

ICANN Transcription
GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group
Tuesday, 13 December 2016 at 1700 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group on the Tuesday, 13 December 2016 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:

<mailto:https://community.icann.org/x/45vDAw>

The audio is also available at:

<mailto:http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-nextgen-rds-pdp-13dec16-en.mp3>

Coordinator: Recordings are now connected. You may proceed.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you, well good morning, good afternoon and good evening to all. Welcome to the GNSO Next Gen RDS PDP Working Group call on the 13th of December at 1700 UTC.

In the interest of time today, there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Chat Room. So if you're only on the audio bridge today, please let yourself be known now. All right, thank you.

And as a reminder to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to 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 welcome everyone to our call today. To start off, as usual, I'll find out if there's anyone who has an update to their statement of interest. And as always, of course remember to update those on the Web site so that they're accessible to everyone. Thank you. Not hearing anyone or seeing any hands for updated statements of interest.

Let's move right on to agenda item two which is to recap our approach for key concepts deliberation. So as hopefully all of you are aware and remember from last week, we made an adjustment to our deliberation process and decided to first deliberate on some key concepts that will hopefully form a more solid foundation for the rest of our deliberations.

And the key concepts we're going to take from our - the sub-questions from our charter again starting with the three areas that we identified many months ago -- users and purposes, data elements and privacy.

We're going to -- like we've planning all along -- iteratively look at those three areas. In other words, we'll bounce back and forth between them as needed to make sure that we cover dependencies and inter-relationships of the three questions, the - again, users and purposes, data elements and privacy.

Now that doesn't mean we're going to ignore all the other questions out of our eleven charter questions. But most of the work on those will follow our work here at the beginning.

Once we have reached significant progress on a particular question, sufficient agreement, okay -- I think rough consensus is the official term we've used --

then we will move on. And now sufficient agreement will basically mean that we've made enough progress so that we have dealt with any assumptions that are needed for the next set of questions.

Now after we reach -- and I'm down to the last paragraph here if you're looking at the screen -- after reaching rough consensus on the key concepts, then we're optimistic that we'll be able to then go through our long list of possible requirements and make reasonably fast progress on going through those. Hopefully many of those will be more straightforward after we have these key concepts dealt with.

Now let me pause there. This isn't - we basically covered this last week. Today we're going to get started and I'll - we'll explain that as we get going in terms of how we're going to start today.

But are there any questions in terms of our approach to starting with key concepts and then - and using our charter questions to do that? Okay.

So agenda item three then is to start deliberations on question 2.1 from our charter. You can see question 2.1 in the Adobe screen. Thanks for having that up, staff. I appreciate that. Should GTLD registration data be accessible for any purpose or only for specific purposes?

Now before we actually start deliberation on that, I'm going to ask (Lisa) if she would just go over a little background from the EWG report. You'll recall from last week and of course it's in our charter too that we're using the EWG report as a starting point for each of these discussions on the key concepts.

Now again let me emphasize it's just a starting point. We're not taking it as a fact but we're going to start there to start discussions. And we certainly will welcome other thoughts besides what's in the EWG report.

So I've asked (Lisa) to start us off today, to give us a little background on the EWG report related to this particular key concept, question 2.1. (Lisa), would you please take charge on that?

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. And this is Lisa Phifer for the record. As you can see in Section 2.1.1 in the document that's displayed in Adobe Connect, we have a few excerpts from the EWG report to try to give some basic answers to the question that we're going to be deliberating on starting this morning.

As with any excerpts that you take from a very large report, sometimes it's useful to go back and look at the full report and where those come from.

But just to start with the high level statements that came from page five -- which is the executive summary of the EWG report -- the major recommendations of the EWG were really twofold. And one part is what we'll be discussing today.

That is that registration data should no longer be available just for any purpose that's unstated but, rather, that registration data should be accessible only for specific purposes, those purposes the policy would ultimately identify as permissible. And that's what you see in this excerpt here.

This excerpt also refers to providing public access to some data. And the EWG report did provide some recommendations about limiting public access and going to a paradigm of gated access. But that is actually really a separate concept in the EWG report.

So another way to look at this sub-question and the EWG's answer to this sub-question is the question should any GTLD registration data be made accessible without a specific purpose. And the EWG's answer to that was really no, that data should only be available or that is made accessible with a specific permissible purpose.

I know there have been some questions on the list about basic data and making basic data publicly available. And I wanted to take this opportunity to really address that by clarifying that in the EWG's proposed RDS, even basic data can't be queried without stating an explicit purpose and agreeing to be held accountable for use.

And for those of you that like to actually see queries written out and data elements listed, there's an example of that on page 135 of the EWG report.

But the whole premise and the answer to - the EWG's answer to this particular question that we're going to be discussing today was that we stop making data, any data, available for undefined and unstated purposes and shift to a paradigm where purposes would be defined by policy and then stated at the time of a query. And data would only be made accessible if the purpose was one of those that was allowed by policy.

So hopefully that sets us at least off with an example of a possible answer to this question. And we can move forward on deliberation.

And thinking about how to deliberate today, I would like to mention that the leadership team took very seriously all the comments that have been exchanged on the working group e-mail list over the past, I guess it would be, week and tried to think about how they pertain to this question that's in front of us today.

Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. And one of the suggestions that came out of the discussion on the list was the idea of starting with a smaller, maybe less controversial set of registration data and that being what some have referred to as thin data.

And so to make our task a little bit easier and to get us going, that's what we're going to do. We're going to start out with focusing on thin data for that term registration data in question 2.1 as defined in the Thick WHOISs Policy. We're not going to spend time looking at that thick WHOIS Policy right now but we wanted to grab a hold of a definition.

Now it doesn't matter too much what definition of thin data we use as long as in the end we cover all the data that is considered registration data. So we didn't want to spend a lot of time debating what the right definition is. Rather, let's start with the definition used in the Thick WHOIS Policy report and that's what we're going to use.

Now the - and to start our discussion, we're going to talk about - I'm going to ask the question: What is the purpose of thin data about GTLD domain names?

Now the first thing we need to do is to go over the definition of thin data that we're using. Do we have that to put up on the screen? I should have asked that earlier but...In just a second, while staff's checking that, (Greg), would - you can go ahead, please.

Greg Aaron: Thank you, Chuck. This is Greg Aaron. Just FYI, I think some of the sections of the EWG final report are useful because they classified various uses, various users and they also classified what I'm referring to as thin WHOIS. So there's some material we may want to refer to.

