

ICANN Transcription – Abu Dhabi
GNSO Next-Generation Registration Directory Services (RDS) to replace WHOIS Policy
Development Process Working Group Meeting Part 2
Saturday, 28 October 2017 10:30 GST

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. 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.

On page: <https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Chuck Gomes: Okay, this is Chuck. Let's restart the recording if it was stopped and we'll get going here.

Thanks to everyone for what has been I think really helpful discussion today. Helpful in the sense that it's - I think we're going to be better prepared once we get into making the hard decisions with regard to legit - with regard to legitimacy of purposes and use cases.

And obviously we don't have to make decisions on use cases themselves. But the purposes have to be very clearly defined. And a lot has come out -- in my opinion -- that will help us going forward. So thanks for your contributions to that.

Again, I want to encourage everyone here to feel free to get to a mic and provide your input. And - because that will help us have a better understanding. Now, one of the things that I want to do is thank (Emily) -- who's on the other side of Lisa Phifer from me here, she's raising her hand -- from the ICANN team. That - she is coordinating with all the remote participation.

So thank you very much (Emily) for that. Very much appreciated. Now, let's back up a slide on the screen please to Six, the one that we were just covering before the break. And I want to ask Susan Kawaguchi and then probably Lisa Phifer too to share some thoughts in regard to that one before we move on to Team Five. Susan Kawaguchi?

Susan Kawaguchi: So unfortunately I stepped out of the room for part of the discussion. But just from my viewpoint and experience in domain name management -- and I sort of alluded to this earlier too -- was you have a duty to respond, or to review - or receive -- let's put it that way first -- and then most likely respond to requests for information for legal actions as a domain manager.

Personally I didn't do it myself, I referred it to other parts of the companies I worked for. But as the importance of contactability and managing your domain and keeping it viable even in a dot com is, you know, there's many laws around the world that require a response. Which may be "No, we're not giving you this information", but you have to respond.

And - to legal actions. And so I think -- and (Milton)'s not in the room so he'd be surprised that I'm sort of agreeing with him I'm sure -- but you know, I think our - one of the over-arching purposes for this - some of the Whois record or the RDS data is contactability. And that includes -- as a subset -- for legal actions. Or law enforcement.

So, you know, Facebook dot com for example had to maintain its - all of its records for - to comply with you know, any registration data necessary. You

know, per the registration agreement. But it was - it also was - could be impacted by rules or laws in different countries around the world.

So you know, what you don't want to do is be shut down in a country because you're not responding, your admin contact is not doing their job. So - and it's, you know, there's different ways of going at that. I mean we only - Facebook only used Facebook dot com. We didn't use Facebook dot FR. But we still were bound to the French rules from a domain name perspective.

So that's just an example. Or for the German. Dot DE for example has a lot of rules. And Germany in general has rules on being able to contact and having information on your website. And - that's contactable. But that is usually what they first go to, is the current Whois Record and the admin contact for that.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Susan Kawaguchi. Lisa Phifer, you want to add anything there?

Lisa Phifer: Don't get so choked.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, you should...

Lisa Phifer: Lisa Phifer for the record. So I was reflecting on the conversations that have been going on for the past couple of hours. And the comment that was made in sort of trying to reframe the definition of some of these purposes or use cases as information collected for this particular reason, to enable this particular kind of processing.

And I was thinking about that in terms of legal actions. One of the reasons that legal actions percolated up as purpose in the expert working group was the group actually did define data that was collected specifically for legal actions. And that was the concept of a legal contact -- which was optional -- but could be provided by registrants to enable contact specifically in the case of legal actions.

And that contact might be different than your administrative contact -- who has other duties -- and your technical contact -- who has other duties -- and certainly might be different than the registrant themselves. So that really was the genesis of there being a purpose of legal actions. And I thought that might be useful to share.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Lisa Phifer. And that gives us a little bit of a view into the future when we start getting down to making some definite decisions on the purposes that that particular suggestion -- for the possibility of a legal contact -- may be a way that facilitates us dealing with this particular purpose. Or if we decide it is a legitimate purpose. So thanks for sharing that.

Now one of the members of the team that unfortunately wasn't able to be with us just before the break is Farzaneh. And she had shared a comment via email that I - and it came in after the document was distributed -- so I wanted to give Farzaneh a chance to comment right now. Please.

Farzenay Badii: Thank you Chuck. Farzenay Badii speaking. So when - in the definition of the legal actions we have put in several examples -- such as business users - - to protect against consumer deception and loan enforcement, to persecute and also for criminal enforcement.

However, my point is that if we are talking about persecution and making example of - some of our examples are for example intellectual property infringement on criminal prosecution. We should also mention making an example of persecution for blasphemous content. And also a persecution of journalists and others that are activists in certain countries.

And these are these legal actions are brought to them because of Whols.
Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Farzaneh. And before we move on to the next proposed purpose or use case, any final questions or comments? Oh, Farzaneh, go ahead.

Farzenay Badii: So I just wanted to ask what are we going to do with this document? Because the paragraph -- and I acknowledge that the - my point was taken and put in on the second page -- but the paragraph that we have now there are very positive legal actions. And examples.

And I don't - I think there should be a balance. There should be also the examples that I made or we should get rid of the examples. I don't know what we are going to do with this paragraph, but I - as it stands it is not acceptable.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. It's a good question. And it's one that we'll come to at the end of our session today too. But let's talk about it, let me respond right now. And those of you that were - that volunteered to be on these teams, you probably thought you were done. You're not. Okay.

We're going to have - notice in several of the ones we've discussed so far that there's been some really helpful input. And you - most of you probably saw Susan Kawaguchi taking lots of notes and so forth on there. So what we're going to end up asking the teams to do is to go back and see how they want to edit the documents.

Now these aren't formal deliverables that - but it will be good if we do agree on a final version. Not that that can't even change in the future. But - so we're going to ask the teams to try and come up with a final version after we get input this week. Okay? Thank you very much. All right, let's go to the - oh, go ahead (Mark).

Marc Anderson: Thanks Chuck. Marc Anderson. With that in mind one suggestion I might give to the legal groups though is the definition was a little - is a little bit intimidating. You have in your document.

