

**ICANN
Transcription
Next-Gen RDS PDP Working group call
Tuesday, 30 May 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-30may17-en.mp3>

AC recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p4pshwjvr6e/>

Attendance is on **wiki page:** <https://community.icann.org/x/IMPRAw>

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

(Joy): Recording is started.

Michelle Desmyter: Great, well thank you (Joy). Well good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to all. Welcome to the Next Gen RDS PDP Working Group call on the 30th of May, 2017.

In the interest of time today there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants online. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. So if you're only on the audio bridge would you please let yourself be known now? Okay, hearing no names...

Rod Rasmussen: This is Rod Rasmussen. I'm - the Adobe Connect isn't apparently working for me. I will try again, but...

Michelle Desmyter: Okay.

Rod Rasmussen: ...I'll be audio only for then till I can get in, thanks.

Michelle Desmyter: Okay. Thanks Rod. We'll go ahead and note that. Alright, hearing no further other names. And so a reminder to everyone to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Also, please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this, I will turn the meeting back over to Chuck Gomes.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Michelle, how do I get the pull message? Pull to message? Maybe I can move it, that's my problem. Oh, never mind it disappeared. Okay. Just wanted to be able to see all the participants better.

So welcome everyone to our RDS PDP working group today. We've got a very full agenda. Hopefully we can make some good progress today. Rod, you know what to do if you're not able to get into Adobe. Speak up and let us know when you want to talk. And I'll get you in the queue as soon as possible.

The agenda is up on the right. And the first thing -- as always -- is for updates to statement of interest. Does anybody have an update? Please raise your hand or speak up. Okay. Appreciate everybody always keeping their statements of interest updated.

The second item on the agenda is to (unintelligible) deliberation on the charter question "What step should be taken to control Thin data access?" And to do that we're going to mainly look at the results of last week's poll. And talk about the results, the comments, and see if we can possibly come to some tentative conclusions that we can add to our ongoing work.

You can see -- and you have scrolling capability -- that there are 26 participants this past week. And there were a lot of not only people answering the questions but some very helpful comments I think. And we're going to go through the results in a different order than the way they were presented in the poll, so bear with us on that.

As you can see in the agenda we're going to start with question three. So if you'd scroll down to question three on there you can see that and you can see the results. The - in that particular one you had four choices. And you actually had three different answer choices for each one of those. And then that's true of the other questions in this poll as well.

So you could pick one as your preferred choice. You could pick one - you could also say you could live with one -- in other words it's not your first choice -- but you could live with it. And then you could say you did not support it. If you look at the results -- whether you prefer the bar chart or the table -- the bottom of page four you'll see the table and you can see that there was pretty good support for option A.

So - and one of the things that (Lisa) did in these results is she added -- in blue font there -- kind of a net results. Where you take the number of "this is my preference" plus "I could live with it" and you subtract those who do not support it. So we got a net result of 18 on choice A. Whereas B was definitely not one that - had much support. And then C and D were lower.

So the option A is what I'd like us to talk about. But that doesn't mean we can't talk about the others still, but there seems to be pretty good support for that. Or at least minimal opposition. And the question I had on that -- option A -- is do we need the word minimum? The more I thought about it -- after reviewing the results and the comments and so forth -- I wondered whether we really need the word minimum there.

Now I don't know - that's not terribly significant I don't think. But we can talk about that as we go forward. What I'd like to ask now -- and I didn't identify who those who did not support that option -- but if you're on the call and you didn't support that option I'd love to hear why you don't support that option. And if there's some modification of that option that could be made that might

remove your opposition. Please raise your hand if you're one of those who opposed it. Okay.

So then let's go to -- and for those that just joined and there are probably several -- we're looking at question number three in the poll. So if you'll scroll down to page four you'll see the results there. And in particular we're focusing on option A, which had pretty good support. A net support of 18. Which is certainly way above any of the others.

And only three people opposed it. So again, I'll ask the question one more time. If there's anybody -- or I'll request -- if there's anybody on the call who did not support -- checked the "Do Not Support" column -- for A, I'd love to hear you share why you do not support it so maybe we could modify it to gain your support. So please raise your hand if you're one of those who didn't support - who do not support A. And share with us your rationale.

In the mean time I raised the question whether the word minimum is needed. Any thoughts on that? I mean does "minimum" really serve a purpose there or would it be sufficient to say a set of Thin data elements must be accessible by unauthenticated RDS users? I don't really have a problem with "minimum" but I'm not sure it has any value. Michele?

Michele Neylon: Michele for the record. I tend to agree with you Chuck. I just - I don't think "minimum" adds any real value. And if we leave "minimum" in then you're going to trigger the natural "What the hell is minimum" argument. Whereas if you just simply say a set of Thin data elements then you leave it up to the reader to decide.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thanks Michele. Chuck again. Greg Shatan, go ahead.

Gregory S. Shatan: Thanks. This is Greg Shatan for the record. I haven't studied statistics since college, which was longer ago than I care to admit. I believe the term

"minimum set" has some meaning in statistical analysis. Or at least setting up statistics-based types of studies.

That said, we're not doing that. And it may have wandered in here. Whoever drafted this may have had, you know, some previous experience in using the word "minimum set" in its proper connotation. But since I don't know what "minimum set" means -- and I actually did take two statistics courses in college -- I doubt that those who are even worse off than me have any better sense of what it means.

So I (think) should get rid of it. And if it was intended to mean either what it means in that context or something else we should figure out what it means rather than leaving it open to ambiguity and misinterpretation and mischief. Attorneys at law.

Chuck Gomes: So Greg -- this is Chuck -- did I understand you to ultimately say that you would be okay if we removed it? Remove the word minimum?

Gregory S. Shatan: Yes, yes you should remove the word minimum. Sorry, I'm on the tablet so we have to...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Gregory S. Shatan: ...unmute. But yes, we can remove it. Because unless we can decide what it means and come up with a definition -- and probably replace it with a word that can be understood by the average person and not be some sort of (unintelligible) jargon -- we should just get rid of it and be simple and straightforward in our language. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Greg. Chuck again. Stephanie, your turn.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks. Stephanie Perrin for the record. And let the record show that I'm agreeing with Greg. I hope I could celebrate that when it happens.

