

**ICANN
Transcription
Next-Gen RDS PDP Newcomer Tutorial call
Tuesday, 23 May 2017 at 17:30 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-newcomer-23may17-en.mp3>

AC recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p73xek0tdqa/>

Attendance on wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/jBXfAw>

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

Michelle Desmyter: Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening to all and welcome to the NextGen RDS PDP Newcomer Tutorial call on the 23 of May at 1730 UTC. In the interest of time there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room so if you are only on the audio bridge would you please let yourself be known now. All right thank you and hearing no names I would like to remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. Lisa you may begin.

Lisa Pfeiffer: Thanks (Michelle) and thanks all for attending the newcomers tutorial. Many of you know my name is Lisa Pfeiffer in together with Marika Konings and Amr Elsadr the three of us staff the Policy Development Process on next-generation gTLD Registration Directory Services. Recently we have seen that many new members joined this PDP Working Group because all newcomers to any PDP are responsible for catching up on required reading for working group members and any deliberation that has occurred prior to joining a working group we thought it would be helpful to at this time offer in introductory level tutorial particularly geared to newcomers although we know

that we have some working group members that are old-timers with us as well.

To determine the topics of greatest interest for this tutorial we did survey the working group members. And the result is this one hour tutorial which we developed to provide an overview of topics that were of highest interest in that survey. That includes the final issue report that led to the formation of this PDP Working Group, the three-phased process framework that was used to structure this PDP work, our goals in phase one and a mind map that you probably have seen in working group deliberations so far that we are using to structure our work as we try to answer questions in our charter.

And finally we'll leave you with a few pointers to additional resources followed by a Q&A session at the end that hopefully we will have time for that Q&A. And with that I'll turn things over to my colleague Amr who's going to present the first few sections. Amr it's yours.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Lisa, this is Amr. And what you are seeing on the screen here right now is the contents of this tutorial Webinar that Lisa just went over. So first let's start with Whois from a historical perspective. What is Whois?

Whois was created in the 1980s to facilitate contact for those who operated the Internet network resources. However the pace at which the Internet has evolved particularly with introduction of the World Wide Web in the past and a number of GNSO efforts have been unable to keep up with policy changes to the satisfaction of different stakeholder groups involved in the discussion.

I will briefly revisit this in another slide but in generally in 2012 the ICANN board launched the RDS PDP and the Expert Working Group was also launched to inform this PDP. The Expert Working Group will, was tasked with taking a fresh approach by redefining the purpose gTLD registration data and then proposing a new model for the - for gTLD registration data services to address accuracy, privacy and access issues.

After the EWG or the Expert Working Group submitted its final report ICANN board reaffirmed its request to launch this PDP and informally worked with a - with members of the GNSO Council to develop a process framework to structure this effort and propose a charter which was included as part of a new preliminary issues report. This was subsequently adopted by the GNSO Council and the PDP Working Group was then established.

And the PDP Working Group is tasked with analyzing the purpose of collecting, maintaining and providing access to gTLD registration data and considering safeguards for protecting that data determining if and why a next-generation RDS is needed to replace Whois as well as creating policies and coexistence and implementation guidance to meet those needs. So when referring to Whois it's kind of a - well as the slide says it's an overloaded term. It could mean registration data, it could mean access to protocol which is a Whois protocol and the directory services. So it's best and then we have made this a sort of a practice throughout this PDP to try to be more specific when referring to registration data.

As I mentioned in a previous slide Whois came to be in the 1980s as a mean for those operating the Internet network resources as a means for them to communicate and giving them the ability to identify each other and then contact each other. With the Internet's growth and the introduction of the World Wide Web in the 1990s Whois became useful to a number of other stakeholders apart from those who were operating the Internet Network Resources. Some of - so some of those are mentioned on the slide including registrants, law enforcement intellectual property and trademark owners businesses and individual Internet users. Despite the change in use and purpose of use of Whois the Whois protocol remained unchanged from how it was initially set up by the Internet Engineering Task Force, the IETF.

ICANN has historically had a commitment through the affirmations of commitments with the United States government to maintain timely

unrestricted and public access to accurate and complete Whois information. This commitment was later incorporated in ICANN's new bylaws. This was following the INS stewardship transition process and the associated work done to enhance ICANN's accountability.