And not to say that's not for good reason. There's a lot of good information in there. But a suggestion I would have that would make it a little easier to read maybe was maybe a more succinct summary to start things off. And...

Woman: We've got that.

Marc Anderson: (Milton) gave a great example in the first work group, where he came up with a very succinct, you know, a statement for what domain name control is for. I think something like that would really help the legal actions one. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Marc. And just for transparency, those on the - this is for the - this comment is for those on the team because they know that I push back a little bit in terms of the length of the definition and so forth. It was along the same lines.

But Marc had nothing to do with my suggesting that. This is totally independent. So thanks Marc for reinforcing a concern I had. But we'll work on that. Thank you very much. All right, let's go to the - okay, let's go to the next slide please.

All right, so again I had the privilege of coordinating two teams. And then of course two team leaders had the privilege of having two of the proposed purposes. So three of us had a little heavier load. This team is on Regulatory or Contractual Enforcement. Notice the team members.

And again, several of them are here. If you'd raise your hands and leave them up a little bit. Make them high enough -- (Beth) -- so that they can see it. And she - is (Beth) the only one that's here now that we're - oh, there we go. Good. Okay. Yes, there - so we have three over here.

So you can see their names there. (Beth). And Theo Geurts was here. Is Theo Geurts - not back right at the moment. Oh, you're over here. Weren't

you over there before? You threw me off. Okay. Thanks Theo Geurts. Steve Metalitz was a major contributor is unable to be with us here. (Chris) is not - he went - he was here but he went I think he's involved in the ALAC meeting or some other meeting.

And then (Farel)'s over - is here right? So. And Bastiaan Goslings is here. So thanks to all of you. Again, a great team. They did the work. I didn't do the work. They did the work. I was just - tried to facilitate. And they really did well.

So (Beth) is going to take the lead in doing an overview of the final deliverable that this team produced. And so I will - if we can bring that up please? Then I'll let (Beth) take over and then we'll course open it up for questions. (Beth), it's all yours.

Elizabeth Bacon: Hi everybody. I apologize, I - (Chris) very conveniently had an ALAC meeting. So I'm not as prepared to present, but I will do my best for you very quickly. So we had Regulatory and Contractual Enforcement.

Chuck Gomes: A little bit closer to the mic.

Elizabeth Bacon: Apologies. Regulatory and Contractual Enforcement was our use case name. So it covered -- in our definition -- entities that have a remit to enforce obligations arising under contracts, industry best practices, or government regulations.

And as an example we included some governmental tax authorities, UDRP, URS providers, ICANN as an organization. We had a little bit of a debate about that in the previous group, so we can maybe take some of those notes here. Intellectual property owners and some account monitoring solution providers.

I'm not going to read the entire definition for you because it's right there on the screen. Some of the tasks that we outlined. Investigation of operators' websites where property owners' rights are being exercised. Much of this goes to determining the identity of the registrant. And again, I won't read all of this to you because it's on the screen and you can ask as many questions as you'd like.

We identified several types of users. Trademark and copyright owners, tax collections agencies -- and this may be for identity - identification, sorry for the phrasing -- of contacts for domain names engaged in online sales. We have some regulatory agencies identified with regards to billing, auditing, and compliance. UDRP, URS providers. Everyone knows what UDRP and URS are.

And as well as ICANN compliance audits and staff. And again we had that - a little bit of a discussion in that previous work group with regards to how to characterize ICANN compliance or staff, so may we can take those notes over. And then we noted very generally the data used is that data which can establish the identity or location of the registrant. And categories - categorize -- pardon me -- types of users.

And then we did list out specific elements by case. And I will let you scroll through that at your leisure because basically it's a list of Whois data elements. And trying to keep it quick, but I will call that the end and welcome questions and comments.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. Thanks (Beth). And feel free to -- any of you on the team here -- to respond to questions that people ask. I did ask the presenters to be fairly brief, but the -- again let me remind you -- the full document is on the Wiki for the working group so you can take a look at that.

So now's the time for questions of this team to help us all understand what this particular use case is. Regulatory or Contractual Enforcement. So and I see a hand. Good, Holly will be next and then Stephanie.

Holly Raiche: I think you've collided into one group what I think are two groups. One -- to my mind -- are the regulatory or contractual enforcers. And that would be your tax agencies, your - say your competition regulator, or your corporate regulator or other agencies.

And the other category would be the plaintiffs. And you're treating them the same. So you're saying copyright owners are on the same level as say a regulatory agency, which is enforcing the law rather than being simply a plaintiff. So could you explain the - why you've grouped them together?
Thank you.

Elizabeth Bacon: So...

Holly Raiche: I think I said Holly Raiche, ALAC.

Elizabeth Bacon: Okay. Elizabeth Bacon. You reminded me, I always forget too. So I think - I don't think it was our intention to group them together as to imply they are the same or on the same level. I think it was just the nature of our discussion and who we had and the experience we had on the group.

So if it's a distinction that needs to be made, I don't have a problem outlining that. I'll leave it to the other group members so I'm not making any executive decisions there.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Beth). This is Chuck. And Holly, I think too we took these the way they had been proposed in the EWG report. Could we decide later on that maybe they should be separated? Absolutely. Not a problem at all.

Again, to just - we use that as a starting point. Doesn't mean they have to be lumped together. Does anybody else on the team want to respond to that? Is that okay? Okay. I appreciate all of you sitting together over there. Or at least three of you. That's great. So, okay. Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin for the record. And Holly has pretty much made my point. My point was -- when it comes to regulatory enforcement -- there are literally no limits to it. From, you know, trafficking in endangered sea turtle carapaces -- or whatever they call them -- to running a dog park that violates local bylaws.

So, you know, honestly I think this is such a slippery slope and such a dangerous kind of pursuit of information for the purposes of investigations. Because it is not within ICANN's (re)mit (sic) - remit to be the data controller for all of these different investigative activities. Which is what's happening when we collapse these things together. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Stephanie. (By the) - just as a -- while others are thinking of questions -- some of you already know this but you submitted your dissertation, right?

Stephanie Perrin: Yes. I defend in two weeks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Stephanie Perrin: It's getting exciting, I have to say...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...so she's been working on it for four years. And as Stephanie - has really been a great asset. And there are lots of tremendous people -- many of them here today -- that contribute in our working group. And so congratulations on that. I hope your defense goes well.