I dropped out of stats in first year so my problem with this -- when we talk about a minimum set, a set, any kind of a set -- until we define that we really can't say that they must be available. Because people like me will continue put their footnote. Which I did, I'm the one that said something about we need to define the elements there R-E I also wonder what agreement 20 is. We just - this is almost like a meaningless agreement until we define what those elements are. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Stephanie. (Michael).

(Michael Hammer): Thank you. (Michael Hammer) for the record. When I read the word "minimum" my understanding was that there's a certain number of data elements that you need to have in order for Thin data to be useful. Not statistics, not anything like that. And we've heard people say for example that expiration dates should not be included.

Things like that. So my understanding was -- absent a definition of what those data elements might be -- that the principle is some minimum number -- some set of data -- should be available in Thin data to unauthenticated users.

Chuck Gomes: And...

(Michael Hammer): So I guess...

Chuck Gomes: ...go ahead.

(Michael Hammer): No, that's all I got.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay. All right, good. Wanted to make sure. So this is Chuck again. So would you be opposed to us removing the word "minimum"?

(Michael Hammer): I would prefer that it stay in simply because there has been disagreement expressed as to what should be included in Thin data.

Chuck Gomes: So what does "minimum" mean?

(Michael Hammer): That's something that we need to define.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And I would prefer we not go down that route, spending time defining it. As we might - and you probably don't need to understand why. From my point of view. But okay, thanks (Michael). That's okay, that's good. (Mark)?

(Mark): Thanks Chuck. This is (Mark). I guess I'm - my thinking's more in line with (Michael)'s in that, you know, I read this as, you know, as meaning a minimum set of elements that must be included. But sort of that phrasing doesn't preclude (including additional) elements.

And I'll point out that there are some registry operators that have additional RDS elements that they provide in their output. You know, there's some TLDs that have some unique attributes and display those in their RDS output. And so sort of I read this phrasing "a minimum set of Thin data elements" as sort of taking that into account. And allows flexibility for registry operators with unique or non-standard requirements the ability to display those.

I don't think it hurts anything keeping it in. And I think it adds a level of flexibility to leave it. So while I don't feel particularly strongly about this my suggestion would be to leave it as is. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you (Mark). This is Chuck. So how would the sentence differ with or without the word "minimum"? So is it really much difference between "a set of Thin data elements must be accessible by unauthenticated (RDS) users" versus "a minimum set", et cetera? That's to you, (Mark).

(Mark): That's to me? Well I guess it - I guess that really depends on if we're defining, you know, we're defining exactly what a Thin - set of Thin data elements are. If we're leaving that up to the implementer, then it does matter. But if we're explicitly defining it then it makes a huge difference.

Chuck Gomes: I guess I don't see that. But we are going to define what the Thin data elements are. I think we've said that every week for the last three or four weeks. And I know in your case you've been on vacation. So we are going to do that. (Lisa), go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks Chuck. Lisa Phifer. I noted this in chat but this principle was based on an EWG principle. And the EWG referred to a minimum set of data elements here. But it also then defined that the minimum public data set - we'll be getting to that when we return to deliberate on the data elements charter question.

So this was really intended originally -- in the principle we based this on -- to refer to that minimum public data set or to lay the groundwork for defining a minimum public data set. I hope that helps.

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

Gregory S. Shatan: Yes. I'm just saying - looking at what's in the chat I think that -- and I said it myself in chat -- that "defined", rather than "minimum" would be clearer and better. Since I don't think we necessarily need to say "to be defined". But I think that, you know, once we've - until we've defined it it's understood. But I would avoid that.

Even if data sets otherwise I see are used -- for instance -- in the sets of data that are used for analysis by say the World Health Organization, the American Psychological Association, you know. It's - in each case it becomes a defined data package that's then used in statistical analysis.

And again, since we're not doing statistical analysis. We're at best borrowing a term and thus misusing it. And I think if we say defined set we say what we need to say. And I've said what I need to say.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Greg. Is that a new hand (Lisa)?

Lisa Phifer: Sorry, old hand.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. "A defined set of Thin data elements must be accessible" - I kind of like that. Anybody dislike that? Rod? Glad to see you're in Adobe.

Rod Rasmussen: Yes, and I had some sort of weird (link). Yes, Rod Rasmussen here. So, yes. So we run into the problem -- if we say "a defined set" -- of prescribing the - it's that set and only that set. And getting -- I actually have a math degree, so I'm - there's a - set (unintelligible). I don't want to bore people with the details.

But I don't know if (Andrew)'s on the call, he could probably tell - talk much better about it than I can. But yes, you run into the issue of (would) you say a defined set. Then if you have other elements that would be Thin based on the registry you kind of preclude that potentially. So you want to be careful there. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Rod. This is Chuck. And considering that we are going to define which of the Thin data elements would be accessible -- and so when we say - when I say a defined set of Thin data I don't know if this is what Greg meant - - in other words we would define which Thin data elements (would) be accessible without authentication. Authenticated RDS access. So Rod, go ahead.

Rod Rasmussen: Rod again. So at least "a defined set" or something along those lines then. Because that's where the minimum comes in, right? I think it was explained earlier that you have potentially more data elements available in Thin based

on the registry itself. Because there's again different registries have other elements that may fall into the Thin category that won't be in everybody's Thin set. So if you're going to say "a defined set" you need to say "at least a defined set". Or something along those lines. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you. And I think we've discussed this enough. I noticed (Lisa)'s suggestion in the chat. "At least a defined set of Thin data elements must be accessible by authenticated RDS users". Just for the sake of time -- and talking - okay, I wanted to see what (Michael) had to say in the chat. Good, okay.

So who - going with (Lisa)'s wording -- and keep in mind we can refine it if we find a better way to do it later -- but if we go with "at least a defined set of Thin data elements must be accessible by unauthenticated RDS users" is there anyone on the call that would oppose that wording? And oppose that statement? Put a red X in the Adobe or -- again if anybody's joined that is not in Adobe -- speak up.

