

**ICANN
Transcription
Next-Gen RDS PDP Working group call
Tuesday, 28 March 2017 at 16:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-nextgen-rds-pdp-28mar17-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p6yyqy3q6q5/>

Attendance is located on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/pLzRAw>

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

Coordinator: The recordings have started. You may now proceed.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening.
Welcome to the Next Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services to Replace Whois call on Tuesday the 28th of March 2017.

In the interest of time today there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room so if you are only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourselves be known now?

Beth Allegretti: Hi, it's Beth Allegretti. I'm on audio.

Terri Agnew: Thank you, Beth. Hearing no further names, I would like to remind all 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'll turn it back over to our chair, Chuck Gomes, please begin.

((Crosstalk))

Terri Agnew: Thank you, Daniel. I have you noted as well.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, let me mark that down as well. Okay, welcome, everyone, to our RDS PDP Working Group today. And just a logistics matter, Terri, can you also maybe expand the chat area just a little bit. I don't know - I mean, like only seeing one chat at a time, and as much chat as we have it's helpful to see a little bit more. Okay, all right, thank you.

So our first item of business today, as always, is to find out if there are any updates to statement of interests, please let us know if there are. And I see Rod's hand is up. I don't know if that's for a statement of interest or not, but Rod, go ahead.

Rod Rasmussen: Yes, thanks Chuck. Rod Rasmussen here. Yes, I did, as I mentioned in Copenhagen, I have recently retired from Infoblox. I have updated my SOI to reflect that. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Appreciate that. Maxim, you're next.

Maxim Alzoba: Yes, Maxim Alzoba for the transcript. I added (unintelligible) in this PDP working group and in RPM Review PDP Working Group. For some reason I forgot to do it.

Chuck Gomes: And did you update your statement of interest online?

Maxim Alzoba: Yes, I did.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

Maxim Alzoba: Yes I did.

Chuck Gomes: Very much appreciated. Thanks to both of you. The next thing on the agenda, still under Agenda Item 1, I want to talk a little bit of standards of behavior and some of my personal expectations of all of you as working group members.

The - first thing, maybe just to set the stage, I've become increasingly concerned about some of the behavior in the working group. And I think we can all work together to improve that. Marika sent out yesterday a very important message about working group guidelines, excuse me, not working group guidelines but working group behavior, the standards, participating in ICANN working groups and so forth. Please take a look at those and take that very seriously because it's very important.

We have a hugely challenging task in front of us, or tasks, whichever we want to say it. And if we all follow the guidelines, it'll make our task a lot easier. Not easy, but a lot easier, and we can avoid some of the pitfalls that often happen in working groups. And in particular, have happened over many working groups discussing the topic of Whois over the last 15 years plus.

I suggest that everyone that hasn't done so recently take a look at the GNSO Working Group Guidelines and I'll ask staff to send links to

those and also to our charter, again, although you can find both of those on our wiki, but just to make sure it's easy. In particular, focus on the decision making parts of both the guidelines and our charter. They're spelled out pretty well. And when we get to the point, and we're a long ways from there, but when we get to the point where we finalize any recommendation we make, I can assure you we will not be counting heads.

It'll be up to the leadership team to make an assessment regarding the level of consensus. And all of you will have input into that as well, but at the end of the day it'll be our responsibility to make an assessment as to the level of agreement on recommendations, and of course in cases of minority reports those will be allowed.

Again, let me say, we're a long ways from there. We're making some interim decisions as we go to try to keep moving forward. Some of those we may have to come back and revisit and change and so forth, so nothing we're doing now is in concrete, and won't change, in fact probably a lot of it will as we get more and more knowledge and understanding and we consider competing viewpoints.

Now, I'd like to encourage a couple things with regard to member attitudes. I'd like us to get past an us versus them mentality. We're not going to succeed if we're competing against each other to who can win. Will the privacy interests win? Will the law enforcement interests win? Will the IP interests win? Will the registrar interests win? I'd really like to ask all of you, and I'll send this out to the list afterwards, to try and avoid that.

I expect you to represent the viewpoints that are consistent with your interests. We need that from all sides. And I want you to do that but I want you to do that in a constructive way. What we really need to be doing right now is making sure that we understand all of the issues, whether they're issues that are important to us as individuals or not, let's make sure we have solid understanding. That's what we tried to do in Copenhagen with regard to data protection and privacy. That doesn't mean that we're favoring that particular side of our debate.

But we have to understand that and the variations of that around the world to do our job. My personal belief is we probably have a lot better understanding in the working group of law enforcement needs and IP needs than we do of data protection because a lot of the data protection stuff is quite new and is changing as I speak. But please don't think that we're just focusing on one area. We will cover all sides. And we want you to help us do that.

As far as member behavior, please try to keep up to speed. I know you will miss some meetings and I know it's very challenging to keep up. We talked about that in Copenhagen on Saturday. Do the best you can, and when you fall behind, try to get up to speed because sometimes we waste time by going back because people haven't stayed up to date.

Also, it's really important for us to stay on task. I know there are lots of fears about where we're going and where we're going to end up and I understand those, but if you can put those aside and let us steadily make progress, we will get to the points where you want to get and but it'll take us some time because there's a lot to cover. So please stay on task. If we get ahead of ourselves, that makes it harder to complete the

tasks we're on and actually slows us down because we'll have to repeat the topics where we're jumping ahead on later on.

And please try to be constructive. When you contribute something, ask yourself, is this going to help the whole working group? Is it going to help our understanding or am I just being defensive and probably will cause more friction than it will good. Try to avoid getting emotional even though you may have certain emotions and fears and so forth.

Try to avoid political statements. To the extent that we can be factual, and I understand that we all have different views of what the facts are and it's our job as a working group to try and sort out the facts and make sure we're making decisions based on the most accurate information we have at the time. And we may have to debate that on certain issues and that's okay, but try to be factual on your contributions.

