

**ICANN Transcription
GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group
Tuesday 10 January 2017 at 1700 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group call on the Tuesday, 10 January 2017 at 17:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance may be found at:

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

The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-nextgen-rds-pdp-10jan17-en.mp3>

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you, Joy. Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening to all. Welcome to the Next Gen RDS PDP meeting on Tuesday, January 10 at 1700 UTC. In the interest of today there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants on the line, attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room so if you're only on the audio bridge today could you please let yourself be known now? All right thank you.

As a reminder to all participants please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I will turn the call back over to Chuck Gomes.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Michelle. And happy New Year to everyone. Hope you had good holidays and a good break from the RDS Working Group. And thanks for jumping in and filling out the latest poll. We have some good data

to go over today so we'll start off with that before getting into the main part of our agenda.

Does anyone have an update to your Statement of Interest? Does anyone have any comments on the agenda? Alan, go ahead. By the way, I did see your message just before the call so – but go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I would like to have that content of that message discussed under an AOB and hopefully presented by someone from the GNSO but if not I will do it. It's...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: So, Alan, I didn't have a – this is Chuck. I didn't have a lot of time to think about it. I've been aware of that particular issue happening in the GNSO Council for quite a while. But help me understand why we should discuss it here.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, I will be glad to. As you're all aware there is an RDS – was Whois – review that is being mandated – that is mandated by the bylaws that should have started several months ago. There was a proposal that the review be – have significantly reduced scope to limit it to just a review of whether the recommendations from the last review had been implemented, how well they have been implemented and where the new work be done to avoid discussing some of the similar issues to what we're doing here and in other activities and specifically to reduce the stress and drain on the community in having to staff what is likely to be a year-long very intensive review in parallel with this PDP going on.

It was largely accepted or not objected by anyone and I fully admit I'm the author of that proposal. The GNSO following discussions has now recommended a much wider review. And I think it's going to impact significantly on the people in this group and on the communities they

represent. And I think we should have an opportunity to say yes it's a good thing, we're willing to put up with the work, or come up with a statement saying this is going to be really problematic because it's going to impact our work as well as impact the individuals. So that's why I believe we should be talking about it.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Alan. Chuck again. So I understand that certain individuals may be impacted, and I guess all of us would in a sense because we have to track what the review team is doing and comment on it and so forth. But it's not clear to me that this – whether it's more restricted or less restricted will impact what we do. So but let me open it up and see if others think that we as a working group should weigh in on this. Obviously we didn't as a leadership team, have a chance to talk about this since that suggestion just came up today. But I'd like to hear from some others. Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks, Chuck. This is Susan Kawaguchi for the record. And, Alan, you know, I was one of the ones that was questioning the proposal to limit the scope. And I agree wholeheartedly that some of the scope should be limited and we should not have a Whois review team, or an RDS review team, that duplicates this work or completely, you know, makes the recommendation that would either derail this work or have two tracks going in two different directions.

What I did feel was, and, you know, I wasn't the only one, Keith Drazek and I worked on a – on language to propose a little broader Whois review team review – is that that just simply looking at what the Whois review team recommended and if those had been implemented – those recommendations had been implemented were, you know, and how they were just reviewing that – those elements wasn't sufficient. I think there's quite a few things that have happened in the Whois since the Whois review team was convened.

And so we drafted some language which maybe you've seen that on the GNSO Council thread, just to make sure that some other elements were

included. Also, as a former member of the Whois review team, I thought it was very important that the team that's put together, you know, has the power to decide what they're working on to a certain extent. So that's sort of the GNSO Council BC view.

But it, you know, I welcome any comments on the language. We haven't approved that yet, that probably will be approved next meeting. And, yes, we're way behind on the Whois review team or RDS team selection of candidates, but we're also just finally getting to the SSR review team candidates to. We're just behind.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Susan. This is Chuck again. Alan, before I jump back to you, let's let Holly jump in.

Holly Raiche: Look, thank you, Chuck. I absolutely agree with what Alan says. On the edit for the ALAC side if we're going to participate in these really important issues there are – we're participating in this because this is really critical as to a way forward. If we're doing a review with expanded terms of reference, you're literally asking for either double the work on the people who are doing this or additional ALAC people who may not have the time and the resources to do it.

So it is a resource issue, but I also would really support what Alan has said – sorry, Andrew has said in the chat, we're going down the same track and if we're doing a review and it's an expanded review, we're doing the same thing, we're doing it twice. You know, there's a lot of work on Whois and where we're going. We ought to be coming to some conclusions in this group and limiting the other so that in fact there's one way forward.

It just looks like an awful lot of duplication of work on particularly on ALAC where the resources are stretched. And frankly, it's going to be a strain on our resources and it's going to be a duplication of effort that I think is not necessary. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Holly. And so, Alan, please feel free to first say what you raised your hand for but a question I would like you to respond to is what do you think this working group should do? And is it in our charter to do that? But go ahead, say what you were going to say first please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. The issues that Susan raises are all quite valid, and there's little in the nine points that the GNSO has said the review should focus on that are not applicable somewhere. However, I do not think that our work has progressed enough for some of those things to be done. I think there is some overlap deciding on whether RDAP is a good protocol or not and is applicable I think is within our scope, not somewhere else. But I don't think we're at that stage yet based on what we're doing.

So I think the description of what is there is an absolutely great review that should take place closer to the end of our work. Right now, as Holly said, certainly from an At Large point of view, we have very few people who are really heavily knowledgeable on this and who are good candidates for working on this PDP and would be good candidates for a review team looking at this. And it's going to stretch things.

I don't know whether it is within our mandate as a GNSO PDP to make a comment or not, but it certainly needed to be brought to the attention of the people on this group because it is going to have an impact and that implicitly will have an impact, you know, if I end up volunteering – or if Holly, let's say, ends up volunteering for the PDP she's likely to disappear from here or at least certainly not be very present. And I think that's likely to be the case.

Other parts of the community may have far more people who are knowledgeable on Whois issues and can staff both operations, certainly parts of the community are going to have a really difficult time and that's going to reduce the quality of this PDP and the review. And that's of great concern to me, which is why I made sure this group was aware of it.

A lot of the initial comments that we should reduce the review of the PDP – of the review the – reduce the scope of the review – and when we were still in the accountability group we were trying at one point to say let's delay it and just not do it right now, a lot of those comments came from people in this group. So that's why I thought this should be brought back here at least to alert people to what's going if not take any action. Thank you. And I didn't mean to...

