Okay. All right.

Next slide. All right. We're not going to go through this work plan in detail. It's available on the wiki for the - if you want to look at it in more detail. But we're in step 12 of our work plan, and step 12 really is broken down into a lot more detail that we're not going to cover here and I've kind of covered all - much of it - of what we've done so far in previous slides. But it's a big step in phase one, okay, and we'll be working on that for - we have been working on it for several months. We're going to continue to work on it for several months, leading up to our first initial report later in the year.

The - we've developed 26 key concepts or we've reached rough consensus on 26 key concepts. Those were discussed in our cross-community session on Monday, and we solicited feedback from the audience in that. We're going to talk a little bit about that in a later slide today and then hopefully the biggest part of the meeting today, like I already said, we will be going beyond the minimum public data set a little bit today and get moving in that regard.

Next slide, please. There you can kind of see -- and again I won't spend too much time on this -- please note the code in the box on the upper right for what the abbreviations stand for, again, it relates to those first five questions in our charter and then the foundational question. And you can see that where we're at in the highlighted box there in orange and where we're at today as well as where we're going to be in the next couple months.

Keep in mind that the charter for this working group is broken in to three phases, okay? We're in - we're just in phase one. Phase one has to do - requires us to develop proposed requirements and to answer that fundamental question whether a new system is needed or whether the existing one can be modified to meet the requirements.

Phase two will be policy development, translating the requirements that we come up with, assuming we propose a new system. And then phase three will be developing a detailed implementation plan for implementing those policies. Again, if we make a decision and the council approves, the GNSO Council approves our recommendations, we would move on to those.

Next slide, please. Now at this point I'm going to introduce Herb Wayne, the ICANN ombudsman, and ask him to share a few remarks. Now before I turn it over to Herb, let me say that the history of Whois, as anybody that's been around even a short time knows, is very volatile. It's been hard to make progress because there are interest groups, stakeholder groups, constituencies that have pretty much opposite views in terms of registration

data, and that's okay and we have to recognize that and we want to recognize all of those in this working group.

But that creates tension and people are strongly vetted in their views, and that's fine, that's good, but it creates challenges, especially in a group where we have over 190 working group members and over 170 observers now. So we've had some lively discussions, if I can say it that way, and some of them have maybe gone over the line in terms of etiquette and protocol and the procedures for the GNSO working groups. I think people have been very responsive and I thank you for that, and we'll have some more in the future.

But I'd like Herb to come in now and go ahead and share some thoughts that probably are really for the whole community and not just for this working group. But, Herb, if you would do that I'd appreciate it. And also, we will take a few minutes after Herb shares to - for you to ask questions, so if you have some, please be prepared to ask them.

Herb Waye: Good morning. Thank you. Herb Waye for the record, ICANN ombudsmen. When I first approached this group, there was a mention of whether the group needed the ombudsmen or a two by four. Despite being carbon based and organic, I unfortunately lack photosynthesis, though my wife does think that two out of three is enough to consider my head to be made out of wood sometimes.

There's really nothing I need to say. You all know that fundamentally we should treat each other with respect. I clearly understand the difficult situation you're in over 300 people with such diverse opinions and agendas enclosed in a working group attempting to arrive at consensus over a topic that has been hotly debated since its creation years ago. That's not easy.

So I will just say this: on my watch, I will not tolerate disrespect, bullying, or intimidation. I want everyone here and everyone across the ICANN community to be able to benefit from a safe, harassment-free environment

online and in person, and to feel comfortable reporting any instances of inappropriate behavior to the office of the ombudsmen so that it can be promptly addressed so that you can get back to the important work before you.

I will leave any dysfunction to the leadership team. That's why they are here, but I will not hesitate to step in here or anywhere else to address disrespect head on. So I wish you all a productive day, I hope you get to enjoy this beautiful city before you head home, and I wish you all safe travels back home to your friends and family. Thank you very much.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Herb. This is Chuck again. And just to add to that, while again if you have a question and you're in Adobe, please raise your hand in Adobe. If you're not in Adobe, raise your hand or actually go to the mic in the back or raise your hand if you're at the table, and we'll give you a chance to answer your questions.

I want to add just a little bit to what Herb said. As a leadership team, we've been reaching out to some working group members individually and some on the list and so forth. And like I said in the GNSO update on Monday, members have been very responsive and I thank you for that. So if we continue to do that, I think it'll all work out fine. The - it's important to remember that we come from different cultures. We speak different languages.

Many of our working group members are actually having to speak in a non-native language so sometimes that leaves impressions that may be sound offensive when maybe it's just, you know, limited English language skills or maybe it's culture or maybe it's personality. So I ask all of the working group members to be as liberal as you can and not to be too overly sensitive. At the same time, if there's something that's offensive, we want you to identify it.

We'll try and catch it; we will miss sometimes. So don't hesitate to go to Herb if you need to. And his goal is to help us succeed, and we appreciate that. Now does anybody have a question? Okay. The - there's some links in the - on the slide that you see there. Feel free to use those, and these slides are publicly available. Let me just turn to the leadership team. Is there anything else that any of you would like to add to this?

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Chuck. Michele for the record. The - I suppose the key thing here is that while there can be disagreement of views that people should try to, you know, retain a certain modicum of calm and, as Herb and others have said, respect. Not easy at the best of times, I get that. So maybe instead of hitting Send on an e-mail, you know, take a minute, take a deep breath, have a look at it. I mean I know for myself that there are literally thousands of emails that I could have sent but haven't, and that's in general, not specific to this.