So here this is a slide to sort of describe how Whois works today's Whois. So first a client would query for a domain name to try to get the Whois information. The server fetches all the relevant records from a database and then the server will inform - will provide information such as the contact persons and technical configuration for the domain and then - sorry.

So domain names are registered by registrants through ICANN accredited registrars. The registrar checks to see if the domain being sought is available and it will create a Whois record upon registration. The registration of domain names is also done via registrar resellers so a registrar could potentially go through a reseller that would interact with the registrar.

This is - yes, this slide shows a snapshot of what information is returned upon the Whois query being done. This includes the contact information for the domain name registrant as well as administrative and technical contacts. It also includes information of the registrar - for the registrar to which the domain name was registered as well as the technical configuration as I explained previously.

So here we have a number of efforts that - within ICANN over the years to sort of reform Whois policy and the implementation of that policy. And then a little later in the presentation we will be discussing where you can find this information. But all of this information is accessible now, information on all of these policies, the documentation on these. And then they are all relevant to the ongoing work in the RDS PDP that we are all a part of now. Okay I'm going to hand back over to Lisa now and she can start discussing the final issues report that we are working with. Thank you.

Lisa Pfeiffer: Thanks Amr and this is Lisa Pfeiffer again. So why are we talking all about Whois and not Registration Directory Services? Well actually RDS is really in many ways a new name for what we used to call Whois. And we're in a transitional period where we've begun to call the Whois system and the Whois policies RDS policies. And as you know in this working group we're challenged with the task of defining what an RDS set of requirements might be and then if a new policy framework is required for it.

The description of what our PDP is actually tasked with addressing is documented in the final issue report. And why is there a policy development process for next-generation RDS to replace Whois? Well as Amr noted Whois started as a tool for system and network administrators to obtain information about domain name operators and to resolve technical issues but today many other stakeholders use Whois for purposes that range from criminal activity investigation to intellectual property protection, consumer protection and even just research about the Internet. The evolution of that I just described has brought about many different issues and concerns. They range from inability to contract registrants due to inaccurate data, conflicts that registrars run into when they tried to meet their Whois contractual obligations, difficulty in securing Whois data given that the Whois protocol doesn't support any kind of cryptographic protection, concerns about identity theft or other misuses of public data published to Whois and costs associated with collecting, maintaining and making this registration data accessible in the way that the Whois system does today.

These issues and concerns apply not just to today's Whois system but they also apply to many of the recommendations that were produced over the years by a very large number of taskforces, review teams and even PDPs that all work to try to improve Whois, both a system that exists and the policy upon which it's based. Back in 2003 the first Whois task force conducted a survey to determine key questions that should be considered such as improving data accuracy and avoiding Whois data abuse. Ultimately the recommendations of that task force led to the development of two new

policies. Policies that Amr noted include the Whois data reminder policy and the Whois marketing restriction policy. And those are consensus policies that remain in place today.

In 2007 another Whois task force was created to define the purpose of Whois in the context of ICANN's mission and privacy laws and to define the purpose of Whois registered name holder technical and administrative contacts. If that question sounds familiar because it's still in front of this PDP working group today it's because that task force made recommendations but unfortunately it could not agree upon a recommendation for an operational point of contact or OPOC to be used in place of administrative and technical contacts.

That impasse triggered a series of studies commissioned by the GNSO to provide facts upon which to base new consensus policies. As shown here on this slide studies gathered empirical data on things like Whois misuses, how registrants identify themselves in Whois today, how privacy and proxy services are actually used and how they are sometimes abused and Whois data inaccuracies. You can find all these task force reports as well as the Whois studies on our wiki.

In 2010 the first Whois Policy Review Team was formed to review the extent to which ICANN's Whois policy as well as its implementation are effective, meet the needs, legitimate needs of law enforcement and promote consumer trust. That review team was mandated at the time by the affirmation of commitments and it published its final report in mid-2012 making 16 recommendations in the areas that you see shown on these - this slide. The recommendations ranged from clearly documenting Whois policies all in one place to ensuring requirements for accurate Whois data or widely and proactively communicated to initiating processes to regulate and oversee privacy and proxy service providers and to determining appropriate internationalized domain name registration data requirements. And that just names a few of the 16.