So I'm not seeing anybody that would oppose that. So thank you. And thanks for the good discussion. So let's add that as an action item. So we will put that statement into a - into our poll for this week. To allow all of you to confirm it. That you (support it) or not. And we will of course get - that will give those who are not on the call a chance to express their opinion as well.

Any more discussion on question three? Okay. Let's go then to questions five and four. And so the - I don't know (Lisa) was your ordering there - you think - did you think it was better to cover five before four? I didn't ask that question before. So, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Yes, I did. I did..

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Lisa Phifer: ...Chuck. This is Lisa Phifer.

Chuck Gomes: Because of that...

Lisa Phifer: Question five is actually all about purpose. And question four has some aspects of purpose in the comments. So it seemed to make sense to deal with five first.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Good. I should have asked that before the call but I didn't. So I just picked that up now. So let's scroll down to question five which I think is on page nine. And the - this actually starts on page eight. Okay, the bottom of page eight. There we go.

So on this one we - you can see the results are spread out quite a lot. And let's see if we can narrow it down at all. There was certainly not a one choice that stood out. The - choices B and C have the higher net number. So A certainly doesn't look like a viable option.

And on question five I want to call attention to some of the comments that were made. So if you want to scroll down to the comments. I thought there were quite a few. And if I don't pick on yours that doesn't mean your comment wasn't good. But that there's certain ones that kind of I thought were particularly helpful.

Comment number three -- Thin data is assumed public -- we haven't quite come to the conclusion that all Thin data's going to be public yet. But that aside, it makes little sense to declare the purpose to access publicly available. And if - I mean that's - I think that's an accurate statement. Comment five and several other of the comments kind of were related to this comment. Without some sort of mechanisms to state purpose -- a mechanism that hasn't been invented -- this is not something we should specify.

So quite a few people who commented had concerns -- as I did myself -- so I can relate to the concern. The idea of purpose -- the implication that a purpose has to be stated -- would be an operational complication that several of you noted. And comment six is very similar, right? The stated purposes open up Pandora's Box to criteria and decision rules and so forth.

And then if you look at comments - the last three comments -- eight, nine, and ten -- they all deal with that same thing. The way some of the options are worded on this one the whole idea of having - of possibly having to state a purpose if you want access. Of course that would go against our principle that we've worked on the last couple weeks and at least tentatively finalized.

So I wanted to call attention to those. And that said let me be quiet and see if others have comments on question five. (Michael), go ahead.

(Michael Hammer): (Michael Hammer) for the record. Because I'm shy. The (wording) of the question leads some ambiguity. So is it that the data elements that we choose to put in should have a stated purpose, or is that the individual accessing the data must state a purpose? So if it's the latter I would oppose it. If it's the former that may not be a bad thing and it may help with beating GDPR or other regimes.

Chuck Gomes: That's stated very well (Michael). This is Chuck speaking again. And I think that's where a lot of people had concerns. Is there anybody on the call that thinks that the individual requesting access to Thin data would need to state a purpose?

I think we all agree that we're going to have to state a purpose. I mean, as (poll) - and that was kind of the intent I think of option B. That RDS policy must cite purposes for giving access. But let's listen to Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Just Michele for the record. This was - it's - you'd have to have a purpose for every detail that's made available. But that doesn't mean that the

requestor would have to provide it. So the case of Thin data elements -- which unless I missed something I think we all agreed were nobody cared about particularly, I mean they didn't want them to -- they didn't particularly need them to be private or hidden or obfuscated or whatever.

You know, we could say that those - these elements are, you know, collected and published for and then provide a list of purposes. And that's fine. It's once you get into the more potentially sensitive data that you open up a bigger can of worms. But in the Thin data elements - they don't open up that can of worms.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Michele. Chuck again. So let me - looking at option B -- especially the last part "RDS policy must state purposes for public access to Thin data" and including the prefatory statement as well -- there were six people that said they do not support that.

If any of you are on the (call) I think it'd be helpful for the whole group to hear your thinking on that. And in fact that might help us refine this statement to something that's more acceptable. Anybody on the call that selected (I do not) support item B? Okay. All right.

So is there anybody on the call that's opposed to item B the way it's worded right now? Okay. That said, now again I'm not doing a very good job at keeping up with the chat. So somebody jump in if there's something in there that's significant that needs to be said. All right. So - (Lisa), go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks Chuck. I just wanted to call your attention to - I copied a couple of our previous working group agreements in chat that relate to having already agreed that Thin data elements should have at least one legitimate purpose. And that every existing Thin data element does have at least one legitimate purpose. Now that's not purpose for access. Purpose for collection. But we did previously agree on that point.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. So should we just put item B in a poll this week as worded? Would anybody suggest any changes to the wording as it is now? And re-poll on that one just by itself as a tentative conclusion. Now we're going to go to four and we may come back to five -- question five -- after we discuss four. But for now, let's make that a poll question pending what we discuss and decide on question four.

Good question (Lisa). I think because we were really exploring trying to get thinking going. I think we need to be more explicit that this is a conclusion that nobody objected to on the call. And that's a little different than what we saw. You know, hopefully it'll be, you know, an easy one.

But I think we ought to explicitly state that this conclusion -- choice B there -- there were no objections on the call. And we're confirming that are no objections in the whole working group. And again people on the call can do that. Steve Metalitz, go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you Chuck. This is Steve. I just had a question about - you're talking about B toward the bottom here of page eight, right? That - to determine...

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: ...its use and promote accountability. All right, well, I understand that the policy can state purposes for public access to the Thin data. But it's not clear to me exactly how that deters misuse and promotes accountability. If we're basically saying -- in not so many words or maybe in so many words -- that it's publicly accessible.

Does this mean that access for purposes other than those stated in the policy would be punished in some way? Or would be prohibited in some way? I'm just not clear how the statement of a purpose in the policy works to deter misuses and promote accountability. So that's...

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Steve. This is Chuck. And what you're getting at is kind of why -- when I stated choice B -- I left the prefatory part off.

Steve Metalitz: Oh you did? I'm sorry, I may have missed that.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, no, I - what you're saying is why I did it but I didn't make that clear. So no. That...