Now, I apologize for taking so much time saying this, but I really do implore all of you to try and take these things to heart so that we cannot spend time managing behavior and avoid irritating people so that they don't want to participate in the working group anymore. We have enough to keep up with without having to deal with issues like that. I think I've said enough. I hope that it makes sense. And that everyone will cooperate in that regard. So thanks for bearing with me as I make these requests.

Let's go now to the poll results for the 15th of March, the poll that was sent out on the 15th of March that followed our last meeting. And let's look at those results. So all of you should have seen the results that

were sent out and let me get my screen adjusted here where I can see more and still read it. Okay.

So we had 25 people participate in the poll. And again, remember that, you know, and we have - we now have almost 170 members so it's not a very good participation rate. But we're assuming that if you wanted to participate you would have. And keep in mind there was participation in the working group meeting last week and so combining the two - now there's overlap and there should be overlap in the two. But our goal is to try and reach some rough consensus decisions on that.

Now in this week's poll, there were three questions. And the leadership team actually decided that the second one, which is Question 3, there probably was reason to accept that. I mean, good enough basis to accept that as rough consensus. We'll go to that one and we'll talk about it and talk about some of the comments.

The first and last one, the Question Number 2 and Question Number 4, we didn't think that it was strong enough to say rough consensus, not that there's a specific bar, but based on the comments and the results, I mean, they were both of 2/3 but still we felt it's better to be a little more cautious before we declare at least rough consensus on those statements.

So let's take a look at the questions. Let's start with Question Number 2, which is if you scroll down a little bit you'll come to Question Number 2. And let's talk about that.

Now, there was a phrase added, if you - in this particular one, we made a change in our meeting in Copenhagen to that particular

statement. And it was - the clause and its resolution on the Internet was added at the end. And you'll recall, and I don't think - oh Andrew is with us today, that's great. I didn't think he was going to be able to be on.

So maybe I ought to turn it over to Andrew if he's able and willing to just explain again for us why he suggested that change. Andrew, can you do that?

Andrew Sullivan: Sorry about that. I needed to turn off my mic.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Andrew Sullivan: Oh, is that any better?

Chuck Gomes: That's a little bit better, yes, it was real low.

Andrew Sullivan: Okay. Well, I'll try to talk really loud. This is the mobile app...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: That sounds really good, Andrew. Thank you.

Andrew Sullivan: Okay. So the only concern that I had was that somewhere in this text we needed to make sure that the name server data showed up in here because it's a common troubleshooting tool and so we needed to have that data available in the RDS. And it looked like we were changing Number 2. I was going to remove 1 so we made some changes. And I think the whole goal was to cover off all of the - all of the functionality.

And we were just, you know, I think this was mostly touching at the edges.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Andrew. This is Chuck. So when we reviewed the comments, and hopefully you have too and you can do that right now if you haven't, by scrolling down, but there were eight people that voted - or voted, I don't like to use the term "vote" but who said no to this particular change. And if you look at their comments, the big issue was a definition of life cycle.

Now, some of you thought that domain name resolution is part of the lifecycle of a domain name. And some thought it is not. And some of you wanted a specific definition of lifecycle. I'd rather not go down that path, but I think staff is working right now on maybe on a definition of that. But in very simple terms, I think that lifecycle of a domain name registration starts at registration and ends at deletion.

And anything to do with the registration is a part of that lifecycle. Some of you mentioned transfers and transfers are certainly part of a lifecycle of a domain name. But is domain name resolution part of the registration lifecycle? Or is it something that happens for probably most domains, but not all of them? It was the assessment of the leadership team that the domain name lifecycle really doesn't include resolution; resolution is something that happens to domains - to many domains during their lifecycle.

So if there's no big objection to that assessment, then probably we need this addition and its resolution on the Internet because the information in the RDS would help include name servers, as Andrew said, would be critical to solving problems with regard to domain name

resolution. Now let me be quiet there, be quiet now, and see if there are any comments or questions on that.

Go ahead, Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. It's Greg Shatan for the record. It seems to me perhaps that the change in the text is really kind of rolling together two different purposes, both, you know, seem valid. But I'm not sure why they should be listed as kind of a purpose. We're coming up with a list of multiple purposes so there's no reason to combine two things. I tend to agree it's not part of the lifecycle in a sense, but whether or not it is, we kind of avoid that discussion by just having it in - it be a separately recited purpose.

And with regard to the term lifecycle of a domain name, I think it's hard to try to crisply define a purpose without defining what lifecycle of a domain name means so we may have to go down that rabbit hole, especially if it's being used in essence to limit purposes by saying that, you know, thus and such, say a domain dispute is not part of the lifecycle of a domain.

You know, whatever it is that we're defining, we need to understand what the limits are now so we can decide if something is not within the quote unquote lifecycle of a domain name is still a valid purpose and also, you know, I guess to some extent it's the whole issue of primary purpose versus secondary purpose which maybe, you know, is important for certain privacy laws. I'm not sure if it's important for other reasons although we seem to be driven by privacy law concerns these days somehow.

But in any case we can't have ill-defined terms that are put in place now and then are used later on to separate potential purposes from being good or bad or primary or secondary. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. A couple responses. This is Chuck. Sorry about the echo. It seems to have gone away. Okay, sometimes there's a certain pairing of people that are not on mute that causes that so it seems okay now.

So first of all, I'd rather not spend time on defining the lifecycle right now but if we need to we will later. And one of my reasons for suggesting a delay on that if it's needed, is that I did learn yesterday that staff is working on a definition of lifecycle and so it'd probably be easier to let them do their work and then we can revisit that after they come up with a possible definition.

Now, I'd like to call attention it says "information about the lifecycle" is all we're saying there. So the RDS is - and it does do that, if we look even at just thin data, that's all information related to the registration.

Now, a question for you then, Greg, and this is my second point. So you would suggest breaking this into two purposes, if I understood you correctly. And if that's - let me know if that's not correct. But how you would word the second one with regard to resolution?