But thanks for your contributions in the group. So any other questions or comments? And I'd like it to be - you have some Michele? Go ahead.

Michele Neylon: I mean just on this - the regulatory enforcement. I mean I totally agree with what Stephanie's saying. You know, for us as a hosting provider, we get letters (the odd time) from regulatory authorities, both Irish and others.

And ultimately what is in the WhoIs for a domain name probably isn't actually that important. It's the WhoIs record for the IP address that they care about. As in where the content is hosted. What the content is. The domain? Totally irrelevant.

Chuck Gomes: That'd be great if some of the other team members would just like to jump in and maybe share any insights you learned. Or things that you thought might be helpful for everyone else here today with regard to this subject. So if you're willing and would like to share some comments, that would be great. Theo Geurts?

Theo Geurts: Thanks Chuck and this is Theo Geurts for the record. So - and I agree with you Michele. You're right. But when we are looking at this piece here and we are looking at the purposes -- the use cases, et cetera, et cetera -- one of the guidelines was here to make no judgement whatsoever.

So when working on this, we put our - put aside our feelings on how we felt, what was actually justifiable or not. We just stuck (sic) with the program and just put down this - the purposes here. And what we thought might be usable for a party to look up in a domain name and a WhoIs.

And that's basically what we did. So we didn't pass any judgement if it's right or not right. I mean if we're talking about the tax agencies, I personally have a very strong opinion about it but that was not the case to vent them here. Thanks.

Darcy Southwell: Thanks. Is this on? Darcy Southwell with Endurance International. I'm curious if someone could expand upon the industry best practices part of the definition of this use case? And what you're envisioning there?

Chuck Gomes: So I think the person -- this is Chuck -- I think the person who put that in there is not one of them who is here. Let me check and see if he's online. Doesn't look like it. So I was going to put him on the spot if he was online.

By the way, when I read it - but again, I was kind of just a facilitator, right? I kind of had a similar question with regard to (indice) (sic) - industry best practices. But anybody else on the team want to respond to that? (Beth), go ahead.

Elizabeth Bacon: So I actually just will -- sorry, Elizabeth Bacon -- mirror what Chuck said. And I think I did read it and said "Hmm" but it was an opinion of the team member. So we - again it was throwing out information that people felt was applicable.

So if we could maybe - I don't think it - if it was either (Steve) or (Chris) I'm not sure. So maybe we can get an explanation. But if not, then I don't have a problem getting rid of it. She says very quietly. But yes, I think that's one of the things -- as Theo Geurts said -- we weren't making judgements, we were just filling out as people's experience warranted.

Darcy Southwell: Thanks. Can I add something Chuck? So Darcy Southwell again. I guess, you know, you're talking about remits here. And so I'm a little concerned that you say we have, you know, the private sector has a remit to enforce the obligations of industry best practices.

So if we can't define that a little better -- this seems like the - maybe the group doesn't have a good definition -- then maybe it should go away.
Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Darcy. And by the way this is exactly why we're doing this right here. Okay? So that's very much appreciated. And we will revisit that particular item when - before we prepare a final for this stage of our progress. Very much appreciated.

Bastiaan Goslings, I'm going to pick on you just a little bit. Because I know that you were unable to make our last call. The last call we didn't have very much flexibility in order to get our deliverable out on Thursday and Bastiaan Goslings wasn't able to make that. Did you have any concerns about what we ended up with? Or are you okay with what we have?

Bastiaan Goslings: I think that -- Bastiaan Goslings speaking -- well as a starting point for discussion that we're having now I think this has been a beneficial process, at least for me. And I can only say -- depending on what we're going to use as this output for and what the next step is going to be -- I think we would be happy (you know) to elaborate -- for instance -- on the industry best practices.

You know, how that fits into this. So that's all I can say about that. And just to confirm, I totally agree with comments made by Stephanie, Holly, Michele as well. From my perspective, you know, we did indeed take the Whols as-is. Certain stakeholder groups that see the Whols and can use it for certain purposes, you know, that -- or activities that they do -- in order probably, you know, to - because the data are there. You can use them.

And that does create -- as a follow-up probably -- and interest for this particular stakeholder to use the data as they are there. And I think, you know, maybe as a next step this particular interest we can have a discussion whether is that indeed legitimate for the use of those data? And should that particular stakeholder then have access to those data?

I'm aware of the fact, you know, that we had limited time and also limited frame. So this is certainly not the limitative list of examples and probably is not very elaborate and detailed. I'm aware of that. So any feedback that we

can receive from others, you know, with regard to elements that are unclear and that need further elaboration you know, I'd be happy to work on that.
Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Bastiaan Goslings. And (Chris) I'm going to pick on you too. You weren't able - you had to go to another meeting. But you have any comments you'd like to share with everyone here today with regard to this particular area?

(Chris): Okay, (Chris) for the record. Well this is kind of the most challenging one. Because we're talking about kind of two stakeholders. But there are obviously more stakeholders in there, which is actually quite related.

I remember it wasn't me who actually put the best practices but I think it was (Farel) or something. But I think he was trying to refer to how the different registrars and registries actually work. Because I think he actually picked it up from the working group whenever we were having issues. The questions actually always came, you know, yes we work in a different way from different perspectives. From - I mean contractual enforcement.

I mean -- and obviously regulatory -- because they're two things in there. I take it as two different things that has to be looked at. Okay, regulation obviously we're talking about law enforcement and what will have you. Contractual enforcement obviously goes into the other end.

I mean, that's where I personally think, you know, what comes out of the policy or ICANN org they need to look at it from a very close perspective. Because you know, contractual enforcement - I remember when we were having the working group sessions, there were lots of questions that came up, you know? We work this way, we work that way.

And I remember I'm not sure who actually said that but there was also the question about contractual enforcement that came up a couple of times. And

I'm not sure actually who did say that but said well, we have to ensure -- at one point in time -- that, you know, wherever the other registrars or the registries are they need to try and enforce their part of the work as well.

So yes it's not - I mean personally it's not that complete, but we tried. I think we have to thank you Chuck for actually trying to make it be less complicated, because it was a long one I remember. But we do need to - but I was next door, so I was actually listening in to what Stephanie and obviously the others were talking about. I do agree and I will be with Theo Geurts on that one. But this is going to be the most challenging one.