Steve Metalitz: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: ...you're fine. What you said is - needed to be said I think. Or is helpful. So I guess my question then do you think we ought to leave off that prefatory part and just say "RDS policy must state purposes for public access to Thin data"? And Steve if you want to respond you can.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, I mean I think that would eliminate the question that I have. And I did wonder if other people may have seen a connection there that I didn't see.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Okay. Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: You know -- okay, Michele for the record -- the - not 100% sure what Steve is querying. I mean every - in terms of data protection you need to have a purpose for every data element that you (collect). And then you need to have purposes for disclosure.

So if you're making something publicly available without restricting who has access to it then you need to have a purpose assigned to the elements. Are we agreeing or disagreeing? I'm not clear. I mean that's...

Chuck Gomes: So Michele, do you think that that prefatory clause there -- "to deter misuse and promote accountability" -- is needed in option B?

Michele Neylon: That actual phrase? No. Because it's inferred.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, and I think that's what Steve is saying. Steve, you're welcome to jump in if I misstated in any way. Okay...

Michele Neylon: I think we're okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...so Stephanie, go ahead. You're on mute, Stephanie. There we go.

Stephanie Perrin: That's - it's Stephanie. Stephanie Perrin for the record. As usual I made some nitpicking comments on the poll. Michele's dead right. You have to have a purpose for collection, use, and disclosure. It's not necessarily (pulled RP) and language under processing but you still need one.

So ICANN -- in order to disclose data elements -- that originate and I draw your attention to (Canatucci)'s remarks in Copenhagen on this score. Even though this is not nominative data it's still information. Let's assume a person that is registering a domain, the data relates to that person's domain and is considered, you know, the purpose of the file is to create a registration for that individual to register that domain.

Therefore, even if it's not nominative the data could be construed to be personal. And therefore you need a purpose for disclosure. Now the problem with the word accountability here is how on earth does ICANN -- beyond stating its purpose for accountability -- assume accountability for who's going to vacuum up the data, possibly link it with other personal data that they can find on the web or that they already have or whatever. And create a master file that is intrusive to that individual.

How much accountability does ICANN and its Whols (audiences) have for that? Now I would point out that the answer that (unintelligible) has given to this very difficult question -- about private sector and (private) crime enforcement which we all know we certainly want to have -- is that those companies are going to be subject to the GD - GDPR. That therefore they

will be accountable for how they collected the data, what their purpose in collecting, using, and disclosing it is, et cetera.

Nevertheless, there's a chain of accountability that goes from ICANN to these guys. And I think I have a problem with the use of the accountability word here if we're allowing free unauthenticated untracked access. Because you have no accountability mechanism there. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Stephanie. This is Chuck. So -- if I'm jumping to an unfair conclusion please let me know -- but it sounds like you wouldn't oppose removing "to deter misuses and promote accountability" and just have the statement "RDS policy must state purposes for public access to Thin data". Is that correct?

Stephanie Perrin: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Stephanie Perrin: Because I think that when you throw the other stuff in you get back to okay, then why did you make it freely available without authentication?

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you...

((Crosstalk))

Stephanie Perrin: Because we're doing nothing to determine...

Chuck Gomes: ...this is Chuck Gomes again. So, is there anybody on the call who's opposed to the statement "RDS policy must state purposes for public access to Thin data" as a tentative conclusion -- just like all these conclusions we're reaching -- but for now, is there anybody that's opposed to that?

Okay. So - and you can put a red X in the - I didn't say that but I think everybody knows it by now. All right. So we'll poll on that one as a tentative conclusion that there were no objections to for those on the call today.

Let's go now - let's now go back to question four, which starts on the bottom of page six. If you want to scroll there on the stream. And let me move it up just a little bit. Okay. So on question four then the - I want to call you - notice the results they're not definitive certainly. But keeping in mind that the main purpose of most of our poll questions this past week was to get us thinking about these things. And facilitate our discussion today. So far that has seemed to have been successful.

But you just had two choices in question four. And certainly choice A was fairly strong. But there were quite a few that preferred none on this one. What I want to call your attention to -- if you scroll down just a little bit into page five -- and look at comment five, okay? Which says it might be helpful to say something like "within the set of approved purposes". And that's to avoid the - a need to match a requestor's exact purpose with one of the approved purposes.

I thought that was a pretty helpful and constructive comment that I made there. So you - are you - you might be surprised that I like that one. Sorry for the light hearted thing there. But "within the set of approved purposes" instead of "within the same purpose" is a suggestion that I would make. And then if you - there's a couple - comments six, seven, and eight are all -- I thought -- helpful as well. Again going back to the concept we talked about in question five that users not need - will not need to state their purposes for Thin data.

Now I probably should throw in a qualification here. In the EWG report -- when we get into Thick Data and the more complicated issues that Michele referred to earlier -- there is this recommendation by the EWG that people do

have to identify their purposes. But we're talking about Thin data right now, and maybe some sub-set of Thin data.

So the - what do people think about changing the end of choice A -- where it says "within the same purpose" -- to "within the set of approved purposes"? Is - does that make sense? Would that help on that? That - let me open it up for discussion. Any discussion on question four.

That - by the way as a math major myself I would not call that mathematics, I'd call it arithmetic. But arithmetic's probably a subset of math, so. I'm being too picky there. (Michael), go ahead.

(Michael Hammer): (Michael Hammer) for the record. I'm not even sure what we mean when we say "a level playing field for all requestors".

Chuck Gomes: So look at comment two, (Michael). That Jim - I think it was Jim Galvin submitted that one. Another I think helpful comment there. Would you be more comfortable with Jim's suggestion?

(Michael Hammer): So, if a requestor is high-ping does that mean we need to degrade responses to low-ping requestors?

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Restate that for me please.

(Michael Hammer): Okay, so if someone has poor access to the internet. Does that mean we slow everybody else down to their level? What is that level playing field we talk about the process creating that level playing field?

Chuck Gomes: So I get your point with regard to level playing field.

(Michael Hammer): Is the - is it that the data elements returned must be the same for everybody? That makes sense. Or is there something else?

Chuck Gomes: It - good questions. How you'll - I mean do - back to the question I asked you, do you like the suggestion in comment two instead of "level playing field"? Or would you modify that?