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: ...I didn't mean to shanghai the meeting at the start so my apologies on that.

Chuck Gomes: That's all right. Thanks, Alan. And you make a very good point and I think I want to reemphasize it. First of all, we have a few councilors in this group so certainly I encourage them to carry back discussion that came up here and the concerns that have been expressed not only verbally but in chat.

But more importantly, and I think this is the good point that you make, Alan, is each of us are members of certain groups and I encourage you as members of those groups to go back and encourage your respective groups to comment on this so that your councilors get word of this. And in the case of those in this group that don't have representatives on the GNSO, please use your liaisons to get that information into the Council.

Now my understanding is the action on this, and I looked at the agenda yesterday, is for the meeting on the 19th of January so there should be enough time for people to provide input into this and to the extent that you have concerns, and by the way, personally I'll say I've had the same concerns about duplication of effort so I don't want to come across like I don't have concerns there.

And I know already some people who have volunteered for the review team that are on this group. So there will be effort. That's good to a certain extent so that they can keep the review team aware of what's going on, where we're at and how far we have to go. So I think that's all very good.

Now you said something, Alan, though that concerned me. You said it's in our remit in this working group to decide whether RDAP is a good protocol. That concerned me a little bit. The standard setting community, the IETF, is – they're the ones responsible for establishing protocols. I think Alan – I mean, I think that comments have been made, I think Andrew even made a comment, this was many months ago now, that don't expect them to create another protocol. I think that's probably a reasonable expectation.

But that's just a side note in what you said, and I didn't want to – people to think that we're going to go back and revisit the RDAP protocol. Except the extent that it can be used to fulfill any recommendations that we make. So that's my own comments in that regard. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. No, I was not intending us to design protocols, heaven help us. But we are going to have to make a judgment as to whether the RDAP protocol satisfies whatever needs we believe must be incorporated into the Whois system and does it have the right capabilities, does it have to be enhanced, does it have some fatal flaw which will mean we cannot implement with what we are doing, I'm not predicting that.

You know, yes we can defer it to say that's part of the implementation team, but I think we need to – we will need to provide some guidance as to whether it is a reasonable base that should be used for the implementation or there's some fatal flaws that have to be addressed. And that is not very different from what has been put in, at least as I read it, in this similar scope.

By the way, Marika says it isn't on the Council agenda, it's already been decided. So we seem to have a difference of opinion on what the GNSO is doing. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Alan. Any other comments on this? Again, let me – and this is Chuck speaking – let me again encourage all of you who are concerned about this, and it's a legitimate concern, to communicate to your councilors and to your groups and to your liaisons and to provide input on this so that they have that input and that discussion.

And Susan, to the extent – in case it would be useful an excerpt of the transcript of this meeting could be made available to those who'd like to listen to the discussion and also look at the chat regarding this subject. So thank you, Alan, for bringing that up. And again, I hope all of you will provide input into the GNSO Council meeting through the channels that you have.

All right, let's go on then to Item 2 of the agenda and let's bring up the document that analyzes or that summarizes the results of the poll that was sent out in follow up to our last meeting on the 21st of December. And we'll go through that now.

So hopefully most of you have had a chance to look at the results. They were pretty clear results in my opinion. Not unanimous but strong. Notice Question 1, which was simply to confirm the continued deliberation on the purpose of thin data. And let me comment, we'll comment – several of us will comment on this more because it came up in your comments for those of you who responded to the survey.

But we're not restricting ourselves to thin data in the long term; we're just doing that to make it easier to start our deliberations. We will move beyond thin data. So please don't think that we're doing that to exclude consideration of thick data. Everybody needs to understand that. A lot of the comments that were made in the poll indicated that some people didn't understand that. So

you'll probably hear us say that several times today to make sure you understand that.

But there was strong support, as you can see, out of the 34 people that responded to this question, 30 agreed that we should continue deliberating on thin data for now as a start. And there were 4 people or about 12% that said no. Now, the conclusion that I draw from the results on this question is that the working group should continue deliberating on the purposes of thin data. So I think the numbers are strong enough that is certainly rough consensus. Okay?

Now, that said, we want to talk about some of the comments. Now you have scrolling capability. Okay. And so you may want to scroll down so you can see most of the comments. I don't know if you can see it all on one screen, depends on your monitor probably. But there are 14 comments that were submitted on this one. And we're not going to talk about all of them but, we're going to talk about a few.

So Lisa, would you – why don't you talk about Comment 6 and 12. I know you had some thoughts there and it might be helpful for the whole group if we talked about those.

Lisa Phifer: Sure, Chuck. This is Lisa Phifer for the record. In reviewing the comments that were posted on Question 1, 6 and 12 jumped out to us because they both seemed to really question the working group's decision to start by focusing on thin data suggesting that perhaps that's too narrow a scope.

As Chuck said, understanding that this – starting with thin data is merely intended as a way to seek common ground on something small and then work more broadly from there. And also just keeping in mind what we're doing is going to be an iterative process so any decisions that we do make on very narrow points should not be assumed to apply more broadly.

The question that came to mind for us is whether there's actually any harm done by starting with this thin data focus. And so in a moment I'd like to give an opportunity for anyone that did feel like there was some harm done in starting with this narrow focus, give them a chance to further elaborate on why.

The other comment I just want to briefly touch on is Comment 4. We noticed that Comment 4 equated thin data with bare minimum requirements, and we did want to, you know, really clarify that thin data as we're working on it right now, is the definition of thin data, defined or at least identified in the thick Whois PDP report. And that might or might not end up being a bare minimum set. So please be aware that we could get to the bare minimum set, but that's not necessarily what we're talking about when we're talking about thin data today.

Chuck, back to you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Lisa. This is Chuck. And let me just pause and say does anybody want to respond to the question that Lisa asked? Does anyone think that there's any harm done in starting out with thin data? Please raise your hand if you think there is or put something in the chat. Okay, then let me comment on several comments, the comments 8, 10 and 11.

The – and Comment 8, if you look at the last sentence, says, "I don't think that we need to define any illegitimate purposes for this data." That's fine as a thought there. And – but a question that I have is – is there anybody that thinks that there isn't such a thing as illegitimate uses or purposes of RDS information? I wanted to make sure that in reading some of the comments it wasn't clear to me if you look at the last comment on Number 11 it says, "There is no reason for ICANN to try to list what constitutes illegal uses which may actually vary by jurisdiction."