I mean, how ICANN enforces the contractual enforcement with the registrars and registries, taking into consideration that we're talking about privacy and obviously GDPR which is going to be hitting on us. I mean we have to not forget that couple of countries actually aligning. I mean like South Africa, they just started to - I think it was Theo Geurts who actually said that it's - there's no changes in the laws per se, but it's just enforcement that's coming in. So everybody has to know exactly what they're looking at.

And one of the other things I'll probably want to add here is I had to go for a course in the GDPR to actually understand what was, you know, in all those pages. But for people who are here, you have to look at it very closely. Because those were actually in the industry and actually registrars, registries the enforcement can actually be applied to them anyway.

Don't forget that, you know, you have - EU citizens actually could be on your database. And you know, that could be affecting you. I was actually looking at one of the other things was like people were talking about the dot Amsterdam for example. And the registrars typically said "No, we cannot release that information".

But if you go on the ICANN WhoIs you obviously get some kind of information in there. Which is again against, well you would probably say best practices

at this point in time. But if the GDPR were to be applied I don't know who's going - who was going to be sitting on top of it. And it looks like it would have been ICANN because obviously the data is sitting on the Whols. And the registrar is refusing to give that information out.

So we have to come to a point -- personally I think -- that we need to come to a point and get away from our prejudice and everything and work and find a solution that works in all interests. And obviously you - I don't see anybody trying to have two systems or three systems in place. I mean, it's a lot of work.

For me, I mean everybody will have to align to one kind of line or be on the same page and move forward. But this is really going to impact very much on everybody else. That's what I have to say.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you (Chris). And thanks for being a part of the team. Thanks to all the team members on this one. I will open it up for any additional questions on this one before I take my measurement of understanding. Lisa Phifer?

Woman: (Two more).

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry, what?

Woman: And Marc is in queue...

Chuck Gomes: Oh, I didn't - sorry, I was looking this way. I was trying to avoid you, Marc.

Marc Anderson: Fair enough. Marc Anderson for the record. You know, in anticipation of your question -- you know, taking a measurement on the room -- you know, you're going to ask if we understand this. And I thought I understood what regulatory or contractual enforcement means, but now I'm questioning my understanding after going through this.

The group seems to have taken a fairly broad brush on what they're including in this. But I really have to question some of the things you're including. For instance -- under users -- you have trademark and copyright owners. You know -- I won't read the whole bullet -- but I'm just not sure how that comes under the umbrella of regulatory or contractual enforcement.

Later you talk about regulatory agents, agencies might want to use the registration data for such purposes you include billing. I'm not sure how that is a regulatory or contractual enforcement area. So I guess, you know, I appreciate some of the other groups took larger, you know, larger brushes to this and that certainly makes sense.

But you know, I'm not sure I understand some of the things that are included in here. And seems you've taken an overly broad approach to what regulatory and contractual enforcement means.

Chuck Gomes: Marc, so your - you would eliminate some of the users that were identified in there. Is that correct?

Marc Anderson: I guess I'd ask the group. You know, to explain your use cases a little bit more. You know, it could be just my understanding isn't sufficient here. But you know, again, you know, I don't quite understand how you're including some of these things under the topic of regulatory or contractual enforcement.

Chuck Gomes: And those are exactly the kind of questions we wanted to have come out in this. So I'm coming back to you guys in just a minute. But let me go to Griffin Barnett.

Griffin Barnett: Thanks Chuck. And yes, I mean just to provide - I came up with a quick thought as to what, you know, a trademark or copyright owner, why they might be included here.

You know, so I could imagine a context where a trademark owner for example has a license for a trademark to a third party. And let's say the third party goes and registers a domain name that has like the trademark in it. Or you know, the website associated with it might have content that might fall outside the scope of the license for example.

And that would be a scenario where a trademark owner would be sort of enforcing a contract and using potentially an RDS to look into that situation. So I mean that's just one example that comes to mind.

And I'm saying it could fall within the scope here, that's all I'm saying. It could fall within the scope of other purposes. Like for example the legal actions one. That - there's overlap I think. But that's just one example.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Griffin Barnett. Chuck again. And that's kind of what I was thinking too. The legal actions kind of cover some of those users. And maybe that's where some of those go at least rather than in this one. But that's the kind of input that we'll take back when we work. And I'm still going to come back to members of the team to respond here but I want to put Lisa Phifer in.

Lisa Phifer: Lisa Phifer for the transcript. So the question that I keep hearing actually and strikes me is what contracts? And what regulations? And the definition says "That relates to activities on the internet" well that actually seems much broader than ICANN's remit.

So for example are we talking about ICANN's contracts with contracted parties? Are we talking about contracts that registrars have with registrants? I mean, narrowing down what contracts are part of this purpose might help them understand what really fits in as far as users. And then the data that is required for that purpose.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Lisa Phifer. Okay, who's going to volunteer first from the team? To respond to these concerns. They're trying to get each other to do it, see? They're over there negotiating. Okay, (Chris), go ahead.

(Chris): (Chris) for the record. I think all three of them have to be tied down together. Because the way things are actually going with the privacy laws and everything. I mean yes, okay ICANN with the registrar, and the registrar with the registry. I think there has to be a clear line that says this is the way it has to be.

Right now it seems like, you know, everybody's doing their own stuff. So I would say to -- as Lisa Phifer's actually said -- I think personally that all three of them have to be in quite good alignment so that we can actually look at, you know, the enforcement. Because it seems like everybody wants to do their own things in their own way, obviously.

I'll take Africa as the typical one, because most of them actually tend to actually either register in Europe or it's actually probably in Asia or whatever. But then, you know, it may not be enforced properly because they don't really care as far as their domain names (unintelligible).

But in other regions -- you know, with the laws of the privacy actually coming in -- I mean we'll have to take a stand where all three of them are actually quite aligned. It has to be. If we have - if you have a contract with a registrar and a registry which is different from what ICANN has on the top, which says you have to follow these kind of rules and they are actually changing it and making it easier for them.

Okay, for the business purposes fine. But if we end up with a three different type of contracts, it would definitely going to affect what we are looking at trying to do right now. That's my take at it.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Chris). Chuck speaking again. (Beth), you're up.