(Michael Hammer): So non-discriminatory, I understand that. But again, there's been discussion about you know, if you're making more than X queries that's a different matter. Things like that. So what is it that we think must be offered in terms of Thin data to all requestors in a non-discriminatory matter? Is it qualitative only? Is it quantitative?

Chuck Gomes: Let's let Michele take a stab at that.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Chuck. Michele for the record. These - I put some of this in the chat. I think this comes back to the concept of equal access. You know, the level playing field that everybody - there's no kind of - there's no preferential treatment. I think that's what I came back to and I wouldn't read too much into it. Does that answer your question?

Chuck Gomes: I suspect not, but I'll let (Michael) answer that.

(Michael Hammer): (Michael Hammer) again. So if we're not supposed to read too much into it then why have it?

Michele Neylon: Oh, don't ask me that. I - (Michael) (wait) -- this is Michele -- from my perspective I think there's a lot of things -- kind of wordsmithing and spending a ridiculous amount of time -- looking at. Which I personally think is a wonderful way to give yourself a massive headache without actually getting much in return. But that's just me personally.

(Michael Hammer): I do -- (Michael Hammer) again -- I somewhat agree. But, I mean, let's be honest. There's - this is going to involve and relate to laws (and) wires. I grew up and you can't see my grey hairs but I have grey hairs. I kind of grew

up with the early internet. And so my predisposition is to have it as open and available as possible.

I remember the days of acceptable use policy and the anointed and the non-anointed. But I think if we're going to have language we need to be careful about the language we have. A, because it may be abused later in ways that were unintended or B, it will lead to conflicts down the road. And I know we've been kicking an awful lot of cans down the road.

Chuck Gomes: So (Michael) I'm going to put you on the spot. And then I'll give some time to think about when I call on Stephanie. But see if you can come up with a wording - I think we're probably all in agreement. We obviously don't have control over the access that different people have to the internet. So it's not going to - their access certainly is not going to be equivalent.

But from a policy perspective our policies should not favor one requestor versus another. And I think that's what we're talking about when we say non-discriminatory. And what Michele's saying when - not to read too much into it. But see if you can come up with some wording. Jim Galvin suggested one approach, I don't know if that totally covers it either but it's an idea. And see if you can come up with a way to reword choice A that might address what you're getting at. In the meantime, let's listen to Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie. My question is if we use this "non-discriminatory" what I'm worried about is -- supposing that you suspect that someone who's a heavy hitter on data is actually compiling it -- adding in personal data as I have suggested. And they therefore are misusing the system to compile a personal information dossier.

If you want to discriminate against those people you can't. If you decide that - if we approve this language. Are we going to get hung up on this later without providing ourselves any benefit? I mean the principle that everybody should have equal access is fine. But the actually reality of having an

enforceable restriction I see fading off into the sunset once we've agreed on anonymous, unauthenticated, free, non-discriminatory access. And I hope you get my point here. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: So Stephanie would - do you have any suggestions on how this might be reworded? And if you want to think about it I can come back to you.

Stephanie Perrin: I'll think about it, but you'll probably kill me because it'll mean going back on "unauthenticated" and all the rest of it. Because clearly you have some means of identifying that this is the same party. Now who is that? Is that by IP address? Is that, you know, I am not a geek so I don't know. A registrar might detect if somebody was mining their system and doing it, you know? I don't know, I'll think about it. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Stephanie. Let's go to Michele and then I'll come back to (Michael). Go ahead Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for records and what have you. I'm not sure whether I qualify as a geek in Stephanie's world or not. But I don't see the two as being mutually exclusive. There's no reason why you cannot put restrictions -- to prevent abuse, to maintain the level, the quality of service, all of that kind of thing -- and still give everybody equal access.

I mean, you're - the assumption is -- in my mind -- if I'm giving access to a resource I'm not giving access sub - to somebody who is being abusive. I'm assuming that their access is legal, permissible, non-abusive, they're not trying to DDoS the service or whatever. So I don't have an issue with having folk -- let's give this a nice wording -- non-discriminatory access for all permissible uses.

But being we - I thought we'd already covered -- ad nauseam may I add -- that there was noting that, you know, maintaining the stability of the system and putting in place measures to ensure that or mitigating against abuse was

all completely normal and acceptable and not an issue. So while I understand Stephanie's fear I think we've already covered it. So I don't think we need to again.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Michele. And let me go back to (Michael), see if he has any possible edits.

(Michael Hammer): I do not. (Michael Hammer) for the record. I do not. I am not an English major. And the fact is, when I listen to discussion of abuse and permissible uses quite honestly I look at DDoS as something totally different than somebody aggregating data. And so are we trying to boil the ocean in answering this question? Is it about technical issues?

And I know that we're still talking about Thin data but you know, people aggregate data and create other value. Okay, so Michelle Desmyter - Michele doesn't see aggregation as an issue but I think others do. And so I'm still trying to wrap my head around what is the intent when we talk about this level playing field. Is it in the actual technical accessing of the data over the wire? You know, there's not clarity to me.

Chuck Gomes: So I think we can answer that question. I think the -- and correct - somebody correct me if I'm wrong -- but I don't think we're talking about the technical access. We know that there's great variability in that depending on where you live and what kind of access you have.

We're talking about from a policy perspective. There should be non-discriminatory access. And I want everybody to focus on Volker's suggestion. Does it work? And then I'm going to throw out another question. Do we even need a statement like A? Are we trying to say something that doesn't need to be said?

And I'm saying that I think that. I'm asking whether we need this statement. And then I'm also asking -- and there's some support for Volker's formulation,

although I'm not sure it deals (Michael) with the concern you're talking about -
- but comments? Okay? What do you think about Volker's statement? Or
does somebody think maybe we don't even need what we're - what I'll refer to
as a non-discriminatory statement.

How many people -- and I want you to put a green check mark in Adobe --
how many people think that we need a statement along the lines -- assuming
we can come up with acceptable wording -- of choice A there. In other
words, non-discriminatory access for permissible uses. Put a green check
mark if you think we need to have a statement along those lines. And if you
don't think we need it put a red X.

Okay, so I - certainly got one so far. Scrolling down - three. So there - and
then Stephanie doesn't even think it's needed. Okay. That's good, okay.
Couple people. Steve Metalitz also doesn't think it's needed. There are half
a dozen or so that think it's needed. A lot of people aren't sure. Okay. So
not - lot of people not - are apparently not sure one way or the other, which is
okay.