You know, sometimes just taking that moment just to have a look at it and just - I mean don't forget as well when you're writing an e-mail, there's no real way to express tone. People will misinterpret things and we have people on this working group whose first language is definitely not English. I'm Irish so for me it's I'm not even sure if that is my first language. So just, you know, take a deep breath and bear in mind that, you know, we're meant to be working on all this stuff together, even if we don't agree and it's - the way this system works is we all end up with a solution that we all hate equally or love equally, but it's not a question of winning. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: I always love to disagree with Michele because he does it to me all the time.

Michele Neylon: And I will continue to do so until...

Chuck Gomes: I would say it is about winning, but what's winning? Winning is working together, making our differences known, giving our rationale for those and then collaborating together to come up with some solutions that best meet of

all our needs. Now that's hard because in some cases they're diametrically opposed, but winning would be doing that.

In other words, we're going to have to find some compromises that don't compromise basic principles or law or anything else but that we work together to constructively come up with recommendations that are for the good of the whole community, a community that has very different interests, all of which are very important. So the - and I know, Michele, really didn't mean anything different than what I just said. So.

All right let's go to the next slide, please. There we go. Okay. Now there have been several instances in our working group over - especially over the last four or five months where our mailing list has just gone crazy, literally. Now I try as chair to look at all the emails. I don't know if I'll always succeed on that because there are a lot of them but we've had a couple of instances at least over the last several months where the list, I mean, nobody could keep up with it without spending all of their life on it.

And part of the - one of the causes of that is that people are so vetted in terms of their interests and their needs that they jump ahead of where we're at. And so what we did recently is establish the rules that you see on the screen here, and we're going to continue to enforce those rules. And I'm not going to read through all of them. You can glance through them, and they're on our wiki.

But one of the key principles of these rules is stay focused on where we're at right now, try not to jump head. And so after our working group meetings, we've started to say, okay, here's our - here are our focus topics for the upcoming week and we ask everybody to stay on those and make sure you're clear in terms of which topic you're talking about. We know that everything we do now and in the future is interdependent so it's not as if what you're wanting to say isn't important or won't be considered, it will be.

But the key principle is to stay focused, keep the focus relatively narrow. Otherwise none of us, not the leaders, not working group members, not those who are observing, can really keep up with a crazy volume of emails that they'd have to spend full time in their life covering. So keep that in mind even in our session today. If we can stay focused on the topics at hand, realizing that there'll be many others that we cover in the future, we would appreciate that.

Does anybody on the leadership team want to add anything to that?

Michele Neylon: Michele again for the record. Thanks, Chuck. The sheer volume of e-mail on some working groups is - can always be overwhelming and if you - you know, things like, I don't know, if you're making a new point, use a new subject line, for example, that would be kind of helpful. If the point has already been made 45 times, there's no need to make it again. We get it, you hate something, you love something but can we please move on?

You know, the way the working groups work, the way the mailing lists works is once you're on them you have posting rights, it's not very easy for us as the leadership team to remove your posting rights, but we will. I have a day job and it is not trying to read hundreds of emails that don't actually add any substance to the discussion.

It really - I know other working group members are in a similar position, so again, you know, replying to a list with hundreds of people with a plus one is not particularly helpful because actually it's not plus one, it's plus 500 and we all don't need it. So again, as I said already, before sending an e-mail, think about it please. Is it actually adding any value or are you just feeding the trolls, reiterating a point that's been made 50 times already, or generally just making us all miserable because we've got to read another 100 emails which don't actually add anything. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. And keep in mind, we're using the polling technique every week when we reach tentative conclusions, so you'll get your chance regularly to weigh in and express a final opinion whether you support a statement that we've tentatively agreed on or not. So we're going to always - and then at the end before we do our first initial report, we'll do more formal evaluation of the level of consensus. So you're going to get then as well, and that'll be done in a more formal way.

Let's go to the next slide, please.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Chuck. So this is Marika. This is just to provide you with a brief update on the status of the legal analysis. And as you may know or may be aware, the working group decided awhile to solicit an independent legal analysis of the working group questions that were developed originally for the session that was held with data protection commissioners at ICANN 58.

The working group did receive feedback from those senior privacy experts, and you see the names of those people here on the slide. But there was a desired aspect to also obtain independent legal analysis of these questions. So the leadership team has worked with a small group of advisors from within the working group on identifying a number of law firms that could potentially do this work and engage with those law firms.

Based on the information provided and responses to some of our questions, the leadership team narrowed it down to one law firm with which were currently contracting. We're hoping that this contract is in place as soon as possible. I believe they committed to, you know, following the contract being in place to be able to provide responses I believe in a six-week timeframe. I'm looking at (Lisa). Yes?

So we're hoping that this moves forward as soon as possible so you have that information for review and that will hopefully help inform the deliberations

on those specific questions. Do we have any questions about this topic?
Greg?

Greg Aaron: This is Greg Aaron. So this is our first baby step in legal analysis and I'm assuming that at a later point there will be more, is that correct? We will - my assumption is we will need some legal advice at various points in our work.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I believe that is correct, or at least as I've been identified I think as well in the different stages. But I just want to make clear that this specific engagement is for this specific project. So it's not some kind of open-ended retainer kind of agreement that we're looking at.

Greg Aaron: Right. I'm assuming at some point a retainer will be required just like the EWG and the thick Whois PDP groups also had some legal advice at their disposal.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. That will be something to be considered but I don't believe any of those groups had any kind of retainer agreement. I think those were also very specific asks. I know for sure on the thick Whois there was a specific memo that was requested on implications of, you know, transfer from thick to thin - from thin to thick. So. But again, I think at some point the working group will need to identify exactly what is needed so we can then also take that back internally to see, you know, what budget is available, what arrangements can be put in place. But that's definitely open for discussion.