I think I agree with what is intended there if I understand it correctly, that, yes there are governments and regional organizations that make the laws and define what's legal. And certainly there's no intent for us as a working group or ICANN as an organization, if I can stretch my role and speak for them, to make laws and define what's illegal. But certainly we can identify issues that are illegal and certain jurisdictions and some may be across the board. And we don't want to facilitate those purposes to the extent that we can influence that.

Comment 10 says, "No purpose should ever been necessary at all to view thin data so continuing to deliberate on it implies that some purposes are legitimate and some are not." Again, that one is the one that jumped out at me and the Expert Working Group also accepted the fact that there are some illegitimate uses.

And so I hope we're not in disagreement on that and that the concerns here are mainly that it's not ICANN's role or our role is to define law. And certainly we're not qualified to do that. So that's true. But I would like to open it up to see if there are any – is any further discussion on these particular comments and on this theme. Jim, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: Thank you, Chuck. Jim Galvin for the transcript. An observation I want to make about 10, since you called it out, Chuck, you know, starting off that no purpose should ever be necessary at all to view thin data, I think there's an important assumption in that phrase that need to be – that I want to call out and not let it be an assumption. I think it needs an evaluation.

If you take that at face value it suggests that there is public data and its purpose then is in fact to be public so that it's always accessible. And I think that's still a topic of open discussion, you know, the fact that we collect thin data there should be a reason for collecting it and I think we need to separate display from our reason for collecting. The fact that we might have it does not at all mean that it should be generally available.

I think that's separate decision point. And that concerns me with Item 10. It seems to suggest that automatically, you know, there's public information and it's generally available. And I just want to make sure that that's a topic of discussion for us and will be properly evaluated in the context of our total solution. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jim. And I'm glad you brought that up because in going through the comments, and I went through all of them myself, it was obvious to me that a lot of people aren't up to speed on the full context of everything that we're doing. And I know why that's the case so I'm not being critical. But we've been very clear in the last few weeks that all we're talking about right now is collection. Now some people don't like the word "collection," and that's fine.

Whoever collects it, whether it be registries or registrars, or if we view it as some purpose of the RDS is to collect that information, I'm less concerned about that. But we're not talking about display now, we're not talking about access now. We're going to get there. And that's going to be harder.

So Jim is absolutely right, we've got to get to that point. But right now all we're talking about is collection and to keep our task. If we cover too much at once it'll make it much more difficult. We have enough differences of opinion without that.

So let me stop there and go to Alan.

Alan Greenberg: My comment may be out of line also. I was simply going to point out that there is some data – thin data that for domains that are in the zone file, are public data. We cannot stop them from being accessed. There's other parts of the data such as the registrar of record, which is not in the zone file and therefore is not necessarily something that is publicly viewable.

And of course there's a vast number of domains that are registered and available through Whois today that are not actually in the DNS. So we have to differentiate between those various things when we have those discussions. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Alan. And that's a point that was made by several people. I think it was on the meeting on the 21st but it could have been the one before that. But I'm glad you brought it up again so that people that missed that hear it.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: And so...

Alan Greenberg: Apparently I'm one of them.

Chuck Gomes: That's all right. It's going to be impossible for all of us, me included, to keep up on everything, okay? So there's going to need to be a certain amount of repetition just to keep us all up to speed. But to the extent that all of us can stay up to speed, that'll be helpful too. So that's no problem. Any other discussion on the – on Question Number 1 and the results?

Okay, let's go down – you want to scroll down to Question Number 2 and we'll talk about the results for that and some of the comments as well. The question 2 was to confirm the requirement that every thin data element have at least one purpose. Okay?

And the yes answer on that was again very strong. You can see the figure 93.75%, 30 people out of 32 that responded. But actually in – and Lisa may talk about this – when she analyzed the comments she found that probably it was more like 88% based on comments that some people shared. But regardless, the conclusion I would come to on that one is that every thin data element should have at least one legitimate purpose. And there seemed to be very strong agreement on that.

That said though, I'm going to ask Lisa to take the lead in discussing some things that were said in the comments and then we'll open it up for the whole group to respond or add additional comments.

Lisa Phifer:

Thanks, Chuck. This is Lisa Phifer for the record. In looking at the comments on this particular question, we noted that Comment 4, 8, 9 and 10, they all seemed to reflect some level of discomfort or disagreement with Option A. And that's what Chuck was referring to that the actual level of support for Option A is probably more like 88% because roughly 30 out of 34 people that took the poll actually supported that option. That's still a clear majority but we wanted to drill into these comments for a little bit – a little bit more.

And it seemed to us that in looking at those comments, 4, 8, 9 and 10, they all expressed some level of discomfort with how legitimate purposes might be used in policies. So they made some assumptions perhaps about what a legitimate purpose would mean in policy in the future.

And we thought it was important to get on the same page that having identified legitimate purposes in the beginning of this Phase 1 will not tie this working group's hands on policy making during Phase 2. It's in Phase 2 where this working group will define specific policies that depend on purposes. And we've talked about some examples already in today's call that there might be access rules, there might be requirements for authentication, there might be terms of service that dealt with some of the purposes that are not desirable.

There might be registered rights to opt in or out of a given purpose. All of those things are still on the table when we get to policy making. Just having identified a purpose as being legitimate doesn't necessarily imply a decision on those policies. So let's keep that in mind as we move forward and look at what purposes we might consider legitimate for collection.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. And I'm glad you added that last comment there on collection. Again, I hope – hopefully everybody by now understands that the fact that we're identifying and supporting some purposes, and we're going to talk about some specific ones one by one today, doesn't mean that we're going to support access to that information, certainly not necessarily public access or maybe no access. We're going to have to deliberate on that as we go.

So for right now all we're talking about some purposes for collection. We will deliberate later whether we think there should be some access to those and whether they should be displayed publicly etcetera, or not. So any comments on the results of Question Number 2 or anything that Lisa said? Keeping in mind that we will have the task in Phase 2 of developing policies to fulfill the requirements we define in Phase 1 so if we get to that point keeping in mind that we need a GNSO approval before we move from Phase 1 to Phase 2, then we will actually be developing policies to implement the requirements.

Okay, going then to Question 3, if you want to scroll down for the results there. And there were eight comments, I think, on Question 3, which was confirm every existing thin data element has at least one legitimate purpose for collection. Again, the results were very strong in yes with three people or 9% saying no.