And (Michael) I - the question is how do we word a broad principle to avoid
getting caught in the weeds later? Which I think is your original point. So
and let's - a couple people are typing so I'm going to just pause a little bit
here and see what suggestions. You can go ahead and remove your green
check marks and red Xs. And let's see. Thanks for clarifying in the chat what
I tried to say.

And one of the things that seems to be coming out is that we don't have any
control over the technical access that people have from a ISP point of view or
local access and so forth. So do we need to maybe -- if we take (Michael)'s
or Volker's statement -- their RDS access to Thin data must be non-
(discriminatory) (sic) from a policy perspective. Would it help to add from a
policy perspective?

Or maybe we should say RDS policies should be non-discriminatory for Thin data. That kind of avoids the technical issues that we have no control over. Okay. Well I don't want to spend too much more time on this. If anybody has a suggestion of how we might move this forward. What - should we test the statement that I -- and I'm not - I'm just trying to help us make some progress here -- what about the statement that I just made? RDS policy must be non-discriminatory for Thin data? Or RDS access policy I guess it should say. RDS access policy for Thin data must be non-discriminatory.

If - or with - well let's leave the parenthetical out for now. If people want it back in, we can put it back in. The reason I'm saying that is because again, "level playing field" from a policy perspective I think is what we need. But we can't create a perfectly level playing field for everybody in the world, obviously, if we include all factors.

So Greg and Stephanie, if you'd - or okay, so you can leave your X or your green check in. But notice that (Lisa) has started another Adobe poll here. A green check if you support this statement, "RDS policies for access to Thin data must be non-discriminatory". Green check mark if you could support that or at least live with it. A red X if you - not. So Stephanie you do not think that "RDS policies for access to Thin data must be non-discriminatory", is that correct?

Stephanie Perrin: I would like to include Volker's language, the "for all permissible purposes"...

Chuck Gomes: Oh, oh okay.

Stephanie Perrin: "Access for all permissible purposes".

Chuck Gomes: So you would just modify it a little bit further. "RDS policies for access..."

Stephanie Perrin: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...to Thin data must be non-discriminatory" - hold on, I'm scrolling up to make sure I get Volker's language. It's way up there now. For - so you would add "for all permissible purposes". Which I don't - I mean I think that's a good edit. So we're back to - yes. So we just add at the end "for permissible purposes". So "RDS policies for access to Thin data must be non-discriminatory for permissible purposes". And you (unintelligible) that Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: Sorry for the delay there. Stephanie again. (Lisa) has suggested "legitimate" to replace "permissible". And if that's what we've been using then I guess "legitimate" is the one we should go with.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Anybody...

((Crosstalk))

Stephanie Perrin: "Permissible" is (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: So anybody opposed to that? And then if any of you want to change your green check marks you can. But is there anybody that's opposed to that wording?

So "RDS policies". We better put it in there in writing so people can see it. (Lisa) if you can do that. "RDS policies for access to Thin data must be non-discriminatory for legitimate purposes". (Michael), you opposed to that?

(Michael Hammer): (Michael Hammer) for the record. Yes, for exactly the reason that Nathalie wrote. We don't - when somebody connects it's difficult to impossible to know what their purpose is. We've already said that they don't have to authenticate, they don't have to jump through any hoops. So this basically leaves it to the eye of the beholder rather than a good standardized way of dealing with it.

Chuck Gomes: Well that's true of any access to Thin data. It's not going to be enforced.

(Michael Hammer): Then why have it? This is a King Cnut kind of situation.

Chuck Gomes: Well because there are laws in some jurisdictions that require there to be legitimate purposes. That's why we have it.

(Michael Hammer): I'll post in the chat a link to who King Cnut is for Volker.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Greg Shatan? Why would you oppose this latest statement?

Gregory S. Shatan: Pretty much for the same reasons that (Michael) just stated. And I would also state that it's - when we're dealing with Thin data I disagree with your statement about what the law says. And...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: So you don't think there are some jurisdictions...

Gregory S. Shatan: ...I think the whole...

Chuck Gomes: ...that require a purpose?

Gregory S. Shatan: (For) Thin data? Not as we've - yes assuming we define it pretty much as we've been defining it. I don't. But in any case if we - if there are then I think we need to have, you know, clearer legal opinions on that. And once we get to personal data the, you know, it's a different ball game.

But I think trying to bootstrap of the personal data back in no matter what Professor (Cotton Macchio) -- or whatever his name was -- said in Copenhagen. You know, I love maximalist government employees. Obviously they want everyone to over-comply. But as far as I understand it -- and obviously I don't know the privacy and data laws of 192 countries or

however many there are that have them -- but as far as we're dealing with
Thin data you know, my understanding is there isn't.

So I think we need to you know, avoid, you know, assumptions. Or, you
know, going with the laws of the most repressive regime. Unless we're
planning to do that with other things such as free speech and other things.
(Private) ownership of private property. I'm not sure where that takes us but
nowhere good. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Greg. That kind of -- we're not going to jump ahead yet -- but if
you look at agenda item four we're going to give a little update on the legal
review that was suggested, you know, quite a few weeks ago now. We'll give
you an update on where we're at on that later in (the call).

So I think we've spent enough time on this one. We're not going to reach a
conclusion I don't think on this - in this call. So we'll table that one for now.
And I know table means different things in different cultures. So in other
words we'll put it on hold for now. And the leadership team will maybe try to
come up with a way forward on this.

So you may remove your marks in the Adobe. And let's go to question six.
And I'm glad that Nathalie is on the call. I'm going to put you on the spot
Nathalie coming up here. So just a little bit of a warning. So if you want to
scroll down to question six. She was the only one that suggested another
possible - oops I'm trying to find question six myself here. Where - there we
go. Okay.

Another guiding principle. Proportionality. So what I'd like to do -- and this is
on the last page, page ten, okay -- what I'd like to do is ask Nathalie if she
would please - to talk about her proposal of proportionality as a guiding
principle. Are you on mute Nathalie? Oh you're typing. Let's see what -
what we get here. Okay. If you can type that would be great.