Greg Aaron: I'd encourage the leadership to think longer term than one short, small engagement because it wouldn't make sense to retain somebody to provide one piece of advice and then do another RFP for on and on and on. The issues here are complex and in the previous working groups, including for the IANA transition, there were budgets made available ahead of time. And I just want to make sure that we have what we need. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Greg. This is Chuck again. And, Greg, certainly a retainer-type option is not out of the question if we saw that that was the best way to do it. And your points are well taken. One of the reasons, and most of the working group members know this already, that we kind of rushed this one in June is we're trying to take advantage of some funds that are available now in the fiscal year '17 budget, which ends in - at the end of this week. So we're trying to do that. Whether we'll succeed, we'll find out this week. But - so that then leaves funds that are budgeted in fiscal year '18 budget available for additional efforts like you're talking about.

Thank you, Marika, for that. And I've got - so okay. I don't see any other hands except Greg's there. So let's go on to the next slide. And I apologize for the time spent so far that's kind of review and going over some process issues and proper etiquette issues for the working group but let's move and continue this. Yes, Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thank you. Greg Shatan for the record. Sorry, I'm not in the Adobe room yet. Just briefly on the point of legal retention. I think we need to think carefully about how we instruct counsel. I think that just handing them questions that we handed to the data protection commissioners is probably not the best strategy.

And as someone who is both instructed and been instructed hundreds of times, that's, you know, you're going to end up in a dialogue regardless with them, so it's not just going to be, you know, take these questions and come back. I'm not sure that that's exactly what we're looking for anyway, but if it is, I think that's - we could well end up with wishing that we'd done something differently. So hopefully the rush to retain the law firm is not a rush to instruct the law firm.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Greg. Let's go now to the ccTLD responses. Some of you will recall that it was suggested that we reach out to the country code domain name operators, especially those in Europe but not necessarily just those in

Europe, to see what they're doing to prepare for the general data protection requirements that are upon us. And so I'm going to turn it over to Susan to give us an update on where that's at.

Susan Kawaguchi: Well pretty much everything on the slide is the update but - so we've sent those out over a month ago and received three responses and one decline. So .me, .ie, and .ca have responded, and those are all posted. We'll - once we have a few more responses, we'll really take a look and see if there's anything common and, you know, some sort of common practices that they're suggesting or they're implementing and then see what value that may bring to our discussions.

Well - probably next week send another sort of reminder around to those ccTLDs, so. And overall we sent out 18 to 18 different ccTLDs, and they are global, it's not just Europe. I mean, as is Canada responded. And so we - hopefully you'll get some good information for discussion. Yes, and the responses are on the wiki.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Susan. This is Chuck again. Let's go to the next slide, please. Oh. Go ahead, please?

(Sebastian Ducross): This is (Sebastian Ducross) for gTLD group. I don't speak on their behalf so they may refuse, try to reach out to AFNIC, .FR. They've been doing a fantastic job in this. They're way ahead of a lot of people and will be very helpful.

Susan Kawaguchi: I think that was on the list. Yes, they were on the list. So. Thank you for that recommendation though.

Michele Neylon: This is Michele. (Sebastian), if you have a chance if you could possibly give us -- I mean not now this minute -- but if you could give us a contact there, a responsive contact there, that would be helpful. Because we did send out the request to a number of CCs. Some have answered very quickly, some we

haven't heard anything from and maybe it's just because we're sending the question to the wrong place.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much for that contribution. And keep in mind, there's a pretty long of questions so - and they're all busy so we understand that. But anything you can do to get them to respond too would be helpful.

All right. The next topic is to just briefly talk about the results of the cross-community session. And let's go now to the next slide. Okay, I need to look out here. My own laptop - the reason for the delay, it's a lot more delayed on my laptop than it is on the screen in front of me, so let's turn it over to Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Chuck. Michele for the record. Okay just a very, very brief recap of what we covered in the cross-community session on Monday, which is in ICANN time that probably feels like a month ago for some of us. So the session recordings and transcript is available at the link on the slide, and bear in mind the slides for this are going to be public of course.

So we went through a number of things during that meeting. Some feedback from the group, I suppose it might be helpful to know which group received the most support and why, which was the most contentious and why, what were the most frequent or significant concerns expressed. But what we're going to come back after post this meeting to analyze and go through that entire cross-community session, we're not going to do this now because we want to move forward with our work because that's a better use of our time.

So we'll be looking at a lot of this, looking at summarizing the feedback, mapping the feedback to the most affected agreements, and taking into consideration during second pass deliberation.

Next slide. So we really want to, you know, finalize deliberations of the minimum public data set. So again, on this slide here the - we've gone

through a bit more on that. And I'll hand it back to - who am I handing this back to? I'm handing it back Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. And focusing on this slide right here, let me just add a little bit there. We're not quite finished with the minimum public data set but rather than continuing to focus on that right now, the four items that you see there are going to be covered and we're going to try and finalize those when we get to our second pass deliberation on this particular area.

So those areas are not being forgotten, we're just going to defer finalization of them to a little bit later in our process rather than continuing to deliberate on those now. So those are not forgotten. Many of you have made some good suggestions in those regards, and those will be dealt with.

Let's go to the next slide, please. And then - and while we're going to the next slide, let me say that we received some great feedback in that session on Monday and it is going to impact, especially a couple of the 26 tentative agreements, so please recognize that we heard it. We're going to include it as we come across those things going forward and take that feedback in. There were some good edits suggested. We're going to probably just make those edits. They were pretty helpful edits that were there.

And now let's get to where we really wanted to go today and that's to start deliberation beyond that minimum public data set, and for those that aren't part of the working group, we have a lot of working group members that have been expressing their desires, could we move on, get beyond that, and we are trying to do that today. So.