As some of you may know there is a new RDS Whois II Review Team just now being formed that's required by ICANN's new bylaws. And they will conduct another periodic review of the existing system and at least how well the recommendations of this Review Team have been followed upon - followed-up on and implemented in their effectiveness. Back in 2012 as Amr mentioned at the request of the board the SSAC reviewed the Whois Review Team's recommendations. The produced a report called the Blind Man and the Elephant SSAC 55. In that document they found that further work should be undertaken prior to implementation of the Review Team's recommendations. That includes conclusions that it's critical that ICANN develop a policy for defining the purpose of domain name registration data.

ICANN should create a committee to develop a registration data policy that defines the purpose of domain name registration data and ICANN should defer other activities directed at finding a solution for this Whois problem until our registration data policy identified in those first two bullets have been developed and accepted by the community. The board considered this recommendation and it ultimately launched a two-pronged approach that consisted of enforcing existing policies and improving existing implementation of Whois as well as launching an effort to consider a brand-new next-generation RDS policy framework that might eventually replace Whois.

As you can see the history of this issue that's in front of our PDP Working Group today is very lengthy. And in addition to the efforts that I just summarized you'll find literally dozens of other Whois related policy and implementation efforts posted on our wiki as input documents. That includes contractual requirements for Whois which is now referred to in the contracts is the RDDS Registration Data Directory Services in the 2013 version of the registrar accreditation agreement.

You can also find implementation efforts to address the Whois Review Team recommendations that include a new Whois accuracy reporting system the Whois primer and a consolidated Whois Lookup tool. Several other Whois

related PDPs that have produced consensus policies since the time that this board initiated PDP started includes the PDP on privacy proxy service accreditation and the PDP on translation and transliteration of contact information to name just two.

Finally ICANN continues to review and refine its procedures for handling conflicts between the registrar and registry contractual obligations for Whois and privacy laws. In addition to efforts underway within the ICANN community and within the GNSO the GAC has also generated a series of communiqués which provide input on Whois issues. Looking outside of ICANN itself for nearly 15 years the Article 29 working parties have generated a lengthy set of correspondence and papers about Whois largely pertaining to privacy and data protection laws within the EU. The IETF also spent several years developing a more robust and contemporary Registration Data Access Protocol, RDAP to replace the legacy Whois protocol that Amr introduced.

There have also been additional Whois studies conducted over the years especially to measure inaccuracy and registration data. All these are key inputs and they're posted on our working group wiki. And you'll also find on our wiki many inputs on purpose data elements and privacy questions that were summarized by this working group as part of its first few months of effort. Please note that every working group member is expected to at least fully read the final issue report that I've just touched upon to learn about this very rich and complex issue history and also to become familiar with that expensive library of available inputs. No one expects you to read the entire library at once but becoming familiar with the history that has gone on and where you can find inputs applicable to any particular question we might deliberate upon is a good way to start, you know, participating in this PDP.

Now in addition to the history that I just covered the final issue report also explains the origin and goals of what was called the next-generation RDS. That is a brand-new policy framework and implementation that might depending on the output of this PDP eventually replace Whois.

When the final issue report and charter actually referred to in next-generation RDS they don't mean a particular policy, they don't meet a particular implementation of that policy. Rather RDS is used as sort of an umbrella term to refer to this entire effort to establish a new policy framework and requirements that drive it. At the end of 2012 when the board considered the review team's recommendations as well as the SSAC's alignment in an elephant report it issued a resolution that actually spawned our PDP. This is a board initiated PDP.

Now recognizing that the community had a very long history and an ability to - inability to reach a consensus on overall Whois policy reform at that time in 2012 the board directed ICANN CEO to launch a new and hopefully different effort to redefine the purpose of collecting, maintaining and providing access to gTLD registration data including safeguards to protect that data. The board's hope was in spawning this new effort essentially asking a team of individual advisors called the Expert Working Group or EWG tasking that team to take a look at this problem, envision what a new system might look like and offer some foundation for this PDP to begin its work. The board hoped that we would build a strong foundation that upon which policies could eventually be based.