Greg Shatan: Greg Shatan again. To answer, I think, you know, simply it would just be that a purpose of gTLD registration data is to provide information about the resolution of a domain name on the Internet, something along those lines.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Okay, good. Thanks. This is Chuck again. Andrew, since you're the one that suggested this possibility in Copenhagen, although - I hope you haven't dropped - but is - does that work for you in terms of your concerns? And Andrew likes he did drop. Okay. Marc, go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Thanks Chuck. This is Marc Anderson. I want to question that definition a little bit or I guess I want to question having that as a purpose for RDS. And I'm not sure that is a purpose of RDS. Say, I think that's a purpose of DNS. And so I'm not - I'm not convinced that that's a purpose of RDS. I think we have, you know, established, you know, reasons why we would want name servers as part of the RDS response. So, you know, I'm not suggesting that removing name server information from RDS is something we should do. I'm simply, you know, questioning that the purpose of RDS is to provide information about the resolution of a domain name on the Internet. I really think that's the purpose of DNS. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: So, Marc, this is Chuck. I'm going to ask you a question. So would it work better if we said the purpose of gTLD registration data is to provide information to assist in solving problems with regard to resolution?

Marc Anderson: I don't have an objection to that at all. I think, you know, many, you know, many in this working group have, you know, have stated that as a legitimate use case for RDS.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. And, Greg, did that sound okay?

Greg Shatan: Yes, I think that sounds okay.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Okay, any other comments on this one? I'm going to ask if there are any objections to that new wording in just a moment. But anybody else want to - oh, Andrew is back on, okay good. Thank you.

Andrew Sullivan: Hi, it's Andrew. Sorry, it's noisy here and I'm going to drop pretty soon. But the - I don't - like I'm not too fussy about the precise words here. I don't care that much. But there is data that is in the RDS and is only in the RDS that can tell you about whether a domain name ought to resolve.

In particular, you can find out the status of a name for instance if a name is on hold that tells you that there's a reason it's not in the zone file. Similarly, if the name servers in the - if the name server data in the RDS and the name server data in the DNS do not match, then that tells you that one of them is wrong and given that the RDS is normally actually the, you know, an interface to the authoritative database, that probably tells you that something's gone wrong in the distribution of the zone data.

So that's the key point and how you want to capture that I'm not too fussy. But it is - it is part of the information respecting the resolution of a name on the Internet, it's - because it's an access system for the authoritative database that generates the zone file.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Andrew. All good points. Greg Aaron, you're up.

Greg Aaron: I'd like to echo - this is Greg Aaron. I'd like to echo Andrew's statement. I think that Q2 was fine the way it was before. Resolution is bound up in some cases with domain statuses and the presence of

name servers and I think trying to further tweak or separate out Q2 is just not working very well. I thought it was fine as it was.

Chuck Gomes: So, Greg, this is Chuck. Are you suggesting that we shouldn't separate the two as Greg Shatan suggested?

Greg Aaron: I thought that Q2 covered it fine. I don't know...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Aaron: ...if separating it out added - I don't think separating it out added particular value.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I mean, I can - this is Chuck again - I can accept that. But I don't think it detracts from the value either, does it?

Greg Aaron: I think we're quibbling at this point. It's beginning to become a waste of time.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, and that's why I - I see no problem with separating it. Whether it's - and whether that adds value or not obviously there are differences of opinion on that. But I agree with you, we shouldn't quibble over it. Let's just separate it for now and we'll do a test in our poll with the new wording. Theo.

Theo Geurts: Thanks, Chuck. This is Theo for the record. So when it comes to the name servers, that's part of the DNS. Does it have a purpose within the RDS? Yes, I think so. I'm very okay with this wording. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Theo. Appreciate that. This is Chuck again. So does anyone object strongly to this wording? Can we decide to do a poll question on this revised wording for this question? And just put a red X in the chat or not the chat, excuse me, a red X in Adobe if you disagree. I don't see any. And looking - yes, the rewording is in there, Sara. Lisa - oh there it is, she put it in again. Lisa put it in again. Thanks, Lisa. And everybody take a look at that and I'll pause a little bit before I ask again if there are any objections to that.

So keep in mind too that there would be two purposes here. One would be to support - for the information about the lifecycle of a domain name; the second one would be the one that Lisa typed there. And I'll wait a second and see what Vicky is typing. Thanks, Greg, for the check. Let me see, just pause a second and look at the chat.

Yes, no, Sara, that's the kind of questions I want. I want to make sure people are clear so I'm with you all the way on that. Let's not get ahead of the game, Maxim, let's - we're not going there yet on the identification of the party. We're still working with thin data for right now. Only because just to keep our task a little narrower and help us make progress.

So all right, anybody object? Put a red X in the thing. It looks like we have a good poll question just it'll - we'll put the - and Lisa and Amr and Marika, let's make sure that we - let's show both purposes in our poll question. The one with the lifecycle and the one - and just say that we went from one statement to two. Here they are and make that as clear as possible. Maxim, go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: Alzoba for the record. I think we might need to add wording that we are talking about the thin registration data, yes to avoid misunderstanding in the future.

Chuck Gomes: Well, I'm going to say let's not do that yet because eventually the purpose - regardless of whether it's thin data or not, the purpose of registration data - we'll do that. But another reason for deferring that, and not doing that right now, Maxim, is when we follow Andrew Sullivan's suggested approach to dealing with this, we're going to start going through item by item. Now whether we ultimately decide to keep that level of detail we can deal with later but let's hold off on that because once we get beyond thin to thick data, that may come into play more and we can always come back and do that.

Well said, Greg. I hope people remember that we intentionally changed the purpose to a purpose quite a few weeks ago to make sure it's not the only one. And hang on, Volker, we'll get to who should get access, that's getting ahead of the game a little bit. And these are all good things. And forgive me for constantly trying to keep us on task but if we cover too much at once it'll be very hard for everybody to keep up and for us to make some decisions that are constructive as we go.