And that happens to be work plan tasks 12c and 12d. And, again, it brings us back to some of the fundamental questions on that. Next slide, please. Well, bear with me here. I probably jumped it a little bit too fast. Look at those - the quick summary in blue there so that you see the first one that we've been working on for the last few months, the minimum public data set.

We have identified possible other thin or minimum public data set elements that we will be covering, but then we get beyond that into registrant data, administrative contact data, technical contact data and any new data that might be identified. Those are all going beyond that first block of minimum public data set. So.

And you can see on the slide there that there are some elements of thin data that exist today that we haven't included in the minimum public data set, so we're going - we will get to those as we move forward. The registry domain ID, the registrar abuse contact e-mail and phone, reseller, last update of Whois database are elements that are not included yet in our minimum public data set. There are also the thick data elements that I already went through the contact data, and then again we may do some new elements.

Next slide, please. Here you can see the data elements in the 2013 registry accreditation agreement - registrar accreditation agreement, sorry about that. I'm not going to go through those. We'll leave it up there just a few seconds so you can glance through those. And this is all non-registrant contact data. Okay?

Woman: Non-registrant, non-contact.

Chuck Gomes: Exactly. Non-registrant, non-contact data. Go to the next slide, please. Okay. And here we get into the registrant contact data. Again, I'm not going to go through those individually, but we haven't started talking about this kind of information. We're going to hopefully get started on that today.

Next slide, please. Here you can see the admin contact data that is collected today. And we didn't prepare a slide for the tech contact data but it parallels this, same kind of information. Next slide, please. So now what we need to do is to decide, okay, where do we go next? That's a lot of information that we have to tackle.

So what we're going to do right now is show you some possible approaches for next steps on this data going beyond the minimum public data set and discuss as a group so we want some feedback here how to proceed next. We're going to propose one idea and see if there's support in the working group for that. The - and we're going to continue on the process of developing key concepts to add to the 26 that we've tentatively agreed to so far and with a couple exceptions where we may revisit those.

So we're going to look at some different buckets of data to deliberate on next. And two very broad buckets are shown in the middle of this slide. That's legal person data and natural person contact data. Okay? The definitions of those are on the screen, legal person being a company, a business, a partnership, a nonprofit entity, a trade association, et cetera, and natural person basically just being a read living individual.

And a little bit of this was talked about in the session late yesterday afternoon on the general data protection requirements, and they certainly talked about these concepts and they use the term personal data. Now a data subject may be a domain name registrant, a tech contact, an admin contact, and abuse contact. And for those of you who haven't been in the industry very long, the abuse contact's a relatively new addition. It certainly came in with the 2013 RAA and was added especially for the new gTLDs at that point.

And, as I think everyone knows, some laws apply only to natural persons and their data, okay? But again, I want you to focus right now on two big buckets, the legal persons, and the natural persons, and we'll have a lot of work to do on each of those. So the question that we want to throw out to the working group is would it be helpful to first deliberate on key concepts for legal person data and then leaving the natural person bucket to deal with next after that. It'll take us awhile to get through that.

So that's a question and I think, because I've been doing so much talking I want to allow some time for feedback on this question. What do you think, as working group members or as visitors here today, about the approach of next focusing on legal persons and their data and then later focusing on the natural person. How do you react to that? Does that seem like a reasonable approach? Okay, all right. Greg, you're up first.

Greg Aaron: This is Greg Aaron. I'm not sure yet if you can separate the discussion into just one versus the other. There's also a third category. Now the legal and natural persons, that's a binary thing. You're either one or the other but there's a third category that could come up which involves both of those, which is commercial activity.

Some ccTLDs make that distinction, for example .UK. And commercial activity can be undertaken by both legal persons and natural persons, and then they use that as a basis for processing and displaying information. So I don't know if these are separable or not. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. This is Chuck again. Let's go to Rod.

Rod Rasmussen: Hello. Rod Rasmussen here. So I think this is really a bad idea. Let me give my rationale for that. I believe we should be looking at the superset of data elements we want to deal with contacts at all because at some point the reason we're doing this is I would assume, as based on that distinction, whether or not you're going to display in some - or collect even, this kind of data, it doesn't matter regardless. Depending on the system that you end up implementing, you need to know what kind of data you're going to collect at all because in - two thoughts here.

One is if they're - for a legal person that may be displayed regardless or may be treated differently. For a - even for a natural person who decides they would like to have their information fully disclosed within the data set, we need to know what that data might be. So I think we should start with the

superset of elements and then we can go to whether or not we collect or display those based on these other analysis.

But I think it would be easier to actually get the overall set of elements determined first so we can get off the table the ideas - or put aside and then get back to legal versus natural versus whatever person. And I'm just taking this from - kind of from an engineering perspective, which is figure out all the things you may want to have and then go and figure out how you want to display, collect, all those other kinds of elements. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: So, Rod, hang in there because I'm going to follow up a little bit. This is Chuck. So explain a little more clearly -- and most people probably got it but I probably need a little more help -- what that super set includes.

Rod Rasmussen: So I'll -- this is Rob again -- refer to the EWG report. I think we collected together pretty much everything that you might want to consider collecting and publishing within a potential RDS. I don't know that there's anything else that's come up since then that we'd want to add to that. But I would say look at those - that super set of elements and see is there anything that we came up with in the EWG that probably is out of scope regardless of whether it's a natural, physical, mythological person, or whatever it is, right?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Rod. So if I'm understanding you correctly, and this is Chuck speaking, I think you're suggesting that we really focus on this overall set of data elements. One of those five questions elements, right, in our charter? Is that what I'm hearing?