The Expert Working Group was not a policy development process but it did try to envision starting with a clean slate what a new system might look like. The EWG when it was formed it studied the board's request. It poured through documents for about 15 months, solicited community input, published draft reports, responded to public comments and it even conducted some new research that you'll find on our wiki all in an effort to better understand the problem and also to suggest a new and different approach that might better meet everyone's needs. The EWG tried to look at Whois concerns from every angle, tried to appreciate the many different viewpoints that exist and it made it so very difficult for the community to reach consensus on policy reform. In June 2014 the EWG recommended abandoning today's Whois

model. That is the model where everyone has the same public access to the same data that is all too often incomplete, inaccurate or simply just not useful enough. In its place the EWG recommended a brand-new system built from the ground up hopefully to meet existing needs and as well as future needs of the global Internet community.

And this diagram tries to capture in one picture the EWG recommendation which is very difficult. But as the PDP Working Group has recently been discussing in its final report the EWG recommended a paradigm shift to a new system that collects, validates and discloses registration data, gTLD registration data for permissible purposes only. In this new paradigm shown on this slide basic data, that is the minimum public data set would remain publicly available to satisfy many common needs however the rest of the data would be gated, that is accessible only to accredited requesters who identified themselves if they did their purpose and agreed to be held accountable for appropriate use of that data. As shown here, only the data that an authenticated user was authorized access for that purpose that they stated would be returned. And that would be obtained from the responsible registries as well as a new ecosystem entity proposed in the EWG report of a data validator. Data validator would gather contact data and validate it prior to use.

In reaching this conclusion the EWG members did try to strike a compromise that while admittedly not perfect we hoped it did a better job of balancing everyone's interest and concerns. Moreover the EWG had the luxury of not trying to patch Whois but trying to think about what a new system should one be described and defined and specified and built today, what a new system to meet those needs might look like.

The EWG considered every stakeholder involved in gTLD directory services today. It looked at needs for accuracy access and privacy. It considered possible approaches to meet those needs more effectively. And ultimately in the EWG final report you'll see 180 principles that encompass the area

shown on this slide. The report was delivered and tried to address all of these questions with principles that could potentially be taken up as the starting point for this PDP working group.

For example as you see here the EWG tried to answer the board's request to define the purpose of gTLD registration data. And in the final report you'll find a definition for each purpose along with a list of tasks and associated data for each purpose. And you'll also find principles regarding why and how data elements for each purpose might be dated how data and personal privacy might be protected in that paradigm. Finally to examine how such a new system might work the EWG did look at several implementation models. It also looked at the cost associated with two of those models. It surveyed the ICANN community for input on potential risks and benefits and in cases where community viewpoints were especially diverse and difficult to reconcile the EWG launched some additional research information, research activities to inform their recommendations. And again you can find that research information on our wiki.

The EWG's findings are documented in this final report. All working group members are required to read the EWG's final report to at least understand where we all started when launching this PDP working group. To help you with that you'll find a series of frequently asked questions and answers, the detailed tutorial that was presented by the EWG members themselves in June 2014, top ten questions Webinars. There are very short three, four minute Webinars on different topics and then half a dozen research reports.

Now to agree upon the principles in its final report the EWG did have to make many compromises. And although the EWG reach consensus on many, many points there was some dissent on some points and in particular one very important principle related to consent. And you'll find both that descent statement as well as statements from other individual EWG members posted on our wiki as well. After considering the EWG report the board, the ICANN board did reaffirm its request for this PDP working group. It requested that the

EWG output be used as a foundation from which the GNSO might build its own new global policy for gTLD registration data.

Starting from the EWG report doesn't limit the PDP working group's efforts. There are many other inputs available to us all of which are posted on our wiki and I should say growing wiki because every time we encounter a new input we post it on the wiki. Our working group charter does call for community outreach to ensure that all perspectives are heard to inform this PDP.

So given this overview of available inputs including but not limited to the EWG report let's talk a little bit (unintelligible) questions that this working group must answer. And you'll see described in the final issue report and our charter the task before this PDP working group is to reach consensus on the big ticket question of whether a new next-generation RDS is needed to meet requirements or whether the existing Whois system can be modified to satisfy those requirements. As evident from the long history on this issue this won't be an easy task.

So in-between delivering the EWG report and actually launching our working group there was a group of GNSO counselors and they got together with the ICANN board to discuss how to structure this PDP. They came up with something called a process framework in an effort to help us succeed. That framework divvies our work into three phases derived from the common development lifecycle.