I also have a question for (Lisa) about the - what she said about the EWG report. The EWG report said that some information would always be public. Now are you saying that if somebody wants to query it, they have to state their purpose to even get that public information? Is that what the EWG recommended?

Lisa Phifer: This is Lisa Phifer. Yes, Greg, that's true. And if you actually look at an example of a query -- I gave you the page number 135 just to give you a firm place to look -- but if you look at a query that's unauthenticated, it still specifies the domain name that's being queried and the purpose for which it's being queried. So even though there's no authentication and no authorization, access is still restricted to the data that's defined for that purpose.

Greg Aaron: So what's the difference between unauthenticated - is there a difference between unauthenticated and no purpose stated? Or any time anybody wants to look at any information, they have to state a purpose in their query before they get a response? Is that what they were suggesting?

Lisa Phifer: That's correct, Greg.

Greg Aaron: So in this case, they were saying anonymous access is okay but still you have to state a purpose. I - that's interesting. I mean, my personal opinion is that's unenforceable and kind of a game but that's - I'm glad that we understand what the EWG said. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: So Greg, this is Chuck. Let me say that that's not what we have said yet, okay? So in other words, we're getting clarity in terms of what we understand the EWG report to suggest.

Greg Aaron: That is exactly what I just said.

Chuck Gomes: That does not mean we will make a decision to do it that way, okay?

Greg Aaron: That is exactly what I just said. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Okay? Thanks, Greg. Steve? Steve Metalitz.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, thank you. This is Steve. I was really - my question is really similar to Greg's, and I haven't looked at - I don't have page 135 of the EWG report in front of me. But what was up on the screen about 45 seconds ago said while basic data will remain public, the rest of it requires a statement of purpose. I don't - it's not on the screen anymore so I'm paraphrasing.

But it just struck me that what (Lisa) said about the recommendation of the EWG is contradicted by the statement from the EWG page five that was up on the screen.

Again, we're not bound by this one way or the other but certainly I thought that what EWG had recommended was closer to what was printed on page five and not what (Lisa) just said. So maybe that could be clarified.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Steve. (Lisa), do you want to do any clarifying on that?

Lisa Phifer: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: We may need to bring that back up. And let's not do that yet because I want people to focus on what's on the screen now, in just a minute. So go ahead, (Lisa).

Lisa Phifer: Sure so the - Steve, you're right that there are different ways that you can read that statement from the executive summary. That executive summary statement was trying to boil down the two key concepts that the EWG recommended into one paragraph. And in doing so, the concepts were kind of interwoven.

But part of the statement that was up on the screen just a moment ago said the EWG recommends a paradigm shift to a next-generation RDS that collects, validates and discloses registration for permissible purposes only. So that captures the fact that the only way that you would collect data or disclose it would be for a permissible purpose.

Then there's a subsequent paragraph that says that some basic data would remain publicly available. And that's true. That comes from the EWG's recommendation regarding gated access. But it doesn't - once you put those pieces together, the report doesn't recommend that you be able to query data and not state what your purpose is.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, (Lisa). (Susan), you're up.

(Susan): Hi. I apologize. I'm in a public area and in - sort of in transit so it may be there's some background noise. But without diving too far into the EWG report, you would see -- if we did pull all the elements up -- is that basic data was extremely basic. And yes, there has to be a purpose collected.

But I think to Greg's point about anonymous - requesting that data anonymously, there's very little data that could be seen without logging into a system, having an account validated or verified and -- so that the RDS would have some idea of who's requesting -- and then also state a purpose. So it takes it a little farther down the road.

So what I don't want - what I was sort of hearing Greg say is, oh as long as you state a purpose, you don't have to say who you are to get the data. But that's just for a very limited set of data.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Susan). This is Chuck. (Lisa), go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks. I just also thought it might be useful to add a little bit about the approach that the EWG ultimately ended up using. And I'll say in the early days of the EWG we did bounce around some concept to concept as we tried to get our arms around it.

But ultimately what the EWG did was hammer out those permissible purposes, look at the individual data elements that were needed for those

purposes and only then did we back into what a minimum data set might be and what in that minimum data set would be the elements that were needed by most or all of the purposes and then within that, which elements were somewhat low risk and therefore could be made public.

So it was a process of sort of top-down from the purpose. Start with the assumption that you shouldn't be collecting data if you don't have a purpose, you shouldn't be disclosing it if you haven't collected it for a purpose. Start from that assumption and work your way forward to what would be that minimum basic data set that then could be publicly available.

So it was an approach to get to that end result rather than starting with the elements that could be public and trying to figure out what purposes they met. I hope that helps.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, (Lisa). So now what I'd like to do is to draw people's attention to what's on the screen, in particular that bottom paragraph there so that we're all on the same page with regard to the thin data that we're talking about.

Now again I don't want to spend time talking about whether this is the right definition of thin data or not. But let's focus on these for right now. We'll have to expand the registration data in answering this question to beyond this. But let's start here.

So you can see that the thin data is information associated with the domain name. And that set includes data sufficient to identify the sponsoring registrar, status of the registration, creation and expiration dates for each registration, name server data, the last time the record was updated in the WHOIS data store and the URL for the registrar's WHOIS service. Okay?

Now focusing on that data, those data elements in particular for right now, I'm going to repeat the question I asked before and so that - and I would like discussion on this. What is the purpose of those data elements, of that thin

data, to use that term? What's the purpose of it? And I'm just going to open it up for discussion on that.

And I note - while people are thinking, I note that some people are talking about, you know, things that are a little bit ahead of the game, the - as far as the process we're going to be following. So hang on. We're going to get to all of those, okay? But try to stay focused on what we're talking about right now.

And we can break it down by element if it's helpful. So for example, we can ask: What's the purpose of being able to identify the sponsoring registrar? Anybody want to comment on that? (Susan)?

(Susan): So in the current world of WHOIS, because we do not have Thick WHOIS in all of the registries, then it's really critical to know where to go and to look to the WHOIS record. You know, there's a lot of tools that sort of bring records together so you can sort of look in one spot, domain tools as an example. But, you know, you're not always sure that they're 100% - collecting 100% of all WHOIS records. So in the current context, the sponsoring registrar is really important for that use. And there are other uses as well so.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, (Susan). This is Chuck. So Steve, your question. Don't - I don't think it's necessary to worry too much about whether we're collecting or accessing or whatever. Is there a purpose for having that information? Obviously it's got to be collected if it's going to be a part of the system. Who accesses it, we'll have to deal with that, okay? But that gets a little bit further down the road than I think we need right now.