Rod Rasmussen: Correct.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. That's good.

Rod Rasmussen: But that's just my own personal opinion, of course.

Chuck Gomes: I asked for it, okay, and that's appreciated. Let's go now to Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. In some jurisdictions it's a situation where the natural person can't be involved in like some kind of entrepreneurship without forming of a legal body and it's reported to the tax agency so he's something between.

And my thinking is until we have a special flag for fields which clearly say that these particular fields, I don't know, phone, maybe address, maybe name, is personal data or not, we will not be able to understand from the - clear it from legal body or natural person distinguished. We came through this in Russian Federation as a registrar so that's - yes. We came to the conclusion that until clearly shown, it's not possible to distinguish. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Maxim. Let's go next to Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks. Stephanie Perrin for the record and I apologize for that delay in getting the mic there. I just wanted to express my support for what Rod is saying and, indeed, Maxim's follow up I also support. I think we would also avoid going in circles as we did during last year over minimum public data set. Maybe year is an exaggeration, but.

If you start with a small subset that you haven't actually defined in terms of your perimeters, you - somebody like me for instance is going to have to keep raising the perimeters, and I think this is, oddly enough, the engineering perspective says figure out your superset and I think the legal perspective is figure out all the data elements you want to gather and then go through and then figure out how they sort. And as Maxim says, it's going to be different in different areas. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stephanie. Chuck again. Let's go to Wendy.

Wendy Seltzer: Thanks. Wendy Seltzer, mostly to agree, further to note that since we don't have people identifying as they give information whether the information is that of a legal person or a natural person, adding this category sort of adds to the task of data collection. And so for that additional reason we are best simply to focus on the data elements here.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Wendy, and for the discussion. It's Chuck speaking again. The - and remember to put your hand down unless you want to get in the queue again. Greg, I am going to come back to you mainly because you were the first one to make a comment and I - and before I turn it back to Greg with the question I'm going to ask him, I'm going to poll the room in just a minute to see if you're kind of tend to agree with the approach that's been suggested by several people here. But, Greg, I want to - since you started this -- and I'll come to you in a second, Kathy -- the - if - does this - is this kind of in sync with what you were saying? Are you suggesting a different approach?

Greg Aaron: This is Greg. Yes. The issue with - is always are we going to present personal information in display. I mean that's always the big question that keeps coming up. But I still don't think these are separable. They're going to - it's going to cross over.

Chuck Gomes: Sorry, what's not acceptable?

Greg Aaron: I don't think - I still don't think it makes sense to just talk about one sliver versus another. I mean we've got to figure out which is the right thing do and we can't just talk about one tiny bit of it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Chuck again. Before I poll the whole room, I'm going to go to a remote comment.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Chuck. This is Amr. And we have a remote comment from Christopher Wilkinson who says, "I understand that there are necessary distinctions between legal/commercial/personal data subjects but the priority

now should be the personal data for individuals. The deadline for conformity with GDPR and for EU individuals is rather short. Let's get this right first soon."

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Christopher. That's appreciated. Now Maxim and Stephanie, are those old hands? Okay thank you. Let's - and Greg you're next.

Greg Shatan: Thank you. Greg Shatan for the record. I think it's - whether we do it as this point or some other point is obviously, you know, critical that we're able to parse between legal persons and natural persons because of the, you know, what has been represented to us as a differing requirements with regard to those two categories of entities. So it's, to my mind, you know, when we do it is I don't know if it's the most effective starting point but clearly when have to do it we might as well, you know, start thinking about it now.

And just in response to Christopher, since we're planning next gen RDS, whatever we implement is going to be well after GDPR is in place, which means obviously we have to plan for it but it's not that we have to kind of prioritize ourselves in a certain way. And in any case, for GDPR we have know both whether we're dealing with a legal or a natural person because that affects how you apply GDPR, and the last thing we want to do is to over apply a legal regime just because we haven't managed to tell the different between who the regime applies and who it doesn't. Kill them all and let God sort them is out is not a good theory. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. And Alex, you're next?

Alex Deacon: Yes I think Greg said what I wanted to say about Christopher Wilkins' (sic) comment there because I think, you know, our focus and our timeline will clearly take us long past, you know, the start of the GDPR. So I'm not too sure that we should let that dictate priorities.

But I did want to mention, you know, I think we tend to let - to run straight to kind of edge cases and gray areas, and those are important but I kind of like the idea of starting with debate and discussions on kind of the things that aren't, that are clearly can be determined as a legal person versus a natural person. And if we start kind of with what I think are hopefully simpler -- again, I'm an optimist -- we should be able to make some progress and then we can deal with the trickier cases in the gray areas after the fact.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alex. And next in the queue is Rod. I'm sorry. I'm determined, Kathy, to forget you.

Michele Neylon: Okay Kathy has the mic. I'm taking over from Chuck momentarily.

Kathy Kleiman: Thank you. The problem is that I'm not in the room to raise my hand so Chuck isn't seeing it.

Michele Neylon: Yes please put yourself in the room as well.

Kathy Kleiman: Physical rooms and virtual rooms. Okay, Kathy Kleiman. And the natural persons and legal persons is a distinction under European data protection law but of course we have to deal with global law. And in other countries that distinction doesn't hold. It's - the privacy rights go with the speaker, not the entity of the speaker.

So in the United States we have the right of anonymous or let's say private political speech, and the right goes whether you're an individual speaker or whether two or three or ten have gathered together. And this was created because speakers were being hunted down. It's actually rather chilling, Greg, that you say kill them all and let God sort them out.