Most importantly the framework asks that we begin with fundamental requirements for gTLD registration data. As the SSAC found it is really very hard to agree upon policy or implementation, if you don't first agree upon requirements that is what you're trying to accomplish with policy. At a minimum this PDP Working Group has been asked to reach consensus on users and purposes for registration data -- associated access, accuracy data element and privacy requirements. This PDP may of course agree upon

additional requirements but those questions were felt to be essential to answer before we can address the question of whether a new system is actually needed to meet those requirements.

This PDP working group has been tasked with trying to reach consensus on whether a next-generation RDS is actually needed. If so this PDP working group will go on to consider some cross cutting requirements such as coexistence compliance, system modeling, cost benefit and risk analysis. These are all felt to be requirements that apply to any system whether they're applied to the existing Whois system or to the new RDS. And then finally if the working group does find that a new RDS is needed this PDP would move on to end that recommendations accepted by the GNSO Council then this PDP would move on to (unintelligible).

This slide drills down a little bit to the minimum set of 11 questions to be considered by this working group during the PDP. And as you read the final issue report you'll see there's a section on each of these questions that outlines which part of this question should be addressed in phase one and what additional questions would be addressed during phases two and three that is during policy development and the creation of coexistence and implementation guidance. Most recently the workgroup has been dealing with the first five questions on this list, who should have access to gTLD registration data and for what purpose; what steps should be taken to control data access for each of those users and purposes; what steps should be taken to improve accuracy if any and what data should be collected stored and disclosed; what steps are needed to protect data and privacy? Those five questions are the fundamental questions in front of us right now within this PDP working group.

After addressing those questions we will continue on to the rest of the questions on this list. As you can see the questions are very closely related to each other. Answers about purpose will be influenced by for example requirements associated with protecting data and personal privacy. And of

course those requirements have to be put in the context of gTLD registration data elements and specific data elements that are going to be collected maintain and accessed.

For data to be useful it must be at least to some degree accurate and so on. Now those aren't easy questions for the community to reach consensus on but our charter asks us to look at at least those five questions before trying to recommend whether or not a Whois replacement is needed and then to look at the following six questions in the context of the system we recommend be used to satisfy those requirements.

This slide shows how each of those 11 questions is actually mapped onto the three phases of this PDP. I'll talk a little bit more about the phases in the moment but for now I'd like to call your attention to a few points. First of all, all 11 questions apply to all three phases. This PDP is an iterative process. We will refine the requirements that we define in phase one into policies in phase two and then provide coexistence and implementation guidance in phase three. We'll do that for every single question. It's not that some questions get deferred to a later phase but that each question gets relooked at in each phase.

Second all 11 questions are interdependent. Purposes depend upon data. Data access depends on purpose. Data protection and privacy laws apply to the data that's recommended. So we're going to have to iterate across all the questions on this list and some questions such as cost cannot even be considered until we have some at least fundamental answers to the first few questions.

Third at least two GNSO council decision points are defined. That's the little triangles at the bottom. They're defined in our charter, one at the end of phase one and another at the end of the PDP. That's to ensure that subsequent phases are based on formal agreement on the requirements and that we don't begin developing policy until we have some formal agreements

on the requirements that we're trying to meet. And that includes accepting community inputs on draft recommendations in phase one and then building formal consensus in phase one before we move forward to phase two or three.

And to illustrate this phased approach this slide shows how the questions of users and purposes might be approached in three separate phases. During phase one of this PDP the phase that we're in now the most fundamental question to be answered about purpose is whether gTLD registration data should continue to be accessible for any purpose as it is today in Whois and if the working group should reach consensus that registration data should be accessible only for specific purposes the working group then has to think about which users and purposes the system should actually be required to support and why. Now this working group hasn't been spending much time on this question. Many of the meetings in January and February of this year addressed that charter question for phase one at least on first pass.

Having forged some consensus on the first five questions the working group will have created a foundation to answer that big-ticket question of whether a new policy framework and next-generation system is needed to meet the requirements. If the working group finds that a new policy framework is needed and if the GNSO council agrees then we continue on to phase two and draft very specific policies to support the requirement. Finally in phase three the working group will have to test its policy recommendations by considering possible implementation in coexistence guidance. And it is quite possible in phases two and three that those phases will happen somewhat iteratively as well since looking at implementation implications may cause policies to be refined and so forth.