In the meantime, if anybody wants to jump in and talk about proportionality as a possible principle you're welcome to do so. Including (Patrick) who apparently -- unless that's an old green check -- or Stephanie or (Tom). I don't know if those are green checks in support of Nathalie's suggestion. If they are and any of you would like to talk please raise your hand.

Lot of people are typing so I'm going to just pause. Bear with us while we see what people are typing. Can anyone answer Steve's question? Steve Metalitz's question? How does proportionality apply to Thin data? I think -- so that we have time to do a couple other agenda items before we close today -- that I'm going to take (Lisa)'s suggestion and take this to the list.

So an action item will be for staff to raise the issue of adding proportionality to a possible principle. A guiding principle. And in particular dealing with Steve's question also. Does it apply, does proportionality apply to Thin data? If so, how or not? Let's generate a few questions -- sub-questions -- too. And hopefully everybody can participate on the list. We're not far enough along I don't think to do a poll question on this one. Okay? All right.

Going on then to our next agenda item. Do we have any progress - let's see do we have - we don't have (Andrew) or it was Rod. It was you. Any progress working with VA on the data of record task that you guys volunteered to work on?

Rod Rasmussen: Rod Rasmussen here. This is the discussion around reasonable limitations on - for access -- based on the fact that you want to protect systems but you don't want to allow registries and registrars to use that provision -- to - I guess the thing we were just talking about. Block access or provide discriminatory access I guess.

So I've not made much progress direct because we haven't been able to connect up. But we did make some progress around looking at the current way policy is implemented around this. Because this has come up as an

issue before and there's been work done on it within the ICANN community. And collating that information together.

I have some requests in for further information. We're looking at this - a similar in the SAC as well. So we've actually been working on some of these things tangentially to what we're working on here. The main thing is to find out what, you know, kind of what the current status quo is from a inferred policy. Because that's - or because ICANN has -- in its operations -- basically created a de facto policy around what reasonable access is currently to data based on compliance regime.

So they're currently testing -- for example based on the RIAA and the registry agreement -- the current versions actually have specifications around being - you have to provide access. It is every five minutes ten different servers around the world will query a - for a information - Whols information. And if you fail that X so many times you're non-compliance with supplying adequate levels of access.

And that's kind of the bare minimum. So that translates it into 10 simultaneous connections or one connection every 30 seconds. Is what's in policy. Then there's implications in some of the things that compliance is written around how often - that they're actually testing and looking at these a little bit more stringently. That - and that's information, I've got some other questions to find out more about how that works.

So using that as kind of a baseline for how we're doing things today. We're also going to take a look at what other people have done and other policy areas to make sure that the policy matches what makes sense for the kind of data access we're talking about. So that's where we are on that one.

Chuck Gomes: And - so you're waiting for some responses on that? Did I understand that Rod?

Rod Rasmussen: Waiting for some responses around what ICANN has currently implemented and the compliance and area around this. Because that's de facto policy, right? But they're also doing some research as to what other regulatory agencies were -- or other areas that are similar to this in providing data access (have done) -- as far as how they've written this up and as far as policy goes.

So doing some research there and to see where we can find some other examples. Because this is not an area where I think we want to invent the wheel, or reinvent it for the 100,000th time. It's more of how can we make sure we're providing good guidance on this. That avoids problems that have been documented in the past around access to this kind of information within the ICANN space.

So and if I can ever hook up that's for the whole - we'll do some more. And I'm looking at from a US slash English-speaking perspective in the work I've been looking at. And I hope to get some other folks and work with other regimes to take a look at some other ways of approaching the same problem.

Chuck Gomes: So thanks Rod. This is Chuck. If you could - and as you pull this together it'd be helpful if you can put something in writing -- it doesn't have to be real formal or anything -- as some recommendations based on what's been done in other areas. And I think your thinking's right, let's try not to reinvent the wheel.

So we'll continue to allow you some time and hopefully you and VA can connect eventually as well. So all right. Thanks for spending the time on this. It's not a trivial task so it's much appreciated what you're doing. And hopefully we'll all benefit as a working group.

Let's go to agenda item four. After our meetings in Copenhagen -- and afterwards when we got responses back from the data protection experts -- we have the - and we'll get to that poll so bear with us. Do I need to do the

poll for - oh, so we'll get to that poll. You can leave that up there for now but don't focus on it.

We -- (Marika) in particular -- has been reaching out to some possible experts that we would hope would be independent. And this kind of goes back to Greg Shatan's comments too. Some people requested independent review of the data protection regulations that are pending in Europe. And in other - and some that are in place in other jurisdictions around the world.

So we've been - (Marika) in particular has been working on this. And (Marika) maybe you can just give a two-minute synopsis of what you've been doing so that people can see a little bit of the picture.

(Marika): This is (Marika). Sorry, getting off mute. Yes, so basically following our - or your conversations on this topic I've reached out to a couple of law firms and contacts that either I had or through other colleagues that we knew had experience in this area. And basically shared with them the questionnaire that was developed originally for this session with DPAs in Copenhagen. And basically requested for some input on you know, whether it would be something that a personal law firm would be able to assist with.

You know, if so what the expected costs would be. As well as the expected time frame for a delivering of responses. As well as proving some information on their qualifications and experience in this area so the leadership team would have the ability to review that information and hopefully make a determination on which of the people we reached out to would be best able to provide the working group with the legal advice it was looking for on those questions.

So that's where we're currently at. We've received input from two people to date, we're still waiting on a couple of others. And that information has been shared with the leadership team.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much (Marika). This is Chuck. And one of the things that (Marika) also did is she confirmed that there is some - there are some funds available in the fiscal year 17 budget which ends the end of June. Okay? And the advantage of using some of those funds would be - leave more available in the fiscal year 18 budget to the extent that funds are available to do follow up work in fiscal year 18.

So in my opinion it'd be really good if we can fund this out of fiscal year 17 dollars, thereby leaving a little bit more hopefully for fiscal year 18 as we need it. Now, to do that though in fiscal year 17 puts us in a real time crunch, okay? Ideally we'd involve the whole working group and get this all put together. If we do that we can forget fiscal year 17 funds.