The NAACP, which was an association of African Americans, the first chapter was founded right near my house, and the address had to be taken off the records, otherwise they would have been hunted down. All across the world

the addresses of mosques, synagogues, churches even now unfortunately, all legal persons are being taken off, directories are being taken off city maps. They shouldn't be hunted down because they're in the domain name system. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Kathy. And my apologies. You're absolutely right, I was focusing on Adobe too much there. But thanks for that input. Appreciate it. Rod?

Rod Rasmussen: Yes Rod Rasmussen again. To clarify my thinking on this is I think it's very important for us to go make these distinctions in legal - all these different types of things, and Kathy brings up a good point that different jurisdictions have different frameworks for this, it's not just legal versus natural, et cetera. So that's a - we actually need to look at that and get what that universe looks like.

And then I think we talked about it in the EWG as having frameworks around -- we may not call it framework -- but the idea that you would apply different local legal norms depending on where the registrant is, where the registrar is, those kind of things. We have this kind of matrix discussion. But I think getting the data elements as a meta set is the first step, then dividing up where - how those are treated is the second step.

And it should not take us a very long time to get the metadata, and I agree that we need to get to this quickly. That's why I suggest we do that because there's - probably shouldn't be much debate about that. It's really whether - how much you collect and how much you display. But let's make sure we know what the universe looks like first. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Rod. Susan?

Susan Kawaguchi: So I do agree with you, Rod, that, you know, all those data elements and datasets should be - we should really look those, but in my mind if an entity has self-identified as an inc, (unintelligible) (BH), not a nonprofit, I think we

could , you know, set those aside. Then it may take away some of the discourse we've had on, you know, on those data elements. And so that was one of my thoughts processes was that let's look at Facebook Inc.

You know, Facebook Inc. doesn't want a registration and I'm not longer with Facebook, but you know, no one - I did not register domain names as Susan Kawaguchi as the registrant and I registered it as Facebook Inc. or Facebook Ireland or, you know, whatever entity was appropriate. And that is the way entities and, you know, almost any size company is going to manage their assets is in the company name and not in an individual's name, and with role accounts in the contact points.

And so we know on a very high level that we cannot convey personal privacy rights to those entities. So it's a real - it is a subset of the universe that we're looking at but it may take away some of the pain we have felt with what are we collecting, who's looking at it, how are we displaying it if we can just focus on, you know, Facebook Inc. and what data elements does Facebook need in their or whatever, you know, XYZ Corp. in the record associated with the domain name to make sure that it's, you know, it works in the Internet.

So, you know, that was the purpose of sort of going this direction. There's going to be variables to all of it, but we do need to come to a point where we can just talk about the data elements without all of the other side issues, you know, being involved.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Rod. Follow up.

Rod Rasmussen: Thank you. Rod Rasmussen again. And I agree with you, Susan, on that. And I think I mentioned that earlier is that I want the capability for someone or some organization to put all the data out there if they want it, right? And I think that's important to know what that data may be.

And I'm going to disagree with myself from earlier just a second. But one of the things that we discussed in the EWG and if you take a look at some of the - I think some of the details went into various types of contacts and potentially new kinds of contacts that we don't have in today's Whois system, there may be fields when we look through this that people would want to add to the RDS type information, primarily I'm thinking commercial use, right?

There may be some sort of location information or some other kind of contact information that they would like to have published, and the system shouldn't preclude that. So we may want to actually look at that so there's kind of an opposite view of looking at this. The RDS is not just - it's not about restricting information for privacy concerns, which is important, but it's also - it is, you know, the thing that was designed 30 years ago is that adequate for some of the commercial use that is going on in the Internet today.

And there may be commercial opportunities for registries and registrars there as well so we shouldn't kind of just preclude things based on that. And we can have a different discussion about that but that's why I think data elements is really important to get first. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Rod. Chuck again. And I am going to poll the room in a little bit but let's hear - there's quite a few people in the queue. Let's hear them out and then we'll do a room poll. So I have next Volker.

Volker Greimann: Yes. Volker Greimann saying his name for the record. I'm not a big fan of differentiating the - between legal person and natural person at this point in time simply because I think that there's no such thing as legal person data or natural person data, it's the same data just that it belongs to either of these categories. So we first will probably have to define what data we actually want to connect at then how - the question will arise at a certain point how to assign it to either.

I think it's very difficult to differentiate between these. While some legal persons may self-identify by putting certain information in the organization fields, and I used to be that would be sufficient to differentiate, I have since learned that by looking at our own registrations that a lot of legacy registrations have people entering their own name in the organization field again, entering dashes, entering weird information there that they think might be beneficial to identifying them or might be funny. It's not as easy as saying there's something in the organization field to say that this is a legal entity.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Volker. Anything remote? Okay. Let's go to Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Chuck. Michele for the record and speaking as a member of the working group as opposed to vice chair or co-chair or anything like that. Just a couple of things that have come up in this discussion that I think we do really need to make clear. The commercial/noncommercial activity discussion, that was had in detail, in excruciating detail, I think many of us still bear the scars, during the PPSAI working group.

So I personally would feel incredibly uncomfortable. I would have felt that if I'm going to be scarred for life at least let it be that I don't have to reargue points that were argued ad nauseam and beyond. So I think that one is problematic. Oh sorry, PPSAI is the Proxy Privacy Services Accreditation -- and what was the I? -- issues, thank you. Sorry, in ICANN land we have acronyms for everything and we often forget what the hell the actual letters stand for.

I mean Volker's point about people putting stuff into the organization field, 100% agree. As a dirty, filthy registrar from Ireland, I have registrants who do the oddest things, including redrawing international boundaries. For those of you who aren't familiar, those - there was a bit of contention around a certain part of the island of Ireland so if you were of a certain political viewpoint, you might not decide that that part of the country is actually in a different country.