All right, now let's go then to Question 3, if you want to scroll down. And you can hopefully you had a chance to look at the comments if you hadn't before. We'll go now to Question 3. And Question 3 - the big change there in what we had before was to change the wording to dissemination of authoritatively sourced gTLD registration data rather than just saying authoritative data or gTLD registration data.

Part of that was to avoid having to decide okay, what's the authoritative source. Obviously registrars collect data from registrants and registries get that information from registrars and so on. The - a couple concerns in the comments, if you look at the comments, had to do with, you know, is the word "dissemination" does that imply display? Well, we as a leadership team didn't think it did, I mean, the word "provide" could also be assumed, I guess, to say that that's display.

But my suggestion there is we don't - it's not intended to mean display. We're going to have to get to that after we - we're going to have to get purposes for collection, for public access, and possibly for gated access. So for right now if you're willing to bear with me on this is let's not worry too much about whether dissemination means more than we want it to right now. We can fix that later once we get into public display, the purposes for public display and also for possibly gated access. So hang in there with us on that.

Now, one person said who knows what applicable policy is? None of us is the answer. That's Phase 2. The whole idea of putting that condition in there was to make sure that there's the understanding that the policy recommendations that we make will impact this particular purpose. We don't - we don't want to end up with a purpose that is inconsistent with policy. That's all we're saying but we're not going to develop policy recommendations until Phase 2.

Now, there is no attempt, let me be emphatic about this, there is no attempt to hide gating behind some ill-defined policy. That might change in the - that is not intent. Again, we will get to gating later. And so bear with us, we're going to have all kinds of issues like this where

some of our work later will impact what we're doing now and we're just trying to realize that assumption.

And then another comment was I'm not sure that we have agreed that domain contacts on our name servers will be accessible through the RDS. We haven't, that's correct. We'll get there.

Hopefully you can tell by some of this that my remarks at the beginning on membership participation in this they all - all these things tie together and so hang in there, we'll get there.

Now the comment was also made that the proposed revision does not suggest confidence in the RDS. Well, I think that's probably true. But hopefully when we get all the way through there will be confidence. Now I think that probably relates to the authoritatively sourced so if we can improve that later on ultimately we want there to be confidence in any new RDS that's developed so point taken. And we'll deal with that in the future as we see fit. Any questions or comments on Question 3?

Go ahead, Marc.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. Marc Anderson again. I mean, and I want to reiterate a little bit what you said, you know, I feel like, you know, I feel like I agree with the overall intent or spirit of this purpose. But, you know, as we go through this, you know, I think, you know, what exactly we mean by, you know, words like facilitate, dissemination and authoritatively sourced, you know, I think we're, you know, we're eventually going to have to make sure we're crystal clear on what that means so that when we exit this PDP anybody reading the results, reading our final report comes to the same conclusions that we intended them to.

You know, I don't think now is the time to, you know, to squabble over the exact wording of this, you know, so I think, you know, just sort of say, you know, I agree with the spirit of this but, you know, as we get further along let's make sure we're crystal clear on the meaning of the words we're choosing. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Well said, Marc. This is Chuck again. And before I go to Lisa, let me say that when we start following Andrew's approach for proceeding further, it's - notice that he looked at these as principles to develop purposes for specific data elements. Now whether we end up doing that exactly or not we'll decide later. But I think he was kind of saying the same thing. And if I'm wrong, Andrew, certainly correct me.

But if we look at these as principles that we will build specific purposes for data elements or some subgroup of where we're headed whether it be collection or public display or whatever, that'll be helpful. And I think it's consistent with what you just said, so thanks for that. Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. Lisa Phifer for the record. I just wanted to call you attention, Chuck, to some dialogue in chat where Sara Bockey actually had been asking about what happened to the previous version of this specific purpose and if we're dropping that in favor of the revised version. She noted that 50% of people had voted in favor of the previous wording. So one possibility moving forward would be to consider when we poll to poll both on the original wording and a revised wording as well as give people a chance to suggest something different. But I wanted to point that out to you so that we can discuss it.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, thanks Lisa. And I had not seen that in the chat, as you could tell. So and Sara, we can come back and decide to do - go back to the original wording. Obviously we changed it because of some concerns I think with regard to authoritative, and so people were trying to fix that. And the first one, I think, if I remember correctly, had stronger support than we got for this one, so it's a point well taken.

Sara, go ahead, please.

Sara Bockey: Yes. This is Sara Bockey. Yes, I just - I guess I was just a little confused by the start point of this question because after the last poll, as related in the chat, there was 50% support for a purpose of RDS is to facilitate dissemination of gTLD registration data such as domain names and their contacts and name servers in accordance with applicable policy. And so the language regarding authoritative had been completely dropped. And there was, I think, 11.1% that supported similar language had a little tweak to the language.

So it seemed like there was a majority of support for language that did not include the term "authoritative" which we, you know, after having an hour long discussion in Copenhagen regarding just that one term, I guess I was just surprised to see that this was where we landed. And so I was just curious as to how that came about.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Sara. In our document that we're going to add this to as rough consensus, any objection to putting a parenthetical in there that we may want to - depending on how things develop - we may want to go back to and look at the original wording of this question. That's just kind of a placeholder to - for us to do that. Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. It seems to me that authoritativeness is a concept in and of itself. And that, you know, if this question is intended to be the one that highlights the issues of authoritativeness, we definitely need to resolve it here. If this isn't then we need to kind of separate out the concept of authoritativeness and highlight it separately.

You know, this is one of these situations, and I don't think it's at all purposeful, but where, you know, a one-word change could have immense consequences for the entire RDS program. So I don't want it to be inadvertently one of those things that kind of is subsumed into, you know, whether a single word exists or doesn't exist in a single question.