Elizabeth Bacon: This is (Beth). So (Chris) is probably going to start throwing empty coffee cups at me because I'm going to disagree a little bit. Inter-group rumble. I'm not going to go to the mat for some of this on the group because in my personal capacity I agree that it's pretty broad.

But part of what our instructions were to use the experience of the group and put it on paper and say this is what folks use it for. If it maybe doesn't live here or if it's not narrow enough I'm happy to take that onboard and work with folks to narrow it down. I'm not going to say that it's not a use - that someone doesn't use it that way.

If it belongs somewhere else I'm happy to change it. If it belongs nowhere I'm happy with that too.

Chuck Gomes: So Marc - oh, good. I keep - I'm looking over here to the speaker and not doing this. Now one of you is going to be offended when I pick the other one. You guys have good competition with one another. So I'm going to go with Stephanie.

Man: Maxim is first.

Chuck Gomes: What's that?

Man: Maxim is first.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, Maxim was next? I'm sorry. Again, my direct rival (unintelligible) I need to back up I guess a little bit. So go ahead Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. I'd like to develop the idea of Marc that -- to avoid confusion -- we can keep it together but separated. Because contractual compliance is pure business to business. And compliance with law, it's relations of, yes, law enforcement and the legal body.

And you cannot combine business interests with, yes, governmental interests or, like, yes, law enforcement interests. It doesn't work. Because they are separated. And I would recommend to keep it in the same document but like two lines the business to business issues in compliance with the agreements between ICANN and the party I'd say because it could be registry registrar maybe the reseller or the registrant after all and - because he has some - they have some rights.

And the compliance with law because we represent by law abiding companies we have to follow the law. And the relations between those companies and the law in the jurisdiction are written in laws of the jurisdiction. We cannot say anything against it because ICANN is yes not supported company in California yes. And they cannot say that yes you don't have - you need to breach these laws directly. It's not good.

And the same thing the second idea is that I see lots of common items in our different work streams. And I think after we refine each of them we can combine some items because in the main (unintelligible) change of control we have similar provisions about GDPR, URS, court, law enforcement agencies and we will have better understanding of what's going on when we refine each of the documents.

And then when we combine it we will see lots of overlaps. And it will give us more clearer understanding of the potential purposes of the system. And yes the last thing one second I think that some of the time we will have to separate collection of data, storage and access and even maybe deletion.
Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Maxim. Holly you're getting some good reinforcement on what you shared before the break. Did you collaborate with these people on the break is that what happened? Thanks. Okay Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks, Stephanie Perrin for the record. I just wanted to in the context of this discussion about regulatory enforcement and law enforcement access to data remind as we have before that while we focus on data protection as the relevant law that actually the kinds of things that Farzaneh was intervening on earlier are protected under the UN covenant on civil and political rights and on the UN Declaration of Human Rights.

So, you know, the Universal Declaration that is. So ICANN has a responsibility to act in the public interest and to actually honor those rules rights in the view of some of us and I believe it's in the bylaws now. So that actually covers a lot of this – the rights of an individual under law to have due process. And that's a concern. It is not the data protection law that necessarily sets these things out it is the charter in each country or the Constitution in the US or whatever. And the easiest way for us to talk about that in this group is through these two international instruments, so just a reminder. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Stephanie. Michele, your turn.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Chuck. Michele for the record. You know as a start I would look this entire thing around, you know, contractual compliance. My initial thought was oh this is contractual compliance in terms of the ICANN contract that the registrar has, or the ICANN contract the registry has or of course it could be the contract between the registrar and the registry. But then kind of realized that what people were kind of loading on to this were things that were completely outside of that. And I think that causes a bit of confusion.

You know, if rights I mean rights holders dealing with contractual issues around licenses and usage and all that that's a completely different issue to you have a contract with ICANN and much do X, Y and Z where - and under the new regime here with, you know, different TLDs with different rules and different criteria. For example registry X might require that the registrar I don't

know enable service Z with every single domain name or that service epsilon is not allowed with a particular extension or whatever.

So, you know, that kind of contractual enforcement I totally get but referring to things like licensing and other things out there which I think is part of a much broader thing which make - and often it's going to come down to content and everything else because it's kind of - it's caused a bit of confusion to kind of load them all in together. So maybe - so splitting them out in some way might be a bit easier.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck again. And I don't think there's any disagreement if there is I'd like to see it or hear it that separating the two items would help a lot in this instead of lumping them together. That's an easy thing to do. Coming back to Marc I think that what's going to be really important in the future when we actually get down to deciding what users would be given access to any RDS data it's really important that we narrow that down and don't include inappropriate ones here. So we're going to have to deal with that more specifically. Farzaneh did you have something?

Man: It's different from legal action.

Farzaneh Badii: Hi. I am a little bit surprised the trademark and (unintelligible) rights owner are the users of this group as well because we are covering them in legal actions real elaborately. So I agree. And I think they do not belong to this group. We need to limit it. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. And that's - that points been made a couple times. And that's good. So reinforce that. And it's going to be less important that we get this document right although it will be revisited then it is when we actually get down to deciding who gets access. That's where that will be critical there. So but the team will take that into consideration in terms of its final draft. (Chris), go ahead.

(Chris): I think Chuck you will remember when we were actually visit - we were drafting the document we knew that some of the things how great - were going to overlap the other groups. But however we actually produced it. And we do accept that, you know, some of the stuff that's here actually would actually belong to other groups as well. So that's beyond any doubt.

We do accept that. And we - when we were looking at it there was more to it. And then we figured out that, you know, we had to take this stuff out. So for clarification and obviously making - breaking the document or the two in two actually which makes a lot of sense. I do agree on that as well. I just wanted to make that point.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Chris). Lisa?

Lisa Phifer: Thanks Lisa Phifer. I – so first I actually got – want to commend you guys for taking to heart the direction to not take anything off the table prematurely and to consider everybody's inputs. I do think that and this goes across the board for everybody working on a drafting team that trying to tease apart what you see is really very different use cases with different users may be needing different kinds of data. Even if you don't break it out of your document separating it in the way that you describe it will help us all understand why those cases are different. And where you see that there might be overlap flagging which purpose you think it might overlap with which other purpose will probably help us in that process that Maxim referred to, you know, when we try to harmonize where the overlaps are.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. So we have a comment over here and one there. Hold on one second.