And so the conclusion from those results that I made was that every existing thin data element does have at least one legitimate purpose for collection. Okay? Emphasis on collection.

The – so that said, the – I want to start off some comments – comment on the comments, some of my thoughts on the comments. And I want to call your attention first of all to Comment Number 2, but also look at Comment 6 and 7 in conjunction with that.

The Comment 2 says – I'm going to read it so that – so not to quibble but the entity collecting the data or generating it is the registrar or registry or there's

some subcontracted resellers and actors, not the RDS. This is getting back to the use of the word “collection.”

Now let me point out first of all, that the word “collection” is used – is in our charter, okay, whether you agree it’s the best word or not, we can quibble on that. But the – and whether it’s the registrar or the registry or a reseller that collects some of that information originally, some of us think that it will be collected as part of the possible policies that are developed for implementing them and put into maybe an RDS system. But don’t – let’s not get hung up on the word “collection” please. That’s not going to be very fruitful I don’t think.

So if you don’t like it, I’m sorry, try to bear with us on that. It is a word that’s used in our charter and in the task that we have before us. So you can see Comment 6, the collection of or more specifically the generation, creation of, I’m okay with those words too. They’re not used like collection is our charter but that’s okay.

Those items being described as thin data elements is a necessary function in the role of registries and registrars. Whether that needs to be further collected into an RDS is something I’m not completely sure of. Well, again, I think we’re mainly arguing terminology here. Right now we’re going to use the word “collection” because it is in our charter and that’s one way of waiting for a few weeks before we get into access and display. So bear with us as we use that term.

And you can see 7 also says this is worded confusingly. Shouldn’t – and at the end there, we shouldn’t be judging who has a legitimate purpose and who doesn’t. Well, I don’t think we’ve started talking about who has or who needs access. We will get there but right now we’re not there. So let me stop there.

And I want to let Lisa jump in maybe to add a few thoughts on this if she has any.

Lisa Phifer: Lisa Phifer for the record. One of the things that struck me about this set of policies – or policies, excuse me, this set of comments was that they all really focus on divining an RDS system and what data might go into an RDS system. But it's really important to understand that the scope of this PDP is actually RDS policy in its entirety. So we can't make an assumption that today's contracts that require registrars and registries to collect and then ultimately provide Whois data that they'll all stay in place.

That's the job of this PDP is actually to look at that entire scope of policy and determine whether it's sufficient and if not what changes to recommend to the policies or to provide brand new policy framework. So we aren't actually limited to looking at the design of a specific directory service. We are supposed to be looking at the policies that surround that directory service, whether it's Whois today or a next generation service.

The other thing that I wanted to just briefly touch on is in Comment 1 there was a suggestion that the person who provided the comment needed to see a little bit more detail about real life examples and processes that use the data. And I think that just recalling back to what we did in the August timeframe, that we have a set of example use cases that do use some of this data. And as we get to Agenda Item 3, we can possibly use those example use cases that we already came up with as a way of looking at the roll that some thin data elements play in certain purposes.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Lisa. Let me open it up for comments from anybody on the call. Yes, Mark.

Mark Anderson: Thank you, Chuck. This is Mark Anderson. I guess, you know, listening to the description or the comments in – on Question 2 and Question 3, got me thinking a little bit. And I think of a use case of mother's maiden name. A registrar may collect mother's maiden name of the registrant in order as one of the means of validating that the registrant is who they say they are. It's a, you know, a validation, you know, it's a common validation mechanism, right?

And, you know, as such the collection of that data has legitimate purpose. But should, you know, your mother's maiden name, should that data be considered part of RDS? You know, I don't think so. And I think that's kind of the point that comments, you know, I think it was 2, 6 and 7, I think that's sort of the point that they were trying to get at or at least that was my takeaway is that there's maybe, you know, there's some data that will be collected by various actors here that really has no part in an RDS service.

And that was just sort of, you know, what I was thinking as I was listening to the conversation and the comments around there. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Mark. Good example. And understand that when we start deliberating on specific data elements, and we're going to start with the thin ones first, which wouldn't include mother's maiden name, but we'll get there and we'll need to cover that and we'll need to make some decisions. Hopefully we can reach rough consensus at least on whether such things should even be collected as part of the RDS, whether a registrar collects it or not.

And as I think all of us know, there are some cultures that specifically use the mother's maiden name and – in their naming processes. So good point, Mark. And we're going to have to make those decisions. We're not there yet, but we will have to make those decisions on specific data elements as we move forward. Any other comments or questions? Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks, Chuck. Can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: I can. And I'm happy.

Stephanie Perrin: Wonderful.

((Crosstalk))

Stephanie Perrin: Yes. I just wanted to – and I don't want to go off on a big tangent on this, but as we have noted this morning, it's a constant process of combing out those of what we ought to be narrowly addressing in our discussions here. And one of the problems that I think behests us is that from a data protection perspective at least, what the registrar or their resellers do on behalf of the consumer or end user falls into two categories.

One, the category that we are working on, namely what ICANN tells the registrar or their representative to do with registrant data. And two, what they do as independent business persons for whatever services they're offering, including hosting and (RFP) and proxy services, and all the rest of it, that is separate.

And I think that Mark's comment right now illustrates exactly how separate that is and should be. E-authentication mechanisms we bring in have to be narrowly focused on what is required for ICANN's purposes. And so I don't know – that information is not clear in the existing RAA or not as clear as I would like it to be. And possibly it might be worth documenting that distinction a little more fully so that we don't keep coming back on it. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Stephanie, I want a little more clarity there. This is Chuck. Documenting what distinction are you – what are you saying?

Stephanie Perrin: There is a distinction between what ICANN tells registrars they must gather and must escrow and must provide in the Whois in the RAA, so that is the collection instrument for the purposes of ICANN; and then there are the individual policies that registrars as business people have for all of their various services that they provide to end users. And sometimes I think these things get blurred.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: No, I agree with you that there is a distinction. I'm not sure how we document it, that's more what I was pursuing. But to the extent that we need to let's keep that in mind as we continue moving forward. The – when we – especially when we're focusing on the privacy and data protection requirements that we need to focus on and make sure those are satisfied it'll be important that those – those may impact things that registrars and registrars do, depending on what policy recommendations we end up making.