So just is there a purpose for having in the RDS a - the registrar contact information is the question we're focusing on. Greg, go ahead.

Greg Aaron: I would point you to page 46 of the EWG report which says that the purpose of publishing this information plus contact IDs is to "meet basic domain control needs."

Chuck Gomes: Can you elaborate on that a little bit, on the control part?

Greg Aaron: Well we've been talking about managing your domain name and its lifetime on the mailing list so it's a reference to that. And I'll post the quote in the box.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So is the - so one purpose of a - the domain registrar information is for control of the domain name, whoever may be controlling that.

Greg Aaron: This is Greg. Not just the registrar name.

Chuck Gomes: Well I'm - I understand that. I'm - I had narrowed it down to that one particular element of the - this data is why I referred to that. So would - following that along, Greg, would you then - I mean, would you then apply that to the rest of the thin data?

Greg Aaron: The EWG did say that. I just put the quote in the chat box.

Chuck Gomes: Now keep in mind that we're not - we certainly want to understand what the EWG said but what do we believe as a working group, okay? What is the - we need to answer this question. We can use - we can agree with the EWG report answer or we can disagree or we can change it. But keep in mind our goal today is not just to understand the EWG report. That's just a step on the way. Alan Greenberg, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: I think there are two answers to that. First of all, in the context of the EWG report, a TIN registry does - did exist. It may not exist two years from now but it did exist.

So the registrar name is the only way to get to the next part of the information, whether it's publicly available or hidden behind a firewall. Certainly in the time in the EWG it was publicly available for GTLDs but you

could only find it if you knew the registrar name. So, you know, there was no other thing that - no other way to get to the data.

In the context of what we're looking at in a more general case, there are other - where all the data is stored in the same place, you know, presumably what we're now calling the equivalent of a Thick registry which may be the RDS, the registrar is the...

For instance as the registrant, if I no longer remember who my registrar is or if my registrar was bought by someone else, that information is the only way I can get to - you know, talk to who it is I'm supposed to be dealing with to renew a domain or do whatever I want with it. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan Greenberg. This is Chuck again. So I think we all understand the current situation pretty well and why the - and (Susan) expressed that pretty well in terms of why we need the registrar's contact information. But let's look ahead.

Will that registrar contract information have a purpose in the future? Alan Greenberg?

Alan Greenberg: I answered that question already in the second part of my answer. As the registrant, the only way I can find out who to talk to to deal with my domain is to know who the registrar is.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So that would be a purpose - certainly a clear purpose -- sorry I didn't call that out -- for the registrar contact information.

What about the status of the registration? Is there a purpose for it?

Michael Palage: Chuck, this is Palage. Can we go back to the registrar field itself?

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Michael Palage: And if I could add one other...So there's actually legal significance. When you - when a trademark owner files a URDP, they need to consent to legal jurisdiction to be - basically to be sued in either the location of the registrant or the registrar. So that's legal significance to know which registrar is associated with the domain name. So I would just add that as legal significance, knowing which registrar is associated with a registration.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Mike. Much appreciated. And I'm not - as I'm trying to manage this, I'm not doing a good job of keeping up with the chat so I apologize. I asked the rest of the leadership team if you would just help me call out things in the chat that I don't stay up with as I'm trying to manage the meeting.

So is there any data in the thin data that we're looking at on the screen there that anyone thinks does not have a purpose? And while you're thinking about that, let me let (Lisa) jump in.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. Lisa Phifer for the record. I just wanted to remind us to keep in mind there are really two ways to get about this, well at least two ways.

One is to start with a pile of data that we happen to already collect and decide if there was a purpose for it. The other is to start with a purpose that we all agree is legitimate and then figure out what the data is needed to support that purpose. And I'm just not clear which approach we're taking in trying to answer this question.

Chuck Gomes: Do you think there's one that's better than the other, (Lisa)?

Lisa Phifer: The EWG ultimately landed on the purpose question in trying to be responsive to the question that was asked of it in the first place by the board. But I think you can do it either way. One is more bottom up and the other is more top down.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you. I'm not - you know, I don't myself have a strong feeling one way or the other. As all of you know, months back we started to try to order which - what - where we would start and there was disagreement on that. Different people had different views on that.

So I'm going to go back to the question that I asked. Looking at that thin data in front of us, are there any of those items for which you don't think there is a purpose? Anybody on the call? I mean, could we conclude right now that we think that we would all believe that all of those have a purpose in an RDS system?

And if not, which ones don't and why? And then we can talk about that. I mean, it makes our job pretty easy if we all think that - as far as the question that we're focusing on right now, it makes our job pretty easy if we're all in agreement that there's a purpose to all of these data elements in the thin data on the screen. That's a little bit of progress. Okay? Alan Greenberg?

Alan Greenberg: There's certainly a purpose to all the data.

Whether that information all has to be publicly available one could debate. I could claim that it's nobody business when my domain expires. It's nobody's business when I last changed it. It's nobody's business when I first created it. And, you know, the name server information is available from the DNS. So well at least I think it is. I'm not even 100% sure of that, if it's definitively available.

So one could debate all sorts of things about whether one needs it or not in a public sense.

Chuck Gomes: And we're not yet...

Alan Greenberg: Ultimately we're going to have to make decisions.

Chuck Gomes: We're not at the point, Alan Greenberg, when we're talking about who should have access or whether it should be publicly available.

Alan Greenberg: Well...

Chuck Gomes: Right now let's answer the question, is there a purpose for it. And people seem to be agreeing that all of these things have purpose. Or at least they're not speaking up. Did you want to follow up on that, Alan Greenberg?

Alan Greenberg: Well yes. In terms of is there a purpose for it, yes. Does it have to be in the RDS? Not necessarily. You know, some of it could be kept privately by the registrar once you know who the registrar is.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And so we're going to have to answer - ask the question, why should it be collected but also why should it be make accessible via an RDS. So that's another sub-question to what we're talking about.

Let me ask a different question to keep the discussion going. Should any thin data elements be accessible without a specific purpose? And I - (Lisa) may have talked about this when she was talking about the EWG report earlier. But let's talk about it a little bit. Should any thin data -- those elements that are on the screen right now -- be accessible without a specific purpose?

I think I understood (Lisa) to say that the EWG report's answer to that was no, that...Did I get that right, (Lisa)?