It's a key concept and, you know, I agree that we need - well I don't know what I agree with. All I agree with is that we can't just kind of let this be one of the things that gets kind of swept along as what seems to be a sub-issue in a much longer question. Authoritativeness is an issue in and of itself and we need to make sure that we do focus on it clearly and expressly. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. It's Chuck. You know, I can tell it's Greg and I when we're both not on mute we get the echo. But, Greg, you know I'm going to come back to you and say, okay, what would you suggest for resolving this now? And while you're thinking about that, let me point out that depending on how any recommendations we make are implemented, that will have an impact in terms of who the authority is for the data.

So if we went, for example, with a federated system, it might be registrars as the authoritative source for some of the data, whereas if we went with a different system it might be registries. So in one sense we probably can't totally decide what the authoritative source is at this point until we probably get to implementation. But go ahead now, let me be quiet and give you a chance to make a suggestion in terms of wording this one.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan again. Yes, I'm not sure that we want to add - I think we want to have a question on purpose basically that the purpose of RDS is to provide authoritative data. Period. And, you know, maybe we have a second sentence. But it's unclear here whether this question is about authoritativeness or about the type of information that's provided. So it's just a - I think we need to highlight that this is - if this is the question about the requirement for authoritativeness, regardless of where and how the data, you know, is - becomes authoritative, or is deemed authoritative, then I just think we need to highlight that.

So maybe it's a purpose of RDS is to collect authoritative gTLD registration data. Period. Such data, you know, may include or includes domain names and contact domain servers. Of course that gets into thick data, right, so I don't know why we necessarily give that example if we're trying to talk about thick versus thin. So sorry if I'm not providing a cogent or even coherent answer to your question.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. This is Chuck. Stephanie, go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I made this point in Copenhagen and I hate to keep repeating it. I really do favor

dropping “authoritative” because I do believe it goes without saying, not trying to capture inaccurate data. And by putting authoritative in, it implies a bias towards one of those options.

I don't see a problem in removing authoritative, none of us are making an argument that we want to gather bad data. But putting a descriptor like that in raises more problem than it solves. Thanks. And sorry for repetition, I said in the poll results too.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stephanie. This is Chuck. Notice the comments in the chat. I was going to ask you, Sara, whether going back to just saying - and I'll get to your point, Stephanie, so bear with me, please. This - what we're saying right now is why this one has gone back and forth because notice that Stephanie thinks we don't even need the word “authoritative,” Greg thinks we should make sure we define it now. In Copenhagen we kind of tried to get around some of these things and talked about authoritatively sourced. Hopefully all of this discussion gives everybody a clearer understanding of why we've been grappling with this one.

So, Sara, a question for you, does - I mean, do you agree, just you personally, that's all I'm asking right now, is do you personally think it would be better to go back and ignoring Stephanie's comment, just for the moment, and just say to provide authoritative data over the way we have it now, you know, provide an authoritative source - authoritatively sourced data. And while you're thinking about that let me call on Lisa.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. Lisa Phifer for the record. I'm actually reminded of the blind man and (unintelligible) report that we may be arguing about the right wording for this sentence because we don't agree on what

authoritative means. And so trying to further word-smith this sentence is really obscuring the difference of opinion and that difference of opinion is probably rooted in different interpretations of what authoritative means.

Chuck Gomes: I'm - this is Chuck - I'm sure you're correct. And rather than belabor this one any longer than we have, my suggestion is that we put brackets around authoritatively sourced and also have brackets there put authoritative and a third maybe brackets just with no - just drop the word. And I think at this point we could spend a couple meetings and maybe not still resolve this. So it may be, I don't know if it will be or not, but it may be easier to kind of postpone this from there.

And, Maxim, what's the definition of technologically? Sorry, I'm playing the game that we're playing, okay? We can go on and on about definitions and it will take us several years longer to get through what we're doing. I do agree that there's some words that really do need to be defined and we will do that - do that where necessary.

So for now let's go ahead and put this one in our document with those bracketed options, three bracketed options for now realizing that we will have to come back to that and make a more definitive decision on that later.

Oka, let's move on, yes, I agree, it would help. I'm not sure we can do that readily defining authoritative right now. So I'm going to make a command decision and do what I suggested realizing that we're going to have to come back to that. And if we get stuck at some point where we have to have the definition, we will spend the time to do that then.

Yes, and Lisa's suggestion is good. If any of you want to provide on the list a definition of authoritative, or authoritatively sourced, or both, please feel free to do that and we'll capture that. Okay? And you're right, Maxim, we - it might be required at some point and we'll have to stop and do it if we haven't already done it at that point.

Let's go to the last question. Okay, so Question 4, then on this one, this is the one that has to do with accuracy. Ok? And again it's one that some people thought we shouldn't even talk about accuracy, so forth. We've grappled with this one some. The results weren't super strong on this one, they were certainly over 2/3 of the people who responded. But again, we're not treating this as a vote, so let's - if we look at the comments, the - one comment was what does facilitate fulfilling requirements mean?

I'm always challenged - this type of question comes up all the time on terms. And if we - we could spend one meeting on each term, if we worry about that is do we really need to define facilitate fulfilling requirements? I don't know. I'm not sure whether we gain a lot by defining that at least now.

Another comment, purpose of RDS is to support domain name registration and maintenance. Is something that Fabricio suggested. And that's another option. You can look at the comments yourself. Is this one that can be fixed? Is it one that we should drop? Is it - what's the thinking on this? I don't think we're ready to declare rough consensus on this one.

Can we do anything to it that maybe could get rough consensus like we did with Question 2? So let me just throw it out there. And sorry -

and I'll try to catch up with the chat. So, Marika, before I go to Marc, is - you're talking about the definition of authoritative in the thick Whois final report? Is that correct?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Correct, it was in response to a suggestion that at least a few people bring back a definition to the working group as part of that they may want to consider what was included in the final report.

Chuck Gomes: Is it easy to put that in the chat or in the notes for people to see? And while you're checking that, let me go to Marc Anderson.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. This is Marc. I actually wanted to respond in part to Marika's suggestion there. I recommend we don't use the authoritative definition, you know, that came out of the thick Whois final report. In that PDP we were trying to - trying to answer the question in a very specific use case because we were looking at the question around what happens when you have a source of data with a registrar, a source of data with the registry, a source of data with the registrar's escrow provider and a source of data with the registry's escrow provider.