Now just to – I'm going to take a little side step here to help everybody see where we're going in the next – in the near term. We've decided we're going to focus on thin data first and there seems to be strong support for that. And so we're not going to just focus on the users and the purposes, we're going to jump ahead with thin data and look at the thin data elements and then we're going to go from there, still working with thin data, and start looking at the privacy and data protection questions related to those.

So one of the questions hopefully in the next few weeks we'll get to is do – are existing systems adequately address the data protection and privacy issues? And we'll do that first with thin data, okay, and remember we committed to kind of doing an iterative approach that Lisa referred to earlier in this call. We're going to be doing that in the next few weeks as we just focus on thin data looking at users and purposes and data elements and data protection and privacy on thin data elements.

So I just want to give people a – take an opportunity with what Stephanie said that that's where we're headed in the next few weeks so that we don't just focus on one of the three primary questions that we're looking at.

That said, and I'm talking too much, I apologize, Alan, it's your turn.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. There is no doubt that we continually confuse what registrars or their agents collect on behalf of ICANN at the request of ICANN and that they do themselves. I wish we would stop doing that. What registrars collect to run their businesses, which is not – which never was in the Whois and is not likely to be in the RDS, is completely out of our scope.

The only intersection could be if ICANN gives a requirement without being specific. So if we require that the registrar be able to positively identify a registrant and the registrar can then choose fingerprints or local ID numbers of whatever, then there may be some – some intersection. But in general, as long as we are giving specific information on what to collect then we are looking only at what is in the RDS or is likely to be and not things that are being used to run their personal business.

Nobody wants the credit cards numbers to be in the RDS. And let's not confuse – let's not obfuscate by adding other things that are in a similar vein into our discussions. Thank you. Our discussions are complex enough as it is.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. Stephanie, your turn.

Stephanie Perrin: I regret to prolong this but unfortunately the data retention requirements are vague enough that they may be seen to be capturing data that the registrars and their agents collect, use for business requirements. And in any case were I a registrar, I would have a hard time dissecting the metadata that is requested under the RAA.

So as long as the RAA is in scope, which I believe it is, we are stuck with a certain gray area there and we just have to skirt around it in my view. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Stephanie. And keep in mind that when we get to the end of our task, assuming that we recommend some policies in Phase 2 and implement

them in Phase 3, the RAA and the Registry Agreements will probably look a little different based on the recommendations that get approved. So we're going to have to look at all of that.

Holly, your turn.

Holly Raiche: Yes, I think I'm going to clarify what Stephanie was saying, I think and maybe respond to Alan. And that is that we're really only concerned with ICANN, with its contractual requirements for both collection and then sometime down the track, but not now, what has to be public. This is not about what the registrars collect for their own business purposes.

But at the end of the day if we are looking at a collection principle, we are asking to what extent is the sort of information necessary or not. And that is part of the basis for which we as dealing with ICANN policy are going to be asking and that's the reason we're looking for it. So of course there's going to be other data, different data, that is collected for business purposes. We're not interested in that data insofar as it's not part of the RAA or considered part of RDS data. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Holly. And I want to encourage – this is Chuck – so I want to encourage people to certainly be aware of the RAA and the Registry Agreements and their current requirements, but like Lisa said earlier on, we're starting from a clean slate, okay, if we recommend policies, they could change a lot of that. And assuming they get approved by the Board anything that we recommend, then it would – so that – let's be aware of that because we can learn things from what's there now and what's being done now properly and improperly.

And but that's where we're headed. The possibility of creating policies that will change a lot of that. And hopefully make it better from everybody's perspective even though we come from a lot of different perspectives on that.

Let's go now to Question 4, so if you'll scroll down on your screen to the results for Question 4. Once again, we have pretty strong results, 91% versus about 9% said yes. Each of the EWG identified purposes listed above apply to at least one thin data element. Now we won't spend too much on this, we're going to – Lisa is going to talk a little bit about one particular purpose that the EWG identified that one person in Comment 3 identified maybe as an exception there. And we'll discuss that a little bit.

But we're talking about the table of EWG purposes that correlated to the thin data elements that we're focusing on right now. And so the conclusion I came to with these results was that the EWG identified purposes apply to at least one thin data element. And again, one person in the comments I think at least identified domain name control as maybe an exception there from that person's point of view, but we're going to talk about that now. And let me turn it over to Lisa on that.

Lisa Phifer: This is Lisa Phifer for the record. Yes, as Chuck said, when we looked at the seven comments that were provided in support of Question 4, really only one of those, Comment 3, really seemed to argue against a particular purpose that was listed above and that was domain name control. And that person didn't seem to be arguing what the purpose per se but that it wasn't a purpose that needed to be satisfied by a Whois or RDS system.

And so we can talk about that as we move forward to our next agenda item and begin to deliberate on purposes, we can deliberate on domain name control and talk further about that perspective.

And just leaping a head a little bit to Question 5 which was an open ended question asking whether there were any additional purposes that people felt needed to be considered for thin data or perhaps rationale for why there shouldn't be purposes for thin data, what jumped out to us is in Question 5 Comments 1, 5, 6 and 8, they all suggested possible additional purposes related to legitimate investigative purposes that are not criminal related to

intellectual property rights enforcement, consumer protection and risk mitigation and consumer trust and verification.

What we'd like to do is consider all of those as we turn to our next agenda item and start looking at potential purposes for collection of thin data and how those purposes apply to thin data. So what we have done in the handout for today's meeting is incorporate those four additions that were suggested in Question 5 as part of our list of purposes to be discussed further.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Lisa. And before we jump ahead then to Agenda Item 3 – I think it's 3, let's see – yes, okay, oh no there's one more thing I want to cover before we leave the poll results and that is that I think it's appropriate, so I'm going to suggest that we add the results from this poll to the key concepts document on our deliberation working draft so that we keep a record of the conclusions that we're reaching, at least rough consensus on, and that certainly seems to be the case on these today.

So I will open it up certainly if there's any more discussion on the results or – and if there are any objections to adding these results to the key concepts document that is the live document we're working on as a means of documenting our progress. And that's Section 2.1.2 of the – of that document. Any comments, questions, disagreement with doing that? Okay.

So let's go then to Agenda Item 3 and let's bring up the document that was distributed a little bit before this call I think yesterday, and what we're going to do here is take a look at each of the purposes for thin data, each of these purposes apply to some of the thin data elements. Now take a look at this table please, you can see the first column has the purpose identified, domain name control is shown first and then technical issue resolution and so on.