Lisa Phifer: Yes, you did, Chuck, that in fact the EWG report doesn't refer to thin data. But the answer is no, no registration data should be made available through the RDS without a purpose.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Now keep in mind -- and this kind of goes back to what we talked about early on in this meeting - is that one way of approaching that if we

agreed with that would be to require people, even anonymous, to state a purpose. And like Greg said, that may be kind of unenforceable.

But we could also decide and make a recommendation in terms of policy later on that there are purposes for some of this data and to get access to that information, people don't have to state a purpose. We'll get to the details of that later on but I'm just pointing out that that's an option we could end up with.

So does anybody think that - does anybody disagree with (Lisa's) explanation of the EWG report that no data should be accessible without having a purpose? Is there agreement in our group?

Can I make the conclusion -- and I'll jump to Steve and to Alan Greenberg in just a minute -- could I make the conclusion that we're in agreement with the fact that no data - all data has to have a purpose in the RDS? If it doesn't, it shouldn't be there. Okay, Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Thanks. This is Steve. Chuck, I think you just made a huge jump there. You first asked whether that is the EWG recommendation. And based on what (Lisa) said, I have to assume that it is.

But then you asked, is that - do we want to embrace that recommendation.

Chuck Gomes: That's correct.

Steve Metalitz: I don't agree with that.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay.

Steve Metalitz: I think it's important to recognize - I guess I had two things to say here. One is this question 2.1 kind of presents things in a binary manner and in fact there is at least one or two other positions that are possible.

One is the status quo, which is no GTLD registration data is accessible for any purpose. If we look at the RAA Section 3.3.5, it specifies some purposes for which GTLD registration data is not permitted to be accessed, permitted to be used anyway. So that's the status quo.

The - but the other point I would make is that ever since we've had a registration data system for GTLD domain names, this has been a public record. It's been accessible to any member of the public. They don't have to state a purpose for accessing it. And that's kind of - that's where we - that's the world that we've been living in for at least 20 years and certainly before the World Wide Web, so may 25 years or longer.

So I think if this group is going to recommend that we end that era and that WHOIS - that this data would no longer be a public record, any of it -- which I think is the question that you're asking -- I think it's important to be clear on what it is that we are recommending. We are recommending that the public's access to this data as a public record be terminated.

I don't happen to agree with that. But I think if that's the - if that's where the group - what the group feels we should be doing, let's at least be clear on what the recommendation is. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Steve. This is Chuck. And obviously we're not quite there - we're not close to making that decision yet. So I hope everybody understands that.

But let's go on and listen to some others. Alan Greenberg?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. If you go to a Web site right now that is owned by a liquor company, they will likely ask you are you old enough to go in here. And you have to answer yes or no. It's unverifiable. It's not tracked. It's covering their - their somethings just because they may be liable to some problem if they let a 16 year old or a 12 year old see what a label of a liquor bottle looks like.

I have a great aversion for us building a system where we're going to ask a question which is unverifiable, unusable and has no real purpose in life other than to annoy people and to make them tick off a box or something like that.

If we're going to build a system, we should build a system that has purpose and not have people go through motions which have no use whatsoever.
Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: And I'm not stating whether we should make things publicly available or not. But just having useless parts in the process I see just no merit in. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. And we're not going to decide - we're not even discussing right now what should be publicly available.

Alan Greenberg: Nor...

Chuck Gomes: Although obviously this is leading to that.

Alan Greenberg: Nor am I.

Chuck Gomes: Okay good. Thanks. Greg.

Greg Aaron: Thank you, Chuck. This is Greg. I think it's safe to say that every field that you currently see in WHOIS does have a purpose. So the question is not do they have a purpose. And the EWG in their report listed purposes for each of those fields actually. They didn't try to be exhaustive in all use cases but they listed common things that people do with that information. The - so the question is not does each one of those have a purpose.

The question is: How do we feel about the validity of a purpose and should the information be shared or not? Okay?

That's - let's get past the...And I wanted - and a lot of these fields have been discussed in PDPs actually and have been confirmed in ICANN policy because there's a good reason for it to be there and people need it. Okay? So I'm hoping we can get past the idea of is any of this useful because it is.

Let's get to the questions of: Are any of these invalid purposes and therefore need - the information needs to be protected in some way? Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: All right. Point well taken, Greg. This is Chuck. Obviously, using some of this information for fraud is a purpose but probably not one that any of us supports. So thanks for that interjection.

So if we go back to the - to question 2.1 and again focusing just on the thin data for right now, should the GTLD thin data be accessible for any purpose or only for specific purposes, is there anyone on the call who thinks that the thin data should be accessible for any purpose regardless of what it is? Raise your hand if you think that's true. And I'm just trying to narrow us down to...

Greg, go ahead. You raised your hand. Is he the only one that...And Greg, just so everybody's clear, state what you're raising your hand for so I make sure that I worded it correctly.

Greg Aaron: You asked -- this is Greg -- you asked if people thought that the thin data should be published for - published publicly for any usage.

Chuck Gomes: For any purpose, right? Okay, so I did say - that's what I intended to say, wanted to make sure. I'm not sure I'm going a very good job of...

Greg Aaron: Correct. Let's be clear, Chuck. Let's say any legitimate purpose. You'd mentioned a minute ago using it for fraud. Well that's not a good purpose.

When I was talking earlier about the purposes listed in the EWG report, every field has a purpose that is somewhat legitimate at least, all right.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, good. Thanks. Elaine Prais, go ahead please.

Elaine Prais: Can you hear me okay?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Elaine Prais: Great. I think it should be available. I don't think we should limit it to specific purposes because someone will think of some other purpose that we haven't thought of. Again, I think it should be legitimate but that we need to define what that is. But I don't want to limit access to thin use data which you pretty much recover all of it but then it's queried anyway based on what we think is a good purpose because someone else will think of another great way to use it.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Elaine Prais. Appreciate that. Anybody else want to talk to this? I see lots of green checkmarks for the things that are being said. Let me scroll down just, whoops. Yes, on - there's one red X. Scott, you get to speak. Scott Hollenbeck.

Scott Hollenbeck: Yes hi, this is Scott Hollenbeck for the record. The reason I said I disagree is somewhat reflected in the note that I sent you earlier this week where I pointed out what we are doing with an implementation of RDAP that includes support for client authentication.

There is some information that is available by the RDS and is available at any time for any purpose, and that's typically information associated with DNS delegations. I don't see any issue at all with that information being made available in the DNS with no specification of purpose at any time.