You know, when you have all of those, which one's authoritative? And so we had a very specific use case in mind when we came up with that definition, and I don't think that specific definition's broadly applicable. And so I don't recommend we adopt that particular one for this working group.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. This is Chuck. Did you want to...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...say more?

Marc Anderson: Yes, yes please. I was going to continue on. I guess we're switching gears to your, you know, Question 4. You know, I didn't respond to the poll so apologies for that. But, you know, I just wanted to add, I like the original version of this one better than the proposed edits. You know, I think the original one's closer to what we've discussed in the working group and, you know, is more in line with what we've discussed so far. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. Chuck again. So you prefer a purpose of RDS policy is to facilitate the accuracy of gTLD registration data.

Marc Anderson: Yes, I do. And just to expand on that, you know, I think we've already pointed out, you know, in previous questions that there are cases where, you know, in troubleshooting an issue, right, you may have inaccurate data somewhere and being able to see that inaccurate data is a good thing, right? You know, it's not always going to be accurate. But the goal is to have accurate data, right? And so I think a purpose statement that reads, you know, the, you know, to facilitate the accuracy of the gTLD registration data, you know, really, you know, hits on what we're trying to achieve. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. Chuck again. So I'm blank in terms of why we moved away from that original one. Can anybody help me out there? Go ahead, Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I may be guilty of being a grammar nerd and saying you don't really facilitate the accuracy, you

facilitate - you need a verb in there, the maintenance of accuracy. So if I did (unintelligible). I agree that going back to a vaguer sentence, even if it's grammatically incorrect, is better than what you're proposing here because facilitate fulfilling requirements for the accuracy assumes that we are accepting current and existing requirements for accuracy, which I take to mean the stuff that we've been receiving or that registrars have been receiving from the GAC.

And I'm not sure that that is consistent with what would be required under data protection. In other words, continuous updating is not required under data protection, so, you know, anyway, vaguer is probably better. I know Greg probably won't agree with me but.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stephanie. Chuck again. So as I'm thinking through this, okay, the facilitate the accuracy, as we - if you can go to the RDS and you see some data that you decide is not accurate, that allows you then to take some steps to get the data corrected, whether you're the registrant or a third party or whatever. Isn't that facilitating accuracy of gTLD registration data? Anyway, just a thought. Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. I'm one who favors the prior version of this, facilitate - and first note that we're talking about RDS policy here and not about the database itself. The purpose of the policy is to facilitate the accuracy of gTLD registration data. First, I agree with the concept. But second, I think and maybe this is my American grammar coming in, it seems grammatically appropriate to me but more importantly it seems conceptually appropriate. I see Lisa's note that at some point said promote accuracy, maybe that was seen as too kind of accuracy-favorable or accuracy advocacy.

You know, at some point we're going to tie ourselves in knots with language that's intended to try to - not to convey information clearly but somehow to strike balances. And another problem of course is that where this is an iterative process and to some extent we're worrying about carts and horses here. You know, in the sense that again a discussion about accuracy just like a discussion about authoritativeness is kind of bound up in this question.

Although, again, you know, I don't see the point of a database that is neither authoritative nor accurate, understanding that it will never be perfectly either one of those things. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. Chuck again. So I apologize for the fact that we're going in circles on this one. That certainly wasn't the intent, but we did. So is there anybody that supports the alternative definition on this one? Obviously there are people who supported it in our last call. But is that - or it was actually in person meeting I guess. Is there anybody on this call that supports the alternative version versus the original? Just put a green check in the Adobe if you do.

I'm - based on today's discussion, I'm thinking that we're back to the original wording, understanding Stephanie's concern about the word "facilitate" I think several of us have a little different view of that. And I heard in Stephanie's statement that it's not a huge issue with her, she thinks it's maybe not grammatically the best.

But if we come up with a better way we can always fix that. So should we just revert to the - does anybody object to reverting to the one that's up - the previous one, a purpose of RDS policy is to facilitate the accuracy of gTLD registration data. Anybody object to that?

So, Stephanie, go ahead. Are you on mute?

Stephanie Perrin: Sorry, my audio dropped for some reason. Stephanie Perrin for the record. A couple of calls ago I think I went on and on no doubt annoyingly about the need to footnote things. And I offer it again as a way of moving forward. All trying to do is not allow words to enter in here that will nail us down with unduly burdensome requirements later. In other words, I'm trying to keep it at a generic policy level without allowing words that would force certain implementation options. So I'm...

Chuck Gomes: Stephanie, this is Chuck.

Stephanie Perrin: ...perfectly happy...

Chuck Gomes: What would the footnote be?

Stephanie Perrin: The footnote would be understanding that the, whatever we say about accuracy, does not imply any particular obligations in terms of implementation to maintain accuracy.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. That...

Stephanie Perrin: That work?

Chuck Gomes: ...for me that...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...very clear.

Stephanie Perrin: Maybe let me work on it and I'll...

Chuck Gomes: Okay, we will.

Stephanie Perrin: ...offer you a footnote.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, so let's put this one on hold and we'll come back to it in our meeting next week with a possible footnote from Stephanie. Greg, you want to add to that?

Greg Shatan: Sure, Greg Shatan once again for the record. I do share Stephanie's concerns, and I think they kind of echoed my earlier concern that, you know, as we talk about what may seem like, you know, mere wording changes or small wording changes that what's, you know, happening is - are kind of maybe gotcha or submarine type of words that are being put in that will later be surfaced to either create or eliminate very significant requirements for the RDS.

And I don't know if there's a way to avoid that at this point, but it does kind of torture us. I mean, clearly there's a discussion to be had about accuracy. I don't think the answer to that is to say on the one hand that we're facilitating accuracy but on the other hand this is not intended in any way to imply that there's a requirement for accuracy.