(Karen Melanterival): Thanks. This is (Karen Melanterival). I'm from (Winterfault) IP Group for the record. I wanted to ask – I think when folks that aren't necessarily ICANN insiders are looking at regulatory and contractual enforcement they're going to insert their own sort of contractual or understanding of what contractual

enforcement means which is probably how this stuff ended up here. And I don't think we care where it ends up as long as it's captured and which people have set already.

But could we then rename this section to be more specific and to capture what the definition of contractual enforcement means in this group so that when other people are looking at it they get it? I think some of our problem is what's the common issue I guess? You know, we have to just more narrowly define it on top so that we know what we're looking at when we're looking at it. That's it. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Karen). Okay.

Owen DeLong: Owen DeLong for the record. It seems to me that it might be useful as part of this exercise to produce kind of a matrix where on one axis you've got the various fields or data that you're capturing and on the other axis you've got all of the different reasons that you're capturing things. And that way you could actually just, you know, put marks in the holes where the field applies and it would allow you to consolidate things or visually see where the overlaps are and such quite a bit easier, just a thought.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much. So that sounds like a good action for staff. Marika, disappeared on me so I just get to pick on Lisa right now. But anyway thanks for a very practical suggestion. That's appreciated. Any other questions or comments on this one? Okay. How many of you think you have a reasonably good understanding of these two proposed purposes raise hands please? Boy there's just a few hands. I'm not sure we got good understanding there are not. Any more questions if you didn't raise your hand was it that that's not clear? Marc raised some good points. Go ahead you Marc go ahead.

Marc Anderson: I'll jump in. And I'm being a little - Marc Anderson for the record. I'm being a little hesitant - cognizant of the fact that my group hasn't presented yet so I

hate to provide too much feedback to a group considering my group is still coming.

Woman: Chicken.

Marc Anderson: But I do feel like, you know, to - for me to be more comfortable I need a better understanding of what is meant by regulatory and contractual enforcement. I think a lot of the comments have reflected that. And so, you know, and, you know, it doesn't for my mind it doesn't necessarily have to be a narrow scope. You know, you can have as broad a scope as you want as long as you've included that in your definition. And I don't feel like I got that coming out of the document that exists currently.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Marc. (Beth)?

Elizabeth Bacon: Oh so I think you all noticed that none of the people in the working group raised their hand either which is simply not good. So I think I - we're super open to all of the comments and appreciate them. So maybe if we I can't believe I'm volunteering with the four more work. If we need to go back and do some of the - make some of the suggestions and insert that people will be more comfortable but I think the understanding is that we've definitely heard the comments and have - we are not going to the mat to keep this the same. So we're happy to insert those and make the changes.

Owen DeLong: Owen DeLong for the record. I think I have a pretty - I'm not one that raised my hand. I think I have a pretty good understanding of what I think the document means. But I'm not confident that my understanding of what I think the document means is shared with any other person in the room as to what they think the document means. And I think a lot of the comments we've heard here kind of reflect that the - there's as many different viewpoints of what this document means as there are people in the room. And that's why I didn't raise my hand is because I don't think we've achieved a common

understanding even though I think many of us probably think we have our own understanding.

Chuck Gomes: Don't go away.

Owen DeLong: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And I'm going to go to (Milton) too in a minute. But could you briefly share with us what you think these items mean?

Owen DeLong: Well I think for example that there are a variety of opinions on what contractual enforcement means. I think it primarily means the enforcement of the various contracts between the members of the CPH and ICANN. So, you know, the contracts between registries and registrars, the contracts between ICANN and registrars, and ICANN and registers, et cetera, et cetera. And as a registrar I think there's at least seven different contracts between various entities that we've had to deal with just to do registrations in .com with ICANN, and Verisign and the financial guarantees to Verisign and this that the other thing.

So I think that's primarily what's intended to be covered here. But I think that the way the document is worded there's a lot of ambiguity as to what other contract enforcement that might mean. Whether it might include enforcement of a contract where party A agreed to sell a domain to party B whether it includes UDRP issues, et cetera, et cetera., and so it's not completely clear to me that we have all the same understanding of things like that.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much. That's much appreciated and I hope all of the team members are listening closely so we've got a little work to do on some of this. (Milton), your next.

(Milton): My problem with the understanding of this is how – why it isn't collapsed with the legal action one? Essentially in both cases you're talking about

ascertaining the identity of a domain registrant for the purposes of deciding whether they're in compliance with a contract or breaking the law. How is it different? And why would we want to have additional categories when, you know, we'd make our life simpler by having the same ones? So that's what I don't understand.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Milton). I'm looking in chat and looking left and right which I usually forget to do. Okay so a lot of good input. We're going to have to – the team is going to have to take a look at that - this part of the transcript and see what we can do. Does anyone on the team have any questions of anybody in terms of understanding the input that has been provided? Okay (Sebastian)?

(Sebastian): Thank you Chuck. This is (Sebastian) speaking. No I take more all the very constructive feedback, so thank you for that all of you. And I don't mean to over complicate matters but thinking out loud I think we could even also following the comments that Owen made split up the contractual part. On the one hand, you know, third parties that use data as reflected in the public Whois way outside the remit of ICANN or whatever ICANN can influence because yes it's publicly available data that they use to enforce contracts or to reach out to certain parties involved in contracts in order to enforce something.

Like for instance the intellectual property rights. And I'm not speaking of domain names related to intellectual property but content that is hosted on Web sites and stuff like that so way outside the remit of ICANN. And on the other hand as Owen referred to the parties, you know, from the CC the Contracted Parties House those type so that is something those contracts that is something that ICANN has an influence on.

So to split that up and then on the other hand we have the regulatory part. And I take on board the fact that it is very generally referred to as regulatory agencies. And I take on board what Marc has said there. But then to

conclude again we could even split them up into three parts to more clarify what we're trying to say. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank (Sebastian). What – who there was another hand. Was it you (Beth)? Okay (Beth) go ahead.