But I can certainly see cases or instances of exposure of even this thin data as we were seeing here in the chat right now. There are fraud purposes where this information can be useful. And I would suggest that that information should not be available unless the server-operator knows something about who is asking the question and thus we have support for client authentication included.

Without client authentication, I would say limit the exposure of data only to that which is available freely in some other - using some other mechanism as well. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Scott. Chuck again. Alex Deacon, your turn.

Alex Deacon: Thank you, Chuck. This is Alex. Can you hear me? Just making sure.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Alex Deacon: Thanks. So I just wanted to quickly state -- we have moved a little bit past this -- but, you know, the question was should GTLD thin data -- which I guess is listed and that we're seeing -- be accessible for any purpose regardless of what that purpose is. And I think, you know, looking at this list, I would agree with that statement.

However, I would - there may be other things we would want to consider. And I don't want to get too far ahead but if you look at the EWG report, they do talk about also providing in the minimum set of data that we're discussing, thin data, things like tech and admin and legal IDs, not the details of who those identify but just the IDs. And I think at some point I'd like to discuss that further. I think that's a good idea. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Alex Deacon. And I'm seeing a lot of comments in the chat. People are certainly pointing out that when we're talking about purposes,

we're talking about legitimate and lawful purposes. And so that seems like a reasonable conclusion that all of us can agree on.

The more I look at the way question 2.1 is worded -- and then I think - I suspect that some of you are having the same frustration -- is making it difficult to respond to the question as is, even if we restrict it to thin data. So - but it's a question that we need to answer.

Now I think we can reword the question some if it's helpful to us. And again focusing on thin data, how would you reword this question to make it more meaningful? It's - question 2.1 is what I'm talking about which is: Should GTLD registration data be accessible for any purpose or only for specific purposes?

(Lisa), what really is the - let me throw it out to you if - or anyone else for that matter in terms of how could this question, question 2.1, be worded to help us reach some conclusion here? Do you have any thoughts on that, (Lisa), before I go to Steve?

Lisa Phifer: I'll just mention briefly that the next question after this is: What purposes should be permitted? And I think that 2.1 was really intended to set up 2.2, really intended to find out if we agree that there should be a set of purposes that are defined. And then if there's agreement that there are, then move on to defining what those purposes are.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thanks. Thanks, (Lisa). Chuck again. Steve, go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, thanks. This is Steve. I think there might be two problems with this, the way this question is worded. One we've already encountered is that GTLD registration data covers a huge spectrum. And we might answer this question differently for some data and then as - than for others. We might answer it the same way for all data but that's one problem here.

The other, as I think I mentioned, is that - the binary option. You either say it's accessible for any purpose or you say it's inaccessible except for a specific purpose. The status quo -- and you could also see other variations of this -- is actually neither of those. It is accessible for any lawful purpose or it's accessible for purposes other than these specified abusive purposes. So that would be another way to approach this.

You know, there's a lot of jokes about, you know, the different legal systems. In some of them everything that is prohibited - everything that is not prohibited is permitted and everything - in others, everything that is not permitted is prohibited. And I don't even remember the punch lines of these jokes.

But in fact those are two different ways of approaching this, in effect with a positive list or a negative list. And those would be two different ways of saying that the data is accessible for some purposes but no other purposes. But it makes a big difference which approach we take.

I think the approach that has historically been taken is, if you will, the negative list. It's accessible for any purpose except these specific purposes. And maybe those need to be - you know, that could be a short or a long list.

And then what I think the EWG proposed, if I understand it correctly, is it's not accessible except for these - the purposes that are on the positive list. And we've come up with a positive list of all the purposes that we can think of. And if you don't fit in one of those categories, you don't get access.

It might be more useful to give those three options rather than simply the two options. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Steve. Chuck again. And your point about the binary nature of this question is really critical because it's really not binary. Is it? It's not an

either/or in this case, either it's accessible for any purpose or only for a specific purpose.

And then I go back to the point Elaine Pruis made when she - she didn't say it the same way I'm going to say it I don't think and I hope I get it right, Elaine Pruis, but as soon as you have a specific list of purposes, you will leave some out or you will discover new ones and so forth.

So the way this question is worded makes it difficult I think to come up with a good answer. And the binary nature of it is probably just one aspect of that. And Steve's suggestion -- and I haven't been able to keep up with all the notes -- but hopefully his suggestions of the three options there is captured in the notes so that we may be able to take off from that going forward.

(Lisa), go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Steve. Lisa Phifer here. Steve, I'd just like to clarify. I put in the chat that I see two of the options which is available for anything except where prohibited which is I think our status quo or available for nothing except where explicitly permitted which is I believe the EWG's recommendation. But I didn't catch what you thought the third position was. If you could repeat that, please.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. The third one is what's up on the screen which is for any purpose, you know, so we don't care what the purpose is. It's a pure public record in that sense and you can access it for any purpose.

Lisa Phifer: Got it. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. And I'll have a follow-up question on that. But let me first go to Stephanie Perrin.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. And I am...Can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: You're coming through kind of faintly.

Stephanie Perrin: Faintly, eh?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, that's a little better.

Stephanie Perrin: That's better? Okay. Amazing. All right. What I wanted to point is so we're leaving out such a whom. I mean, there may be numerous parties, registries, contracts, anti-spam companies, you name it, who might be able to have access to data that the grand public would not have access to.

I think this is - it's not binary. It's almost a multiplexed issue. It always has to be to whom. If you're investigating a case, only the people that are investigating the case and the relevant parties should have access to that data, not every Tom, Dick and Harry. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stephanie Perrin. (V.A.), you're up.

Vaibhav Aggarwal: Hey, hi. Good evening, good morning, good afternoon to everyone. I think Stephanie Perrin has a very valid point. And I've been listening to views coming from different channels. Now what I see in front of me, let me break this in a couple of parts and then we can - you know, we can take that for more discussion to give us a direction.

Now the domain name is of course matter of public record. When a domain gets registered and I search for it example -- even while I don't go to WHOIS, I know it's registered -- it'll show me unavailable. So domain is matter of public availability.

The registrar could be a decision, a name service that could be private to the registrar, whether he wants to show his name or not. I'm of this opinion that

that should be a right that should rest with the registrar or the registry because that's - why would I want to know who I have registered with?