You know, I think at that point we should all just put our noses and cycle around on tiny tricycles because we're just not going to make any sense. But I understand what Stephanie is trying to do is kind of reserve the discussion. And in a sense that's what I was doing too with

the concern about authoritative. So some extent, Chuck, I think this comes back to your discussion at the very beginning of this call about trying to, you know, avoid getting kind of caught up both in positions and also in maybe even a little bit of paranoia or well-regarded concern.

And lastly, I think this is to an extent an iterative process, and maybe the footnote needs to be on this, rather than the one Stephanie put in, is that, you know, we still need to discuss accuracy conceptually, you know, are we - because I don't - in a sense I agree with Stephanie, we don't want to say we're buying into accuracy just because we have this question. But neither do we want to say as a footnote we're not buying into the concept of accuracy even if we're going to facilitate it. So that - at that point, you know, I just don't think we're making - we're kind of, you know, becoming an ingrown toenail. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: And I don't like ingrown toenails. So anyway so, Greg, this is Chuck. Would you be willing to work with Stephanie to come up with a footnote here? And if you think it's useful in the previous one that's okay too. So the two of you could just exchange emails...

Greg Shatan: I think Lisa actually has a good suggestion in the chat as much as I would love to meet Stephanie in the old part of Montréal for a drink on the terrace and work on a footnote.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So, Lisa, you're suggesting wait until we - until later? I'm not sure I get - Lisa, do you want to talk to your suggestion?

Lisa Phifer: Sure, Chuck. So my footnote was just intended to indicate that we haven't yet defined accuracy and we'll define accuracy as it pertains to

the RDS later in this PDP. Just pointing out also, we actually have a whole charter question on accuracy. It's not one of the first three that we decided to talk about so we know we'll come to that charter question and have to deal with what accuracy means for the RDS. All we need to do is...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: So does that work as the footnote maybe?

Lisa Phifer: ...is point to that. Yes, exactly.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thank you.

Lisa Phifer: That's a proposed footnote.

Chuck Gomes: Stephanie, is that okay for now?

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, I think it works for me.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Let's do that and then we don't have to postpone this, but obviously we're going to have to come - we'll have to revisit it when we do get to accuracy. So - and I want to take this opportunity, especially since Greg used the word "iterative" for those that are new to the working group, if you're on this call, let me take this opportunity - first of all to welcome you, but also to emphasize the point that all of our work is iterative. And by that we mean we realize we may have to come back to it and change it or delete it or start all over or whatever as we make more progress.

And new issues we come across and decisions we make, may impact the things we're doing now. So that's what we mean by iterative. Nothing is in concrete yet. And it won't be for a while so that we can go back and make sure we're being consistent in everything we do. And that concept, and thanks for mentioning it, Greg, is really important. So the - I like iterative better than circular. But sometimes, as we learned today, we may go in a circle and come back to a decision that we changed before.

So and I like the way Greg Shatan defined it. The difference is that an iterative process makes progress while a circular one does not. And even the circular, if we're forced into doing it, can end up with progress if we reach agreement. So thanks, Greg, for that. Is that an old hand, Greg, or did you want to say something else? Okay, thanks.

So all right so I think maybe we came up with a solution for this one on 4. Do we need to test that in a poll with the footnote? I suppose we should just especially for those who are not on the call. But again, in the poll please participate even if you were on the call. Okay so that will be important. And again, for those who are new, the polls are not considered votes; you're giving your personal view so that we try to see whether we've got rough consensus in the group at least at this point in time.

Okay, let's go then to Agenda Item 3, the issue of ccTLDs and what they're doing on the data protection requirements especially in Europe was raised. And we even had a couple volunteers to help with that. So do we have any other volunteers that would like to work with them in terms of developing some questions for some ccTLDs to see if we can

learn what they are doing? Or should we wait a little bit until we get a little further before we do that?

We - as most of you know, I think, we shared some purpose statements from some ccTLDs, in particular the dotEU one. My suspicion is that they're probably going to have to work that a little bit more with the new regulation that goes into effect next year in Europe.

But what's the thinking of the group? Do you think we ought to have a few people work on some questions for ccTLDs? Or would we maybe be better off to postpone that until we get a little further along and possibly until ccTLDs get a little further along in preparing for this new regulation in Europe? Any thoughts on that?

Theo.

Theo Geurts: Thanks, Chuck. This is the Theo for the record. So you are right, what I see from the ccTLDs here, they are looking at their own Whois system as it is now the - thought most of them are mostly compliant but they are still looking at it. We are having internal reviews about the so called registrar Whois for the dotNL registry, which is a registrar only Whois, and even that is under review now.

But I think we should move along to speed up the process here. I think they already can give us some basic outlines when it comes to the current directives, which are mostly in line with the EU GDPR. So that might be helpful in our work. Thanks. And I'm willing to volunteer by the way.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so we now have three volunteers - this is Chuck - for this. Anybody else want to volunteer to work with these three? Okay, Nathalie, thank you. And Stephanie, go ahead. You're on mute, Stephanie. There we go.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin. I'm just - I'm just volunteering. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Oh thank you. Okay. So what is that about five now? Very good. So maybe if I can ask one of our staff members to kind of coordinate with those volunteers on this just to facilitate the discussion. Who from staff would be willing to coordinate that discussion?

Susan Kawaguchi: Chuck, this is Susan. We had talked about this and I can do that.

Chuck Gomes: Oh you can do it, good, so yes, I should have said anybody from the leadership team. In fact it wouldn't even have to be anybody from the leadership team but that's great. Thank you, Susan. Appreciate it. And, we had talked about that.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, so no problem. And I'll get an email out today to the - to all the volunteers.

Chuck Gomes: Excellent. Okay. So let's go to Agenda Item 4. One of the messages that came out of Copenhagen from a variety of sources and meetings and so forth was that we're at a point where we need to try to speed up our progress if that's possible. And so as a leadership team, we talked about setting a target of the Abu Dhabi meeting in - is that October or November, I don't remember which, but in the fall - as a point when we would start developing our first initial report. Keep in mind that our work plan calls for two initial reports, not just one.