Those are all – the first group of purposes, I think it's on the first two pages, are all purposes from the EWG report. And then the others, and some of them overlap with purposes that people said in their comments. And the last

two specifically we took from the comments but they also can be found in the EWG report and in there.

Now the second column lists tasks associated with the – that particular purpose like domain control. The third column then lists related thin data elements that might be used for domain name control, in the case of the first one. And then use cases are listed in the last column. And you'll recognize this information from the EWG report, but we're going to use it the same pattern, the same format, for any additional purposes that we talk about with regard to thin data and then of course later on thick data.

So if there's any questions on the way this information is laid out please feel free to bring them up but we're going to start by talking about domain name control as a possible purpose. And I'm not going to read what you can read yourself. But I hope you will glance through that – the tasks and also the thin data elements as well as the use cases for domain name control right now. Lisa, your turn.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. Lisa Phifer for the record. I just wanted to clarify, the fourth column here, the example use cases, although the EWG did of course develop some use cases, the ones that are listed here are actually the ones that this working group, the PDP working group, developed this summer. And what I did is populate the fourth column by linking to the use cases that we went over in August and early September I believe it was related to each of these purposes. So that's not EWG material but actually links to the material developed by this working group.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks for setting me straight there. Sorry for miscommunicating that. And everyone should realize that this document is on the wiki, you'll see it linked in our agenda for today. And so if you want to go back and look at – so you can see how some of our work, this is a good example of where some of the work – and I know it seems like we're taking forever and we're going at a slow pace, but now we're starting to see where some of the work that we did in the

past year is starting to tie in with what we're doing now. And hopefully we'll see more and more of that as we continue to proceed.

So does anybody have any questions about the format of this table? Okay. Then, let's talk about domain name control and especially since at least one person questioned whether that was a purpose for some of the thin data. Take a look at those thin data elements there that certainly I think the EWG thought was – were elements that were needed for domain name control and were legitimate purpose.

I'd especially like anyone who thinks that – agrees with the person or maybe is that person who didn't think that these are purposes for the thin data elements, I'd love to understand that not for me but for the whole group so that we can focus on this. Is domain name control a legitimate purpose for the thin data elements listed there? Or if you think it's not for any of those which ones? And why?

Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. The only one I think there is questionable but is really a matter of semantics is the name servers because that's not used to control the domain name but is used to implement the domain name as it were. So it's clearly necessary for something, whether domain name control is the right title under which it should be listed one could question, I don't really care to be honest. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Alan. Someone else. Could we leave out name servers on that one?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Who is speaking? Go ahead, Daniel.

Daniel Nanghaka: Yes, it's Daniel for the record. One thing is that if I look up the domain name control, especially in reference to (unintelligible) servers, I don't think the DNS servers should suggest as I commented on Question 5 (unintelligible) whether this information is public information. In case you're restricting the transfer of the domain then it is the (unintelligible) of the registrant to control the domain transfer. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Daniel. Alan, I'm assuming that's an old hand. So are – can I assume that there is support for domain name control as a purpose for thin data? Is there anybody that disagrees with that?

Daniel Nanghaka: Daniel here for the record here.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Daniel Nanghaka: I think – I support domain name control as a reference to thin data. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Okay. So I'm not hearing anybody disagreeing with that. Now, as always we'll confirm and whether we can do it in one question or item by item, depends on how far we proceed today. But I'm – looks like we have a decision point here with regard to domain name control. Certainly no one on the call, and we'll give people that aren't on the call a chance to chime in as well after the meeting. There doesn't seem to be any disagreement on that as a purpose for thin data.

Now domain name control may have – be a purpose for some thick data too but we're not talking about that now. All right, the – so the – going to the technical issue resolution. Take a look at that. And I'm going to – we're going to end this with the same question is there anybody that doesn't think that – and you can see the kind of things that are involved with technical issue resolution there and in particular the domain name and name servers are flagged as related elements for technical issue resolution.

Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I would argue that expiration date is in that category also. The prime problem is the domain name doesn't work, oh, because it's expired.

Chuck Gomes: Oh I see what you're saying, okay. So anybody object to adding expiration date there? No objections to that. Any other observations on technical issue resolution?

Alan Greenberg: If I may interject...

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Alan Greenberg: ...Roger in the chat said status and I tend to agree on that one also because status can also affect whether the name resolves or not.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, very similar argument like you just made, right Alan? So any objections to adding the domain name status? Registration statuses, okay. Good. And I'm pausing intentionally so that we give people a chance to think. Jim, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: So Jim Galvin for the record. And I'm just sitting here wondering, I mean, you know, technical issue, domain name control, that seems a technical context. I guess in general terms I'm just wondering why the same data that you need for control wouldn't be appropriate for a technical issue. I mean, why not list really the same set of things and have them all? If you think you need them for control why wouldn't they be something you would need for resolution? Just putting that out there. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Good point, Jim. Let's let Lisa jump in.

Lisa Phifer: Lisa Phifer for the record. I thought it might be helpful to just mention why these were two separate purposes in the EWG report. Technical and issue resolution is intended to be, you know, the broader set of technical issues that might arise with use of a domain name on the Internet. And that includes, you know, resolution failures, but it's not about the registration itself, whereas domain name control is really all about registering the domain name, updating the registration, maintaining it, renewing it and so forth. So it potentially involves different parties, not necessarily different data, but different parties. And that's why the purposes were separated in the list in the EWG report.

Chuck Gomes: But, Lisa, this is Chuck. Even with that distinction, if you're dealing with Website functional issues, which is one of the things there in the second column for technical issue resolution, you probably – you may have to contact the registrar, right?

Lisa Phifer: Not necessarily.

Chuck Gomes: Well I didn't say necessarily but you might, is it a possibility that you might have to contact the – I'm not saying you'd have to in every instance. I'm kind of defending Jim's point. But please argue with me and if you think I've got it wrong. Is it possible that you might have to contact the sponsoring registrar to resolve a technical issue?

Daniel Nanghaka: Chuck, can I say something? Daniel...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Sure. Who is speaking?

Daniel Nanghaka: Daniel.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, Daniel, okay. Sorry, I didn't hear enough to...