My purpose as public, in a matter of public record is I need to talk of specific - to a particular domain that I should be able to reach out to for all legal purposes. There is no illegitimate purpose that can be served by asking WHOIS information.

So what is my public interest? My public interest is to know if this domain is unavailable, who does it belong to and what's the expiry date and what's the create date, not even the update date.

So break what I'm seeing here into a couple of parts. So registrar information could be a private information like my mobile number, MSI/SPN when I'm traveling to Western countries from India.

In India, it's illegal for me to hide my standard ID but when I go to Sydney, when I travel to Singapore or U.S., I can just do a private number. It is no problem. So there should be a facility here. But I - but my operator still knows that I've done a private call. My call is still traceable. It's just that it won't show it to you.

My number 2, what purpose of keeping the name server and the public domain out in open. Out in open is being served. I want to understand because I'm a domain name user myself.

Why would I want to know why Verisign.com or our CSCGlobal.com is hosted on Time Warner's server? What's my purpose be? Will I sue Time Warner for hosting CSC? Or will I reach out to Time Warner saying, hey I need CNN.com, so please give it to me? No. I'm going to reach out to the domain owner. So let's see this.

Now status, client council prohibits. I think that's none of my business as public. It is between the registrar and the domain name, the lessor. It's not even the owner; it's the lessor, okay?

So I think in my view this should be a little specific to the record that we discuss. The WHOIS server is again private information. Why would I want to know who is providing the WHOIS?

Once we reach to a gated access kind of environment, we will be able to understand whether we want to share that information or not as to what server is providing this information because in my opinion, this should be centralized just like the TMC Edge. So yes, pretty much.

Chuck Gomes: (V.A.), this is Chuck. I have a follow-up or two for you, okay?

Vaibhav Aggarwal: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: And I see we're - I'm echoing. Sorry about that. So if you can put yourself on mute for a moment, then when you respond, you can go off of mute. So keep in mind, we're not yet deciding what is public or if anything is totally public, okay? So let's put that aside for now.

But do you see purposes for some of the elements like registrar or name server in an RDS, whatever that might look like, even if it's not public information? In other words, if there is restricted access like the gated access that we referred to, do you - I mean, would you just not collect registrar in an RDS? I understand you may not make that public but could some people have restricted access to that if we went that route? Let me give it back to you to respond.

Vaibhav Aggarwal: Right. I think that's a very valid point. Vaibhav Aggarwal for the record. My question - my point out is to give a little more thought to a specific direction. I'll tell you why. Very simple. Because it is an agreement between

the registrar, the registry and the registrant, not between the public. So the information provided is absolutely privileged.

So we need to as a group - perhaps this can be one of our points to discuss, that what information is privileged and what is not.

So for example in my opinion, my name server of my domain is privileged, my registrar is privileged. So it's not that we will not capture it but we will not display it out in the public domain. So if my login ID and gated access have that privilege, then I will be able to see it. If it does not have the privilege, I will not be able to see it.

And from where I'm coming from, my privileges will be decided by the role I play while I have gated access. So if I am a registrant, the owner of the domain, then I will be able to authenticate myself accordingly with some mechanisms and I'll be able to establish that, that this is my privilege.

Otherwise, I will have limited information which is only a matter - which is only sufficient for the public.

So I think that should play for a lot of stuff on whether we - whether WHOIS has to be restricted or forced or limited. I think that should give us some idea.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thanks. This is Chuck again. And you answered my question. I appreciate that. And we're going to get to gated access. We're going to get to who should have access. We're going to get to those sort of things so. But you answered my question. I appreciate that.

Alan Greenberg, your turn.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. A couple of small points. First of all, the existence of a domain name is not matter of public record. The only way you know when you've - if you go to register it, the only way the registrar knows is because they query

WHOIS. So - and, you know, they may have a repository of past WHOIS information but it is not a matter of public record. We could set rules...

Chuck Gomes: Alan Greenberg, I want to stop you there for a second, sorry. But I - domain names are in zone files, right, which are public?

Alan Greenberg: If we want them to be public, we could - we could have a new rule saying no.

Chuck Gomes: In other words, yes, we could write - I don't know that that's a...

Alan Greenberg: And similarly, name servers. Unless there is an error, name servers are a matter of public record. They're the start of authority that you get with a - when you do a DNS query. So let's make sure that we're not going to make things private that have to be public because of DNS. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Right, right. So go ahead. I'm sorry to interrupt but I wanted to cover that before you went on. Go ahead, please.

Alan Greenberg: I'm done.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, you're done, okay. Thanks, Alan Greenberg. Okay. Greg?

Greg Aaron: Yes, let me emphasize something that Alan Greenberg just said and despite what (Mr. Agarwal) just said. The name servers that are associated with a resolving domain name are a matter of public record. You can look them up in the DNS. Anybody can do that. And you can do that because they have to be published out there in order for the domain name to work. So name server information is not privileged. If you want your domain name to resolve, it's published in the DNS.

Why is it in WHOIS information right now? Because registrants sometimes want to refer to it. A particular registrant may not but others do. And that's why it's in there.

The same with identity of the sponsor and registrar. Now there have been PDPs in the recent past that have emphasized that this information should be published. One reason is for transfer purposes. Some - you know, if somebody needs to transfer a domain name, the gaining and the losing registrars need to have that information available to them.

And there are many other purposes why people look up information about their domain names and other people's domain names to find out the sponsor and registrar. If you register your domain name for example through a reseller, you still need to sometimes find out who the sponsoring registrar is which is a different company. But that's the company you have your contract with for example.

So I dispute that this information is privileged. There are good reasons for it to be published.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. Alan Greenberg, is that an old hand? Okay. (V.A.), your turn again.

Vaibhav Aggarwal: Okay. Vaibhav Aggarwal for the record. Thanks, Chuck. Greg, first of all, my sincere thanks to you that you pronounced my name correctly. I think it's excellent. It's kudos to you, thanks.

And yes, I agree to what you said. The information is definitely to be there in public. Do not for one second let your thought be that I'm against publishing WHOIS in the open. No. I'm absolutely for full transparency. I've strongly advocated - I come from an NSCG background and I strongly advocate things openly displayed as much as possible.

But here where I'm coming from, my thought and my suggestion is privilege could have definitions. As I say, that until and unless I have certain specific requirements for a particular domain name, I won't know what to look for. I

won't just - it's not an Excel sheet that I can do Control F or I can just continue running the columns. I'll need to enter a specific query in the system.