So what the leadership team proposes is to go ahead and get - try and make this happen in fiscal year 17. Obviously with - it would have to be with minimal working group input. We would try to do everything in our power -- depending on the available legal experts in the short time frame -- to make sure the advice would be independent.

We would give them the same questions we gave the data protection commissioners. And so forth. And the leadership team would coordinate with the - with whoever would be contracted with on this issue trying to best represent all of you. Recognizing that obviously there are very different perspectives on all of these issues. And that's one of the reasons why we have a leadership team that's made up of vice chairs and myself who are all from different stakeholder groups in the GNSO.

And then we also have interests - you know, people like on the -- in particular -- managing abuse and so forth. So what we would try to do as the leadership team would be to do as best we can to represent the working group on this. And might even reach out -- we still need to figure out how to do this and we've talked about some ideas -- to some of you if we have questions. We're not going to ask you to interface with the - with whoever the

expert is. But we would -- as we see needed, as we see it might be useful -- reach out to some of you from different - having different perspectives like that.

That's about the best we can do and pull this off and get it out using fiscal year 17 funds. So what I'm doing right now is communicating where we're at and just give you a chance to react quickly to that. And Stephanie. And we are just about out of time, so please be brief.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks Chuck. Stephanie. Some of those questions that we put to the data commissioners were a little basic and naive. I hate to sound like it's okay to abuse the data commissioners but not lawyers we're paying for but I'd hate to spend money on some of those questions. I would suggest we have a go (at them, and) revise them a bit. But they wouldn't be questions I'd send to a data protection lawyer. Thanks. Bye.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thanks Stephanie. And we'll take that under consideration. In fact, that could be an area -- although it would have to be really quick turnaround - - where reach out to some of you and get your suggestions. It would have to be a really quick turnaround to make that happen. But thanks for that suggestion. Appreciate it.

Is there any I mean really strong objections to the leadership team taking the lead on this in the short term? And doing the best we can to try and take advantage of current fiscal year funds to get some advice that is hopefully independent of the answers that we already got? Not that those should be - shouldn't be taken seriously. They should be. But if you have any strong objections please let that be known today.

So that done, I'm going to - we'll go ahead and proceed as the leadership team then and keep you informed and possibly even reach out to some of you. We can't - doing it with a full working group it just is going to be unmanageable, so I hope people aren't offended by that. But it'd really help

us if we can use fiscal year 17 funds. And hopefully there's enough trust in the leadership team to do that.

Now, there's a poll on the screen right now. The sub-pro new GTLD working group has requested that we switch meeting days for our working group meeting. This is not the cross-community session in JoBurg but rather the working group meeting. Our working group meeting was scheduled on Tuesday. They'd like to switch with us so that our working group meeting would be on Wednesday morning from 8:30 to 12:30.

It - and we're just going to survey those on the call right now just to see if should we make this change? As far as the leadership team is concerned I think we think it's okay. But we wanted to give the working group a real -- at least those on the call today -- a real quick chance to say if it's a problem. If the change seems okay to you.

I understand that we haven't seen -- and we won't see until I think June 5 -- the detailed schedule. But certainly if you know of any problems that this change would cause answer no in this. And then the third choice looks like is "Will not be able to participate whether it's on Tuesday or Wednesday" or you don't, you know, or no vote. And the default will be no vote if you don't send one. So could everybody please respond to this poll?

"Yes" if you're okay with the change as far as you know. Understanding that all of us don't know too much about the schedule. "No" if you already know that would be a problem. If you can't participate in either one -- either remotely or in person -- check the third one or you can check no vote. If everybody'd do that right now I would appreciate that. Okay and they'll tally that. Rod, go ahead.

Rod Rasmussen: Yes, Rod Rasmussen. Chuck, you just asked the question verbally opposite the way it's stated in the...

Chuck Gomes: Did I really?

Rod Rasmussen: Yes, I think so. So the question is "Would this affect you, yes or no?" Which is why I actually raised my hand in the first place. It actually would affect me positively, right? But that wasn't really kind of the - I would actually be able to attend more events by - being based on Wednesday rather than Tuesday. But that wasn't really an option. So anyways. Yes, so it was (unintelligible). Now I'm confused. If it - yes...

Chuck Gomes: Yes, that last sentence is worded poorly. Should this change be made would affect... Okay, so let me word it and I'm sorry that it's not worded more clearly there. Should this change boy I - that's - (Lisa) go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Chuck I've put a couple of things in chat. "Yes" means that changing the date to Wednesday would affect you in a negative way.

Chuck Gomes: Oh.

Lisa Phifer: And "No" means keeping the date on Tuesday would be okay for you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, so I did reverse it. So if it would affect you negatively -- I would have reworded this differently but it's too late for that now -- if this change would affected you - would affect you negatively you answer "Yes". Is that right (Lisa)?

Lisa Phifer: Correct. In other words, if we make this change and it stops you from attending the meeting, say yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. If it wouldn't have any impact on you answer "No". And then you have the other two choices. So do that right now please. Thanks Rod for pointing that out. I - anyway, hopefully we'll get a sense this if we need to go back to the list we'll do that. Okay. All right.

Now we're out of - we're past time. By quite a bit now. I apologize for that. We have made some good progress in this call. Action item - confirming actions items. Anybody on staff want to - is anything not clear in terms of action items?

We're going to have two poll questions coming out that you'll have until Saturday to respond. Rod's going to continue working on the - with hopefully with VA on the data of record issue. Unreasonably restrict legitimate access. Any other action items we should go over? And Rod I assume that's an old hand but if it's not, speak up. Okay.

Lisa Phifer: Okay. Think the only other action item was for Nathalie Coupet and anyone else who wishes to participate in a working group mailing list discussion of a new principle on proportionality.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, and that's a whole working group discussion. Not a special working group. Let's be clear on that. So that's another actions items. Staff will initiate a discussion that we'd like everybody to participate on the list including Steve Metalitz's question about Thin data and proportionality. So thank you for remembering that.

Anything else? Okay. Thanks everybody. Have a good rest of the week. Participate on the list in the discussion and in the poll. And that'll facilitate our meeting next week. Thanks. Meeting adjourned. The recording can stop.

END