Elizabeth Bacon: I was just going to welcome everyone who had comments to make edits to the documents. It's available. And that way, you know, you don't have to rely on us to interpret what you meant. And if you want to just even if it's a comment bubble and then we can maybe make changes have at it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. We'll wrap this one up here. Thanks again for the very helpful interaction. And the team will regroup and work on this, some very helpful input. Let's go then to – we're going to skip ahead. So let's go back to the slides. And we're not there yet. Backup go back to...

Lisa Phifer: It's the easiest way to get there.

Chuck Gomes: ...okay. Hang on no.

Lisa Phifer: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Oh academic?

Lisa Phifer: Sorry (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Yes. I don't think so. Okay there we go. That's what we want. Lisa was trying to mislead me there, just kidding. All right so let's go to the individual Internet use. And that's a second one by - that Susan Kawaguchi coordinated. So Susan Kawaguchi, I'll turn it over to you.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks Chuck. And this is a - it's a shorter one so maybe we'll get through this quickly. Same team and - but we didn't spend a whole lot of time

discussing this I would say because some of this was included in the domain name control. So can we go to the document for – let me see if I've got it too here. So a very brief definition is identification of registrant for contact by Internet user. So this has been the rare case and I must admit that it's probably a rare case where any Internet user has gone to a Web site and said, who is the registrant? Who can I contact here whether they have a problem or, you know, just a question, concern? So it's a simple use in some ways.

So they would – the real world user contacts a domain registrant for information about their Web site or services offered using the domain name. This may not necessarily be a Web site either. It could be that, you know, there is some sort of service offered via the domain name that's not content or not on a it does not resolve to a Web site let's put it that way. So very few people probably actually do this because how many of the, you know, Internet users out there really understand there is a Whois record though many on the team also said they often do that. So - and personally I do that. But as we did, you know, that was one point that kept we kept coming back to is it's probably not used very often. And maybe there's an opportunity for education here where people would look to a Whois record before they used a Web site.

The other possible use here is consumer protection. The Internet user may reach out to their IS to an ISP to determine if the Web site is legitimate or if they received a suspect email to find out if it's phishing. So users could be any Internet user and anyone operating infrastructure on the Internet. And if we can scroll down a little bit you'll see it sort of a limited set of data compared to domain name control. But it's pretty much most of it. So it's fairly simple and maybe not widely used. And some of this could have been covered in other use cases. Maxim, did you want to add anything to our...

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Talking about customer protection we also could divide it to the consumer protection agency section. And yes

consumers themselves trying to understand how to behave in certain situation because the one is regulator and the other is yes the end user. So we could add reference that it's covered in the other side of the document. I don't know.

Chuck Gomes: Holly?

Holly Raiche: It's really not a question. I fully understand what this is. I guess the comment would be that this is perhaps the most problematic of the categories in terms of the GDPR and basic privacy law. And I think everybody can put their hand up they understand what it's about. But when we get to the next phase of the discussion which is the legality or otherwise then probably this will be the subject of a lot of debate. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: Yes Stephanie Perrin for the record. And I do understand that we were tasked with looking at the current situation without making judgments as to whether it is. But in terms of - whether it is valid. But in terms of consumer protection I wouldn't consider Susan Kawaguchi a typical consumer. She's a data manager with vast experience in this area both prior to Facebook and certainly at Facebook. I would suggest that the average individual who uses the Internet is not capable of deciphering much from the Whois records.

Those who come to ICANN and Tapani is looking at me like I use it all the time what you mean but he's not typical right? So the concept of the – of use of Whois as a mechanism for consumer protection needs to be completely unpacked the whole issue of resellers and end user awareness of which reseller is – they're getting their domain from, and who is the accredited registrar, and how the obligations are passed on those are the kinds of things that consumer law look at consumer protection law in the various national jurisdictions. And, you know, we're nowhere near having a proper medium for

consumer protection through Whois. So I just want to put those brackets around this whole concept. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Gentlemen at the mic.

Owen DeLong: Owen DeLong. I think that this is probably a wider spread use case than you give a credit for because in addition to the technical people, and the people that come to ICANN meetings, and data managers and that relatively small subset that directly use Whois, and understand what Whois is, and know that they're using it they're actually a lot of spam reporting tools and point click lookup tools out there in various parts of the Web and other places that actually use Whois on the backend to gather and consolidate a lot of the data that they provide to end users. And so I think there is an actually broader end user use case than maybe realized as a result of those tools and that, that should be considered.

Woman: Can I just clarify something? Learned something new here so when I'm using my - and I hate to admit I'm and sorry if Yahoo is here but still use Yahoo email. But so when I'm in my Yahoo email and I get what I consider a spam or something I don't want to see again and I mark it as spam are you saying that then that goes off to a tool that would check the Whois record?

Owen DeLong: I have absolutely no idea in the specific case of Yahoo. But I do know that for example if you type report spam into Google you can find a half a dozen tools pretty readily where you can paste the entire content of the email with the headers into a Web page and it will go off and look up Whois for all of the different domains on the received headers and all of the different stuff and spit back a spam report with a list of email addresses. You can send it to and a lot of the data that it bases that on is gathered from Whois on the backside.

Marc Anderson: Thanks Marc Anderson. I'll point out that my group covered abuse. And we get into this in a little detail. And I'm sure everybody will be wowed and have

only supportive comments for us. But there is a little bit of overlap and I think maybe the topic of abuse is probably left best for that group later on.

Sort of a separate comment though I think for me I'm – I was listening to what Susan Kawaguchi was saying and I think what I took away from what you said is that there's a contact ability use case. And, you know, I think that's nothing new to any of us on the working group. You know, contact ability is one of the topics we keep circling back to. And so for me this is another, you know, another case where providing a mechanism or means of contacting somebody authoritative for the domain name registration is really the purpose we're trying to solve for. So that was what I took away from the presentation. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: And just, this is Chuck just to jump in. The working group has and we don't have time to go into it here because we're going to have to wrap this up but the working group already has made some tentative conclusions. And I say tentative because we always leave it open to come back and revisit them as we get more information but with regard to their being at least one contact that is workable. But anyway just to let you know that quite a bit of thought and action has gone into that already and we'll do more later on. And go ahead Susan Kawaguchi.

Susan Kawaguchi: Tapani?