That means I have some work already established with that particular domain name. I won't have time enough to - or at least I want to believe this that most of the people around the world won't have time enough to just sit on the Internet and just start querying the domain names alphabetically, you know.

So if I establish that I have some work related to a particular domain and I want more information to that, I think I should be able to go to that level where I would want to authenticate myself as a person accessing information which is actually private to me.

So for example, my information of my Web site and my name servers are absolutely private and that's the reason most of the time I would have my own hidden name servers. So for example, I host on GoDaddy but then I subscribe to Premium DNS.

Or I host - I have my own servers also but then I have custom name servers made and I've tried to subscribe to DNS name servers related to me because I don't want people to start looking around where I'm hosting or I don't know what designs they may have.

So I'm trying to - I'm just trying to throw an idea to the group. I'm trying to bring together a perspective and - which is of course to my opinion. And perhaps when I will already establish the relationship to that domain name, then I may as well be ready to establish the relationship to that data.

But why do I want to access it? And that's the only thing I'm trying to say. So privilege, yes. It's like a privilege to perhaps cut a long story short, but then just be with me, just bear with me. And yes. Sorry, Chuck, I took extra time.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. That's all right. And I think some of the things that you're thinking of are going to come into play a little bit more as we get deeper down into some of the details. So I - it's appreciated. Probably it's going to be even more valuable later on, certainly for the discussion. So we need to do that.

The - now I'm going to - so I'm going to try and forgive me if I'm not doing a very good job today, you'll probably get used to that throughout the whole group. This is a challenging task but I'm trying to keep things going in terms of our thought processes.

And so I'm going to make an assumption and I welcome people to challenge me on this assumption. But just for the sake of discussion I want to make it. And that is if there's at least one legitimate purpose for an element, okay, registry data element, then I'm assuming that the EWG statement that everything needs to have a specific purpose, even if it's only one legitimate.

And so if I make that assumption, are there any of the elements here, forgetting whether it would be public or not, okay - is there any elements out of these thin data elements that doesn't have at least one possible legitimate purpose? Can anybody identify one? So we're talking about domain name, registrar, WHOIS server, referral URL, name servers, status, updated date, creation date.

(V.A.), go ahead. Which one or ones?

Vaibhav Aggarwal: Status update and update date. Status, the client transfer prohibited, and update date.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So you would...

Vaibhav Aggarwal: So these two I see no relevance. I have a portfolio of about...Yes, absolutely because I have a portfolio of about 1,800 domains. And I have -

you see, client council prohibited, why do I want to know about it? Because any which way that - I can't buy it because it's registered until 2184, right?

And so why do I even want to know if it's client transfer prohibited? Because for me that's privileged information between the registrant and the registry and the registrar. If I as a lessor wants to transfer my domain out, then I might as well do it. Nobody else can.

Chuck Gomes: So you picked out - it was updated date and creation date. Is that what you said? (V.A.), that was a question for you. I want to make sure I got the two. Did you say updated date and creation date?

Vaibhav Aggarwal: Yes, absolutely.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thanks. I just want to clarify. (Susan)...

Vaibhav Aggarwal: No creation date. Status and update date.

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry, what was - oh status. Okay, I thought I messed up there so thanks. So status and updated date. Okay thanks. And we may talk about those more but let's go on. Alan Greenberg, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: One might be able to argue that client transfer prohibited is something that doesn't need to be displayed although I don't agree.

But that's not the only status that you can have. There are other statuses that may in fact indicate something about whether the domain is actually active or not, whether it's in the zone file or not. So status has a number of different meanings. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks, Alan Greenberg. (Susan)?

(Susan): Yes. And in corporate domain name management, those statuses are crucial to our security protocol. So, you know, we actually have three statuses, client statuses, which are all registrar locked. And then we have the server status which is the registry locked. All three comprise one registry lock. Those are really crucial to me and my management. I mean, this may be an edge case for, you know, very visible domain names on the Web but it's extremely important.

And, you know, I mean, we'd had a case where our registrar was compromised so statuses were removed and that was our first inkling that something was wrong. Let me back up. The registrar's statuses were removed, not the registry. And so that was our first indicator that something had gone wrong in our security protocol and in our account.

So those are crucial to me, all of those statuses. And I think they should be - if they exist, they should be in the record.

Chuck Gomes: So (Susan), Chuck again and I'm going to follow up with you as well. So are - is that status information for the domain name that your organization registered?

(Susan): Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Is that why you need it or do you need it on other names that aren't registered to your organization?

(Susan): Well, and that's a really good question. In an M&A situation, if, you know, Facebook announces or we've got a deal pending with - WhatsApp was a good example of this, WhatsApp.com.

And in that case, I immediately - as soon as I became aware of it and it was public -- though the deal had not closed so we were not managing the domain name -- then I reviewed the record and went okay, now we have a

big problem because WhatsApp was famous enough but adding Facebook to the mix, it became an immediate target and had no registry lock. So then we entered into discussions with WhatsApp to immediately put that in place. So in an M&A situation, it's also critical.

And back to the updated date, that's critical in maintenance of a domain name too. If all of a sudden there's been a change and you see an - and you didn't make it, that's critical to know. That may also be critical to know in an acquisition target. So there's - I mean, there's a lot of nuances, a lot of reasons, to have this available publicly.

Chuck Gomes: So you've identified needs, purposes, for those fields. And to deal with (V.A.'s) concern, we could possibly control that through gated access. So the - you as registrant, say, could be given access through gated access and others would not. I don't know.

And (V.A.), why don't you just put a green checkmark in the chat if that would sound okay. In other words, it could still be in the RDS but very limited access, maybe only to the registrant. Does that -- and I have to scroll down to see where you're at -- yes. Okay, so thanks.

And Stephanie Perrin, I see your checkmark too, thanks. Okay, very good.

Greg, you disagree so you get to talk.

Greg Aaron: Thank you, Chuck. This is Greg. Status and date information is there because it's essential to understanding why a domain name is working or not working sometimes. It's essential to lifetime management including grace periods. And it's there for legal reasons too.

And there have been - some PDPs have talked about why this information is there and who uses it. And the EWG report also lists the uses.

It's not accurate to say that only the registrant uses this information.

Chuck Gomes: But hold on a second.

Greg Aaron: Although they often do.

Chuck Gomes: Hold on. I don't think I said they're the only ones. I used that as an example to deal with (Susan's) case.