So I've got a ton of registrants who believe that Belfast is in the Republic of Ireland, sort of, which is kind of interesting.

On the organization bit, I - one thing I think here is that I think what we're trying - when we were discussing this on the leadership team, so I'm putting that hat back on sort of sideways but it's just kind of dangling off the back of my head, the idea was really to kind of look at something that we could actually at least have, you know, clear agreement or disagreement.

And I don't think anybody was suggesting that this distinction between legal person and natural person would be some kind of, I don't know, proxy for kind of identification in the real world or anything. So I mean it's down to I have chosen to identify myself as this, therefore this set of rules apply. I mean that's where we were kind of trying to come from. But I agree with all the points others have made that it might - it makes more sense to actually look at the data elements themselves.

Because I think from the leadership side, we're just - we're very conscious of the fact that we need to move things forward so we're trying to come up with something that at least will get you all talking and not talking about the godforsaken minimum data set. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. This is Chuck again. We've got several people in the queue. I'll ask you to be fairly brief. But let's try and get through the queue here. Maxim, go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. I think it's important to talk about design of data before we talk about the processes because we might come to the point where the different kinds of data should be handled differently. Like for example, we will place a station where the personal data should be stored in different locations than - yes, for example some political country demands that its personal data should be stored in - yes, the personal data of citizens should be stored within the boundaries of that particular country.

So it was one of the ideas why I recommended to have something like flag personal data or not, because data of companies it's open by definition and they - we don't have to protect it. We have to like deliver it to those who - yes, who wanted to access it without stepping out of a legal boundaries. And for fields marked as personal data, we might need different ways of protection of access, storage locations, things like that. And if you do not design data properly, whatever you build on the top might not be compliant with your later desires, just from a developer's point of view. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Maxim. I want to - I have a follow up for you. This is Chuck. The - and you may have assumed this or even said it in what you just shared, but am I correct that even in the case of a commercial entity there may be contact information that is personal data?

Maxim Alzoba: Yes. The clear example is some not very wise director use his like home address for correspondence or his mobile phone or, even going further, like he's so technologically advanced that he's using DNS server installed in his home and applied a geo tech to it. So all kinds of weird - people do all kinds of things, but it might lead to legal consequences formally. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Maxim. Alex and then Stephanie, and then I'm going to do a little poll.

Alex Deacon: Yes thanks. Alex Deacon for the record. So again, I think we're diving into the deep end here and focusing on the more difficult kind of edge cases and gray areas. And I don't think that's a great place to start. I think there will always be registrations associated with entities that are clearly legal persons and there will always be registrations that are clearly associated with natural persons, and I think we can make progress if we focus on those, you know, registrations that aren't ambiguous. And then we can figure out how to deal or - with the edge cases and some of the things that Volker mentioned and

Maxim mentioned perhaps after that. And again, in an attempt to make progress. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alex. Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: Thank you. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I'm not clear why we have to focus on this particular aspect at this time, and I'm not inviting a huge fight. I want you to get to your poll. But I'm thoroughly endorsing what Michele said. We had a long, protracted discussion of this in the PPSAI. It was sorted. That's a recent decision.

It would be truly awful if we had to fight that out. I mean I've got all my ammunition ready, as one does, and we can argue about it again, but it will take weeks and weeks of our time and it's such a recent decision that it just seems ridiculous to argue about that again now. Because, well, I won't give you the reasons because I'd be arguing about it, wouldn't I? Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: So, Stephanie, a clarification. You said you're not sure we should focus on this now. What is this?

Stephanie Perrin: The distinction between legal persons and natural persons and the ones in between.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...understanding. Thank you very much. Okay. Chuck speaking. And Rod has put a specific suggestion on the table, and the reason we're taking this time and we threw an idea out, we're not pushing the idea that we put forward. That's why we're spending this time right now. But Rod put forth a very specific suggestion that what we focus on next is the super data set that - and see if we can get some agreement in terms of what that is. We're going to

have to deal with all these other issues as we said, and I'll probably come back to Alex's suggestion too. But.

So what I'm going to ask right now for those in the room if you support Rod's suggestion as a next step, and by the way, it's what we will do in the rest of the meeting today, okay, if it takes the whole meeting. So if you support his suggestion, what I'd like you to do if you're in Adobe is...

Woman: Can you read what the question is?

Chuck Gomes: Sure. Rod, go ahead. I'll let you reiterate it. It was suggested that we state it one more time in terms of your suggestion. Since you made it, I'll let you suggest it.

Rod Rasmussen: Okay. Rod Rasmussen. I think you just said it is we're going to concentrate on the superset of data elements that may be included in any sort of collection and display in RDS.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Rod. I tried to. But okay. That's okay. Is anybody not clear on what the suggestion - if you'd just raise your hand if you're in the room, if you're not clear on what Rod's suggestion is. Alex?

Alex Deacon: Yes I guess I'm not clear. So focusing on the superset of all data? I mean how are we going - I guess I don't understand what that means. I'm sorry.

Rod Rasmussen: Rod Rasmussen again. So the - I guess focus is focus of the group, not focus on individual elements, if that's the confusion. But the idea is we have gathered in all the various input documents we have for this whole process, especially the EWG report, which I think there's a very nice table of potential data elements, all the, you know, the potential data elements that we've got in the universe so far of what could be in there.

And let's make sure that we are looking at ones we believe will be used in some form or capacity in RDS and get rid of ones that we think have no business being there, and then also have a discussion about potential ones that aren't there. The idea is determine your universe and then, you know, from there we can decide all this other - all these other things around what you collect, what you display, depending on various situations, and we need to determine what those situations are as a separate step.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Rod. Alex, go ahead, follow up.