Tapani Tarvainen: Tapani for the record, just a quick point on the consumer protection issue that there have been attempts to educate users to use Whois. They are Web sites that say that if you suspect this do phishing do this, do that. And some of them do have Web site automatic tools for doing the Whois instruction. So I'm just saying this is a use case that has existed and does exist not whether it's a good thing but it certainly there are (unintelligible).

Susan Kawaguchi: (Chris)?

(Chris): Yes (Chris) for the record. One thing perhaps which I see very often is basically, you know, you have the big names out there and there's normally you find a user trying to wait for a deadline for reregistering or paying back your domain name. And they just get in there they buy the domain and then they just, you know, kind of frame the others to pay more.

That's probably another thing that should be considered because this has been quite an interesting one for quite some time because you see those people going online and saying, you know, pay me a million dollars now for you to get back your domain because you actually have missed, you know, renewing your domain name that also can actually fit in there.

It's not a business necessarily but it can be users. I've seen many users do that actually. They just go on the Whois. Look at when the renewal date will come and wait for whatever happens. If they forget they'll just jump in buy the domain and then frame the company again saying okay now you have to pay for that. That's one thing you could probably consider in there as well. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: (Chris) I have to disagree. I mean we have an entire PDP on post expiry domain name recovery several years ago which covered that comprehensively. I mean the issue you're talking about at this juncture shouldn't be as much of an issue as it could have been in the past when the lines around how registrars are obliged to notify a registrants of upcoming expiries, the number of notices and all that. You know, that was - prior to that particular PDP and I bear the scars of it they're deep, you know, that could have been something that was open to abuse. In 2017 if that's still an issue then that's a contractual enforcement issue. It's got the Whois thing here really I mean sure I can see a use case but it - your - with all due respect I think it's covered it's done.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks. Lisa Phifer for the record. I know that many people in this room probably are aware of it but some of you may not be that in the bylaws in the

section that covers the obligations for registration directory services it does discuss the use of RDS for promoting consumer trust. And in fact there were efforts made after the first Whois review team to take steps to try to expand awareness of Whois for individual consumers.

And the Whois portal that you see on ICANN's Web site is actually part of that effort to make sort of a one-stop place where you could go to do a Whois lookup and present the information in a consistent human readable form. So this particular purpose actually does relate back to part of the mandate and the bylaws.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. We're getting very close to adjournment time. And I suspect there's another meeting in here 15 minutes after we end. So it's important that we end on time. Let's measure the understanding of this purpose not that you agree with it or think that it's a legitimate purpose or whatever but how many – you have a question?

Man 1: Just a quick clarification, I understood that the individual Internet user case excluded registrant problems that we are not talking about registrants but what other individual user cases because that's covered elsewhere?

Susan Kawaguchi: I'm sorry I missed that.

Chuck Gomes: Mic.

Susan Kawaguchi: Could you just restate that?

Man 1: I understood that it's individual user case excluded registrant problems because they are covered elsewhere. And this is just users...

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes.

Man 1: ...exploiting that?

Chuck Gomes: Good clarifying question. So how many of you think you have a reasonable understanding of this one? Can I see your hands? Okay quite a few. So a little bit better than the last one but by the way on the last one that's what we wanted to find out so that we work further on it to make sure there's good understanding. All right appreciate that.

The – let me make a general comment - general observation on my part. I don't know that I've ever been in a session a work a live working group session where I've seen such broad participation from different individuals. That's fantastic. And I think the idea that Susan Kawaguchi and Lisa came up with this particular exercise we're going through facilitated that, so my compliments. We've heard from so many different people. And that's what we really need in working groups. So my compliments and thanks for that for the team members, for the team coordinators and for everybody here today who has contributed so that's very much appreciated.

Let's go to the next slide please. What's that – is that the last slide? Oh I don't think it is. Is it? Go up then. Where are the links? Oh that's what I wanted to show everybody. By the way this presentation is available on - so on the Web site. So you can get it but there's all kinds of links provided so that you have information there. And is there a slide I don't remember an action items or is it just something - no okay thanks.

Woman: You have to make them up.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Have to make them up. That's right. So I kind of covered this already the action items. The – we do want the teams to revisit each of theirs and this will be said again on Wednesday. Let me tell you what's happening on Wednesday and let's see help me real quick is a 4 o'clock or 4:15?

Woman: Four o'clock.

Chuck Gomes: Four o'clock 16:00 on - oh it's on there. Okay right at the top. The first bullet the second item there we have another face to face meeting from 4:00 pm to 6:30 pm on Wednesday. We will continue and do our best to cover the other proposed purposes that weren't covered today. So please remember that.

A lot of mention has been made to the – and this is not on the slide but has been made to the GDPR. Of course that's a hot topic for this ICANN 60. There is a session on Thursday morning on that a panel group is going to be on that. So certainly if you're available encourage you to attend that. And certainly for those of us on the working group that's a good session for us to attend.

So the action items for the coordinators and the teams is to take all the feedback that we're getting today and Wednesday and do a redraft of the document not that, that documents going to end up in so much as a final deliverable at the end of our work for Phase 1 but that it will be very useful when we start discussing the legitimacy of the proposed purposes, the use cases and as well as when we start talking about access, when we start talking about gated access, privacy and so on. So did I leave any action items out there? Go ahead Lisa.

Lisa Phifer: So for those drafting teams that have not yet presented their work if you want to make any refinements to what you've come up with in advance of Wednesday that is just fine because the purpose here is to learn from the discussion, apply it to our work and move forward. So for the drafting teams that'll be presenting on –in Wednesday's session if you have updates please provide them before you go to bed on Tuesday night.

For those of you who were kind enough to go first today maybe you can still use the time that we're here together at least the subset of your team that's here together to advance your work while we're here at ICANN 60. The - we will have a little bit of time on Wednesday when we start for people to give an update on their team not necessary represent your work but to let us know if

you've made any forward progress. And specifically if you have any questions that you'd like to raise while we're all here. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Lisa. Any final comments before I adjourn our session today? Again I want to express my thanks for the great participation and so many contributions from the teams but also from those who are here today and weren't on a team. This is exactly what we – result that I think and what we hope would happen. So I'm very pleased with the outcome. At that I will adjourn the call. The recording can stop. And everybody have a good rest of the day and rest of the week in our ICANN 60 meetings.

END