The first one after we get through the first five questions of our 11 questions. And we deal with the question, is a new system needed or can the existing Whois be tweaked? The - so we wanted to just bounce this off of the working group in one of our meetings, and we chose this one, to see whether there are any objections.

Obviously we can only do what we can do so if we don't meet that objective we'll have to adjust. But it may be helpful for us in our progress to put that as a goal to at least not necessarily be finished with the first initial report but be ready to start putting the pieces together for that by the time we get to the Abu Dhabi meeting, which - is that ICANN 60 I think? So what do you think? Just a couple minutes here to get reactions. Anybody want to comment on that?

Anybody strongly object to that soft target? I say soft but at the same time I'd really like us to seriously work together to try and make good progress. Okay, I'm not seeing anybody - I better scroll down so I can see any red Xs, I don't see any. So we're - okay. So we'll go ahead and do that for now. And that means we all have a lot of work in front of us and all the more important for us to be as constructive as possible.

Now, the fifth agenda item is a follow up to Kiran's comments on our Saturday meeting in Copenhagen. And, Lisa, let me - and let me agree with Lisa, like I said, the first initial report covers the first five questions, not just the three we've already started discussing. So and it would be more than thin data, absolutely; it would be thick data as well. So thanks for pointing that out. But, Lisa, would you talk to the - about what has been done?

And, Marc, I'll get to you in a second. But since I started this topic I'd like Lisa to comment on what staff has done to try and make - to prioritize things, to put action items, make them clearer and so forth dealing with Kiran's comments in Copenhagen. Lisa, please.

Lisa Phifer: Sure, Chuck. Lisa Phifer for the record. So as I'm sure you all have seen in our notes from our face to face meeting in Copenhagen, we did collect together the action items and proposed agreements and put them in the email message at the top of the notes when the notes were distributed. They of course also appear in the notes themselves in context so that you can find what led to any particular action item or proposed agreement.

We also modified the subject line of the messages to include important I believe, but we could use another tag if people prefer, but we can tag in the subject line messages that are either poll invitations or notes or, well, all notes will be including action items, and proposed agreements if we have any. So we can use the subject line to flag that information. We can attach priority to those messages.

Where we stopped short, however, was actually creating a separate email list for the purpose of distributing notes and poll invitations. As we discussed that idea, we were concerned that that actually may cause more confusion than aid in raising your attention or raising attention to those messages because then everyone would have to monitor yet another mailing list which would be archived and then you'd have to decide if a particular message you're responding to should be responded to on that special priority list or on the main working group list.

So in reviewing that suggestion, we actually felt that might create more complexity than the good that it would do. So we wanted to bring that back to you and let everyone indicate whether they believe that it would be important given the steps we've already taken, whether it would be important to have a separate list that you receive meaning notes and whole invitations on or whether you're happy with having that as messages on your working group email list with the priority tag and with a keyword in the subject line that you can filter on.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa. This is Chuck again. Now, Marc, I'm assuming you want to talk about something different, if not please jump in, but I will come back to you so you can leave your hand up. So what do you think? Any comments on what Lisa just suggested? Are you okay with what staff has done to try and make things - the important things the priority things more visible in case you can't get to every email on the list? Do you have other suggestions? Any comments?

Okay so since - because we're running out of time I'm going to assume that everyone is okay with what staff has done in response to that request and concern that Kiran expressed. If not, please communicate. And, Lisa, probably what we ought to do for those who are not on the call is kind of a brief summary of what you shared and give people that aren't on the call a chance to express their opinion or to make other suggestions. So let's make that an action item for staff.

And then let me go back to Marc.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. It's Marc. My hand was actually back on Item Number 4, the work plan and target for the first initial draft report. I just want to

say, you know, I support having, you know, a goal and a target to shoot for. I think that's a good thing and encourage that. A request I guess for the leadership team, Lisa sort of touched on this a little bit, you know, in chat mentioning the things that are necessary to reach that target.

But I think it'd be useful if, you know, we had maybe a task list that we can sort of track to and check things off as we accomplish them. Of all the things needed to, you know, that we need to accomplish in order to hit that goal so I think that might be helpful for the rest of the working group. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. It's Chuck. Now I assume you're talking about more than our work plan because our work plan especially in Item Number 12, Item 12 in our work plan is broken down into quite a few sub steps. Are you talking about more there already?

Marc Anderson: I guess I'm thinking kind of like a, you know, a checklist, you know, Lisa has them in there, you know, in chat, okay, we need to cover, you know, we're talking about three questions, we need to cover all five. We need to cover, you know, thick data as well as just thin. Like what are all the items that we would need in order to meet the goal that you've laid out in Item Number 4 there?

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Okay, we will work on that. And we can watch what Lisa is responding to there. I know we're out of time so I'm going to need to adjourn the call as quickly as possible here. Notice we didn't get to Agenda Item 6. All we were going to hope to do today on that was just kind of to quickly go over Andrew's proposed approach. If you haven't looked at that please do.

We will hope to pick up on that next week when we - after we go over the poll results. Keep in mind there will be a poll coming out in the next day or so and maybe today. And please participate in that. And hopefully we will wrap the items up that we discussed today when we discuss the results of the poll next week. So the action items will be in the notes and please watch those.

So everybody will need to take the poll. We have a small group that was formed to start working on some questions for ccTLDs. And I probably left some off there. But because we're out of time our next meeting date is Tuesday the 4th of April at same time as today. Thanks for the good turnout and the good participation. Please let us know if you have any additional input into the things that happened today, just do that on the list.

And let me ask if there's anything I missed or anything else we need to cover before I adjourn? Okay, thanks, everyone. Have a good rest of the week. And remember to participate in the poll. Meeting adjourned. The recording can stop.

END