((Crosstalk))

Daniel Nanghaka: ...connectivity issues. But one thing is that name resolution is taking place at the registrar because the registry requests that a certain name server delegated. So in case the registrar does not authenticate the resolve the transfer, then it's not going to happen and that is going to call for domain – for the domain name control. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Any thoughts on that? Now I don't know how important it is for us to specifically list or even decide exactly which related thin data elements are – should be listed in this table. I suppose the more accurate the better, but at the same time I'm not sure we gain a lot by being too precise. But I welcome people to disagree on that. Jim, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: Thank you, Chuck. Jim Galvin for the transcript. To speak to your comment there, Chuck, about why to be specific about what's there, I mean, I don't know that we need to spend a great deal of time now but ultimately when we get around to deciding that the list of purposes are actually valid purposes and they are to be allowed, then you can imagine down the road you're going to be creating, you know, some set of credentials, you know, either a set of credentials or a hierarchy of credentials or whatever to determine, you know, which elements you're going to get at if the information is not generally public, if we decide it's going to be controlled.

And once you head down that path then it is important to be precise about what's exposed in that context and what's not. So we may not have to make the decision now but it is worth noting I think that, you know, maybe – I assume, Chuck, there's an opportunity to adjust these list of elements, you know, further down the road. I do think that there's significant overlap between technical issues and domain name control. That distinction may not be relevant down the road. I appreciate that we keep it for now because the EWG made that distinction.

And, you know, my only motivation for saying – having the same set of elements there is just to sort of press this discussion a bit. Maybe we don't have to solve it right now but we should make a note about the potential for expanding the list of elements there probably even a potential of combining these two things at some point down the road when we get that far. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jim. Appreciated. This is Chuck again. And when we get to looking at specific data elements in terms of being in the RDS, in terms of whether it's displayed publicly or whether it's given access on a controlled basis, we're going to have to look at the specific purposes at that point in time. So, you know, I suppose it would be helpful if we could identify them now but we may not need to spend too much time at this point unless people think it'd be better to do it now. And I'm looking for guidance from the rest of you in that regard.

So the – should we – are there any elements in domain name control, any of the thing data elements, that anyone would not include in technical issue resolution? Or would it be better to combine those two even though the EWG dealt with them separately and used different definitions? I suspect at this time it's – I'm leaning a little bit against combining them not because that would be wrong but rather because just, you know, keeping the continuity in terms of being able to find things and correlate them between the EWG report, between what we're doing and other documents that we'll be relating.

So I think as long as we understand that there, like Jim said, that there's probably a lot of overlap there, we're probably okay the way it is. Does anybody disagree with Jim that the domain name control elements could be duplicated in the technical issue resolution? Okay, so we could duplicate them there I think.

Anybody have an objection to this particular purpose, technical issue resolution as a valid purpose for thin data elements? Maybe all of them, okay. All right. So another decision point there.

Domain name certification, again I'll let you read the tasks associated with that and domain name and name servers. Jim, I'm going to come back to you because you raised the issue for – on the first two. But as I begin to look at these, I mean, is it possible that all of the thin data elements may be needed at some point for any of these purposes? Jim, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: Okay, so Jim Galvin for the record. So I'll make a comment for promoting some discussion. I would assert that we should consider that domain name certification if that there is about issuing certificates which is what it sounds like there, that's not a valid purpose of data because I mean, the process today for getting a certificate, if you're going to get a certificate which is I'll use the phrase "high value" to reflect the fact that as a client who wants a certificate your obligation is to submit appropriate documentation to the certification authority and the certification authority, you know, has to validate that documentation by whatever means that it wants to.

I think that we should ask ourselves is it our obligation in this particular context, the ITN community registration context to support that industry in doing that job? They have other means of validating data. So I think that answers your question about whether or not this should even be included. I think it's a fair discussion to have whether it's our obligation to support that step because there's certainly many other means to perform that action and they're already done today. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Jim. Now I'm going to stir up some controversy on that one. So please don't take this personal, but couldn't we make an argument like that for most any use that we have no obligation to do it? We're going to have to decide I think what uses we want to support and we think are valid and not.

Should we eliminate certification authorities and accept, here's where I'm going to get into trouble, trademark management?

You know, I'm not – I'm not suggesting a position, I'm just trying to challenge your argument there, Jim. Go ahead.

Jim Galvin: So Jim Galvin for the record. I'll actually agree with you, Chuck. In fact, I would like to promote that discussion because I agree with you. I think that a case can be made that the only valid purpose of data is exactly those first two things, that all the rest of this are not valid purposes of data. I think a case could be made in that direction.

Now I'm not necessarily suggesting that's where we need to land, but I think one of the things that's interesting is that we have gotten to this place today for a variety of different legacy reasons. And since we're starting from a clean slate I think it's appropriate to ask these questions and to talk about them and look at the positives and negatives and actually make a real decision about what our responsibilities may or may not be rather than just inheriting them. So actually I agree with you, Chuck, and I welcome your provocative questions because I want to support them and I'd like to speak to those issues. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jim. And look at Lisa's comment in the chat, "Are certificates and DNS space validation of them required for secure, stable operation of the Internet?" That's a good question. And note the support for this discussion.

Now I'm going to draw this discussion to a close. I'll let Alan and Susan be very brief. But we want to allow – try to allow at the end of each meeting a little wrap up where we confirm that we're all on the same page for action items and decision points. And so let me let – and we'll come back to this domain certification issue and we may even do a poll. We'll see. Leadership team is going to have to think about this one a little bit.

But we're going to continue the domain certification issue because I think – and the broader issue that Jim has raised and that I have raised because it's really going to be fundamental to where we're headed. So don't think we're stopping with domain certification. Alan and Susan, I'll let you each be brief please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Alan Greenberg speaking. My initial inclination when Jim started was to say, “that’s ridiculous,” if indeed certificate issuance is something that we need to support then we need to support it because security of the Internet and the use of it is ultimately a very important issue. But I then looked at the third column and said, what data items are we talking about there? If the only data items we are providing that are related to certification are the domain name and the servers, information which is publicly available within the DNS, then there’s no need to have that item there at all.

If we start adding other data items, which we may want to put restrictions on, and decide who is validly allowed to access them, then it pops back as an item we have to consider. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: So I, you know, I would welcome that discussion. I think I would maybe be on the other side of Jim’s point of view. But just from a domain name management point of view, most of this information is critical for my management of Facebook.com, Instagram.com, Whatsapp.com to maintain a secure registration and stability of our Website. So, you know, maybe it’s my paranoia but I check this information all the time because things go wrong.