Alex Deacon: That was helpful. So I was thinking the same thing. Let's determine - that makes sense. Let's determine our universe and then take it from there.

Chuck Gomes: Greg?

Greg Shatan: I think I was actually responding - I responded in the chat just that the PPSAI discussion is not germane in terms of trying to foreclose the discussion about the difference between legal and natural persons. But I think that we've kind of moved beyond that into the superset discussion. I'm happy to stay in the superset discussion. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. Stephanie is that a new hand? Susan?

Susan Kawaguchi: So I agree with Rod too that we should just look at the whole dataset but what we really need to keep in mind is we're looking at data sets, the data elements and we're not going to be discussing how those are used for natural person, legal person, you know, my mom, my, you know, my cat. We don't go there on the discussion because otherwise we'll be here for ten years longer before we have a set of data elements. So if we can all agree to that, then I'm on board.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, and I -- this is Chuck -- and I think that's right. We - we're going to have to get to those other things but remember that new rule we have is that we're

going to keep our focus relatively narrow so that we don't end up all over the place, understanding that we're going to get to those other places in our work in the future.

All right. So anybody else not clear on what the suggestion is? And let me be fairly concrete and, leadership team if you want to qualify what I'm saying please do, but in essence what we would do just to make this really concrete is that we would, after our break, which is going to happen in ten minutes or so, we would actually put up a slide that shows what this super dataset, data element set would look like and we'll talk about that and see have we missed anything, does this cover it, and explore that a little bit.

So that's really what we would do next in this meeting and spend as much time as we need talking about that super dataset and even see if we can come up with a tentative conclusion today with regard to what that super dataset is, not debating the individual elements and whether they're natural person data or legal person data, not getting into that discussion yet. So is anybody not clear what we're asking? Okay.

Let me look in the queue. Okay. So if you're supportive of that approach, would you, if you're in Adobe, put a green checkmark. If you're not Adobe, just raise your hand in the room and hopefully those who are dialing in remotely can - are in Adobe so that they can put their hands up. So go ahead and do that now if you're supportive of that approach. I'll give a chance for objections later.

But raise your hand if you're not in Adobe, put a green checkmark in your - in Adobe if you are supportive of that approach. Okay. Quite a lot of green checkmarks in Adobe and hands - put those hands up again please because I was looking in Adobe and was no - so I was several hands go up. You're supportive of that, okay.

Let's take the green checkmarks out, please. And if you would - if you are pretty strongly opposed to this approach, put a red X in Adobe or raise your hand in the room. Let's see if we have anybody that is strongly opposed to this approach. I'm not seeing any. Yes, that wasn't a red X. So I did see that in - from a remote participant. Okay anybody - so I'm going to conclude then that this is the approach we will take in the rest of this meeting today.

And on the break, (Lisa)'s already told me she will actually find some additional materials. We already have one slide that probably is a good place to start after the break, and we'll take this approach. And let me say thanks for the feedback. That's why the agenda was designed the way it was so that we could listen to the working group members in terms of how we approach this, and some very good feedback in that regard.

Now I think we probably have about five minutes before they're going to be ready for the break outside. Is there anything that anybody wants to ask or say before we do the break? Okay. Yes? Oh, Rod, sorry. I was looking at my screen.

Rod Rasmussen: Thanks, Chuck. Rod Rasmussen. Yes, I figured I'd just wave at you. So now that we've got that put in, I just want to put a little marker in for - because I have to go the SSAC meeting after the break so I'm going to drop this on you and walk out the door.

The - but the - one of the things I'm going to put a marker down for is that having a meta dataset figured out today or, you know, that would be awesome if it was today, but, you know, in the short period of time is great, you also need to have the capacity at some time in the future to introduce new or to remove data elements. So think about that too. It's not just - it's not set it once and forget it, it's a living document.

And we talked about that in the EWG report but that's also an important thing to think about within this context here is try and get things right now that have a process for addressing that in the future. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Rod. Chuck speaking again. And that could be one of our recommendations actually as it was in the EW report, like you said. And keep in mind that the work of this working group is iterative, so we may today or in the next week or next few weeks agree on what we think is this meta dataset but we may find three months down the road or six months down the road that oh we missed one, we may need to add. Again, that's why we're doing this in an iterative way. Did you want to add something, Rod?

Rod Rasmussen: Yes. Rod Rasmussen again. And to be helpful and constructive and give an example of what I'm talking about, I think one of the things we came up with in EWG was that people don't necessarily use e-mail to communicate, especially, I know there are not too many millennials in the room, but my kids hardly use e-mail, right, they use instant messaging or Facebook or something like that for their communications methodologies.

So when you're designing something, you want to take into account that communication methodologies may change. And if we're talking about contacts, you know, the technology - the way that people communicate today is vastly different than they did ten years ago, or even five years ago in some cases.

So five years from now there may be some new service, blah, blah, blah, blah that everybody's, you know, a billion people on the planet are using, I don't know what it'll look like, if I did, you know, I wouldn't be here, I'd be off trying to, you know, make that billion dollars doing it. But, you know, there are ways that we will be communicating that are not anticipated today that that is what I'm trying to drive at is thinking of being - having a flexible system and a way of doing things in the future. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Rod. And the key word is flexible, right? Things change very rapidly and probably will change more rapidly going forward. So certainly any recommendations the working group makes will need to be - have some flexibility and processes in place to deal with changes that occur.

Anything else before we break? Okay. Then we will take a break until 10:30 and reconvene them, and we'll have some new slides up to take this approach that we've decided on. Thank you very much. Enjoy the break.

END