Greg Aaron: Right. But (Agarwal's) case was it's my domain, only I should see it. Now, for instance in transfers and UDRPs and URS cases, status and update information and expiration date information is essential to be referred to by several parties including the challenge, the challenger, the registrar, gaining registrar and other people.

As far as making all this gated only for the registrant of a particular name, we go back to (Allen's) question, which is how are you going to possibly manage that. That's a huge practical issue.

So my note is this information is there for some legitimate purposes and it's not just used by the registrant of each individual name. And I'll point back to the EWG documentation about these fields. Also please refer to transfer policies, UDRP and some other policies that exist and that we've arrived at through PDPs and so forth over the years.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. And note that question 2.2 under uses and purposes is for what specific purpose should GTLD registration data be collected, maintained and made accessible. So we're going to get into more detail there but I appreciate that. Before I say anymore though, let me go to Stuart.

Stuart Clark: Hi, Stuart Clark. Is there anything to be said for making some of these things up to the registrant to determine, as in my case I don't want the status to be visible but other people do? Rather than saying well actually everybody has

to, it's a one size fits all that we as the policy people have decided that status and etcetera, etcetera always is visible to everybody but actually I'd rather make things available or not make things available.

Chuck Gomes: So I - Stuart, it's a good point. And I recall somebody maybe can help me pinpoint where it's at but I believe, I don't know if it's in the EWG report and other places that that actual - that is actually considered in some of the possible requirements that we'll be looking at down the road. So I can't pinpoint it right now but I'm pretty sure that I saw that somewhere. So I think that is a possibility.

Alan Greenberg, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: I'm getting a little...

Chuck Gomes: You are.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry for that. Maybe I'm getting a little confused. I thought we were talking about whether it should be there, not who can access it.

Chuck Gomes: We are.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Then I cannot envision any of this data where the registrant can say nobody can see it. There are use cases related to transfer, related to law enforcement with valid access trying to address things that are - you know, things within their domain that if the registrant can say sorry, no one can see anything about that, that seems to be a perfect world for criminals and other people like that. We can argue about who can get to it but saying it's not visible by anyone, I'm not sure why we're talking about that.

Chuck Gomes: I don't think anybody has said that yet or at least I didn't understand that but...

Alan Greenberg: I thought I just heard that.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And you make a good point. So that's good. Stuart, go ahead.

Stuart Clark: Yes, I think that's the thing is that I was more saying who could see it rather than anybody could see it because at the sort of one end of the thing, if the only person who can see it is the registrant, then potentially for all of these things there is a reasonable purpose to see them.

Because if the only person who can see these things is me as the owner of a domain name, then actually these things are always useful for all of the use cases we've sort of talked about. But at the very least, as the registrant, I want to be able to see these things.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Appreciate it. This is Chuck again. Now I'm going - because we're coming up to the end of our time, I want to ask (Lisa) and Marika a couple logistical questions.

Do we have - based on today's discussion, do you think that you could create any possible poll questions that we could put out to the whole group that would help us come together possibly on some of what we talked about today, not necessarily an answer to the full question? But I'm putting you on the spot.

And if the answer's no, that's okay. But the reason I'm asking you is if you need to ask any clarifying questions to help in that regard, I wanted to give you the opportunity now.

Go ahead, (Lisa).

Lisa Phifer: Lisa Phifer for the record. I do think, Chuck, that we had a couple of clarifying statements that were made. For example, Steve Metalitz threw out, you know, the potential rewording of the question to be a question with three possible answers. That seems like it lends itself to a quick poll to understand

where people fall on that spectrum of everything being available for any purpose all the way down to only for specific permitted purposes. So that's just one example.

I think we have a few things that have come out from today's call that we could tease out potential poll questions. But then we also need to tie that to what our next step will be.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I understand. And we'll come - we'll get to there as well I hope. We have to I think. But - so thanks.

So for everybody, okay, not only those on the call today but those that will listen to the recording or read the transcript, please watch the lists, okay, because we'll try to use that polling technique -- and it's not voting, please remember that -- but to try and see if we can refine a little bit of the thinking that came out of today's call.

And so that we're a little bit further ahead of the game before we get to our next meeting and continue this particular question, question 2.1. So watch for that. You won't have a lot of time to respond. You can just respond with first thoughts and so forth.

I was pleased with some of the - a lot of the data that we gathered in the polling after we did it following Hyderabad. So I think there's some value in that and it's a way of helping us focus and get some things done in between meetings. So watch for that please.

Now as far as next steps, I think one of the things that maybe the leadership team needs to do is take a look at the wording of question 2.1 and the feedback we've gotten today and what we'll get on the list and from the polls, and see if we can't maybe tweak that a little bit so that we can decide, I mean, is this a question that needs to be answered in its binary form or do we

need to change it as suggested by Steve and maybe some others too. So the next steps for the leadership team is to work on that.

I believe what we will need to do is to continue our deliberation on question 2.1. A couple other questions that I'll throw out -- and we probably don't have time to talk about them right now but we might be able to consider it next time -- is, I mean, do we need to go to question 2.2 before we go on to the first data element question, keeping in mind that we want to rotate among users, purposes, data elements and privacy questions so that we don't just focus on one of those areas because they're all three very important and we said we would do some rotation?

So think about that. If you have some thoughts on that, put it on the list. And the leadership team will talk about that as well. So any feedback you give us will be helpful.

Our meeting next week, it's - I believe it's our third meeting of the month. So am I right on that? Yes okay. So that will be at our alternate time. I know that that means a lot of people are going to be at an odd time for you for that, not the greatest time, but keep in mind there are some that are at that bad time three or four times out of a month. So let's be cooperative with those that bear with us at our better times and participate in that if at all possible.

Leadership team, let me -- I think all of you are here except for (Micaeli), anything else we need to cover or address before we adjourn? Okay.

I think we made some progress. We'll try and capture that for continuing next week. And for those of you that can't make it next week, make sure you participate off - on the list and in listening to the recording and so forth so that we can keep making progress.

That said, thanks, everyone. I think - I felt like I kind of got us started kind of poorly but I was real pleased with the discussion that got going later on. And I

think that'll help us get a little bit closer to dealing with question 2.1 maybe next week, if not fairly shortly thereafter. So thank you very much. Have a good rest of the week. And we'll talk again. Meeting adjourned. And the recording can stop.

Man 1: Thanks, Chuck.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you again. The meeting has been adjourned. Operator, please stop the recording lines and disconnect all remaining lines. And enjoy the remainder of your day.

END