So if the information is valuable from my point of view to be displayed publicly so I can independently verify information, then, you know, I think there’s a lot of other business cases that we could use that information for.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Susan. Just a quick follow up question. This is Chuck. Do you need anything more than as far as thin data the domain name and name servers in what you do with regard to domain name certification?

Susan Kawaguchi: Maybe not on – well, you know, I was part of the group that sort of made, you know, created these. But, you know, for our – for – in our case, you know, and Facebook is usually sort of the exception but, you know, it is very optimal for the security and stability of the Internet that a cert provider can look at a registration and go I don't think this is really Facebook and then they each out to us. Because what we don't want is, you know, certs being put on Facebook-like domain names so.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you, Susan. And we're not done with this one so but I'm going to cut it off so that we can do a wrap up. I'm going to jump ahead just so that we – everybody knows before more jump off the call. Our call next week is at our alternate time, which will be on Wednesday the 15th – or excuse me, I better get in the right month here on my calendar. It'll be on Wednesday the 18th of most of you, a few of us on the West Coast of the US it'll be – still on the evening of the 17th, but keep that in mind for next week.

Now, let me try and summarize, and I welcome help here from anybody in the working group, but I think we reached a couple decision points today. I think there seems to be – at least for those on the call there seems to be strong support for domain name control and technical issue resolution as legitimate purposes for thin data. There's some debate about which thin data elements but we've certainly reached that. And so we need to confirm those with the full working group.

And keep in mind, if you didn't speak up today as opposing that you can do that in a poll if we do a poll with those two issues. I'm not sure whether we'll ask a question on domain name certification, we may need to grapple with that one, although it might be helpful to get people thinking about it more. I suspect we've gotten into an area here that's going to be very important to a

lot of people, not just on domain certification, but on the – it'll affect other issues as I think that Jim and I in our interaction have illustrated.

This whole question is going to affect a lot of things with regard to whether this is a legitimate purpose or not. So please be thinking about that because we're going to delve into that more next week.

Is there anything else in terms of – that we should highlight in terms of what we covered today? Okay. Now we spent a lot of time going over the survey results because it was a much longer than usual poll, I shouldn't call it a survey – a much longer poll than usual. But I – hopefully people are getting the sense of where we're at and where we're going so that everybody has a better understanding of that so I hope that the time was useful.

Stephanie, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks, Chuck. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I just wanted to note, I don't have any objections to including the poll results in our achievements. Heaven knows we need some achievements or we're all going to go crazy. However, the polling instrument is pretty (unintelligible). That's not to say that our usual methods of reaching consensus sometimes can't be rough.

It'd be very helpful if, for those of us who are nerdy enough to want to look at the actual polling data, what people said, if we could have that archived somewhere we could have access to it just to back this up because it is a summary. It's an excellent one. Lisa does a great job. But if we're going to rely on it, we should have access to the full documentation. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: And, Stephanie, let me ask you, are you – you're talking about raw polling data anonymous data, right?

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, I don't care who said it. I can probably guess. My remarks are usually identifiable. That's not the point. The point is just to see what people said and, you know, what the discussion was. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so we'll – that's an action item for the leadership team to take up and we will certainly do that so let's note that in the notes as an action item for us. Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. And Lisa Phifer for the record. I just wanted to clarify, everything that actually was said in the – or collected by the collectors in this past poll was actually in the poll results with the exception of the individual's name and a mapping between that individual and what their answer was for each question. So I'd like to understand what additional information you would like to see in future poll results.

Chuck Gomes: Stephanie, can you respond to that?

Stephanie Perrin: I think if that's the case then I'm not concerned. I just think it would be probably easier on these polls if we just anonymized them and gave access to the poll as it is because then the questions and the answers would all be there (unintelligible) conglomerated in a way that would be useful.

Chuck Gomes: So, Stephanie, I didn't get an answer to Lisa's question in what you said. What are you looking for that you don't have in the results that are in front of you?

Stephanie Perrin: When you look at the summary you don't know what the polling results were. So for instance, the – let us say that someone fills out the poll and has self-contradictory responses. You know, I would of course interpret that. I think it's useful to actually...

((Crosstalk))

Stephanie Perrin: ...follow a character to their responses.

Chuck Gomes: So you want to map the response to the comments?

Stephanie Perrin: I just want to see the raw data, that's all, just want to see the raw data.

Chuck Gomes: What raw data...

Stephanie Perrin: So for instance...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...do you want to see?

Stephanie Perrin: Of the Survey Monkey poll. Just take the names out.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I get that. We may have to pursue that a little bit further. I don't want to take everybody's' time because we're over. Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: I just – I think this is a really important point of clarification because it does constrain how we word all future polls. Do you want to see individual names in the raw data? We have to collect the individual names in order to verify that only working group members are participating in the poll and to understand the demographics. But do you want to see individual names in poll results? If so we have to ask for explicit permission to publish that as part of the poll.

Stephanie Perrin: I actually, as a point of, you know, clarity about how we participate in these things, I don't see a problem in people being transparent. I don't actually think we should be able to do anonymous polling in a working group where we're all working together to achieve consensus. So even though I'm the privacy nut here, I don't think that should be a problem, but if people see it as a

problem, all I'm concerned about is the – is the totality of the response. So you could delete the names and I would not be upset. But I do simply have to ponder why on earth would people not be ready to stand by their comments?

Chuck Gomes: Okay so we've gone over far enough so this is Chuck, I'm going to stop it here. The leadership team will take this up. We may interact a little bit further with you, Stephanie. And if others have input on that, we may even put a question in the poll in this regard if we think it's useful. So that's an action item for the leadership team.

Sorry for going over. Thanks for your participation not only in the meeting today but in the poll for those of you that participated. And with regard to Stephanie's comment about, you know, how we use this poll data, incorporate it into our record, I want to be clear that it's important that people stay up to date as much as possible.

It's not going to work if a few months down the road people say well, I didn't participate in that poll so if you don't participate in the poll you need to live with the consequences because if we have to keep revisiting every issue, and we're going to have hundreds of them, it won't work. It's going to take us long enough as it is. So it's our responsibility as working group members to stay up to speed. There'll be times when you fall behind but you have to catch up otherwise we will never finish this thing and I don't know about you but that's not acceptable to me. So I suspect it's not acceptable to any of us.

So thank you very much. Stephanie, is that a new hand?

Woman: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so sorry for going over. Meeting is adjourned. The recording can end. Thanks, everybody.

Woman: Thank you.

END