Now in this tutorial obviously this is a very big issue with a lot of history. We hope that we've given you a good starting point to do your own reading and homework. And in particular we recognize that there are a very large number of inputs. To help you identify those that are most relevant to any particular

charter question under discussion you will find on this working group's wiki that there are a list of questions and hyper linked key inputs for each of the charter questions. You'll also find at least for questions on purpose data elements and privacy a summary document developed by this working group when it first formed the first half of last year. Many working group members contributed to producing a summary of all those key inputs for those first three charter questions.

Now this slide and the next are taken from the PDP's charter directly. And as you can see it each of the 11 questions are actually expanded and then sequenced to reflect interdependencies. As you look across each row you can see how each question is mapped into the three phases. As you read down each column you can see how questions depend on each other. And I encourage you to study these two tables in the charter and to see how the phases fit together and how the questions rely on each other.

Note that the first five questions listed on the previous slide were considered fundamental, that is applying to any kind of registration directory service be that today's system or a new next-generation system. However the cross cutting questions that are listed on this slide -- coexistence, compliance, system modeling cost benefit and risk analysis -- may apply to any system. And for this reason they'll come - they'll be addressed after the first five questions and after we set an initial context for whether requirements need to be satisfied by tweaks to the existing Whois system or a new system.

Before we conclude I want to touch upon the working groups near-term goals workplan and phase one mind map. These other questions as you know we've been looking at recently, the first five questions. And these other questions that we expect to address in our first initial report.

This is our near-term goal. It's outlined in our workplan as Task 12 but what is Task 12? Task 12 in our workplan shows a - an approach that we'll use to try to reach consensus in phase one by taking out first the first five questions

using our deliberation during working group calls, using the results of polls that we've been taking almost on a weekly basis trying to develop rough consensus on agreements in each of these five charter question areas. Note that we won't actually attempt to achieve formal consensus per the instructions in our charter until the tail end of phase one, that is after we've done two public comment cycles, one public comment cycle on the first initial report which covers those five fundamental questions as well as this working group's recommendation on whether a new system is needed and then a second public comment period after a second initial report, that is after the group looks at the results of the first public comment period, refines its initial working group agreements based on rough consensus and then looks at those following six areas of coexistence, compliance, system modeling cost benefit and risk.

That would go out again for public comment and only after receiving those, at least those two formal periods of public comment only after receiving that input would we try to reach formal consensus within the working group that these are in fact the recommendations we want to publish out of phase one.

And this slide just gives you the target dates for moving ourselves through Task 12. Note in particular that we want to start pairing that first initial report by the time that we get to Abu Dhabi ICANN 60. And that means that we need to start discussing that big question of whether a new system is needed based on requirements that we've established by September of October - or October this year in that rough timeframe in order to meet this target for publishing our first initial report.

Last I want to touch on the mind map and then I'll turn things back to Amr. The mind map actually presents the questions from our charter and it opposes sub questions that were drawn from the final issue report and the charter itself so questions to be answered in phase one. For each question there are sub questions that kind of tease apart that question. We don't have to answer all of the sub questions. We can add new sub questions. We can

refine this as we go but the mind map is a way to help us get our arms around the questions and break them into smaller pieces that we can deliberate on as we move through the first five questions and then that first initial report.

This slide was the eyechart slide but there is a link at the bottom to the full mind map. The full mind map only covers the first five questions. It does list some but not all of the key inputs to each question. That might help you as you prepare to deliberate on any particular charter question each week. It might be helpful to consult the mind map, look at the key inputs that are listed see if there's any input that you want to become familiar with and also review the sub questions related to that charter question to kind of get a context for the discussion. And Amr I'll turn things back to you to wrap up.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Lisa. This is Amr again. So throughout the slides that Lisa was talking about she mentioned a number of previous efforts done on Whois, the different task forces, previous policy development processes, the expert working group the final issues report for this PDP, research studies, a number of efforts and documentation that is available and is within the scope of this PDP to discuss. So over the next two slides I just want to briefly highlight where you can find all of this information.

So we - staff does maintain a robust wiki and as Lisa mentioned there are constantly documents being (unintelligible) to that wiki. I'm going to paste the link to that wiki in the chat here, just the link to the landing page but it's also the first link up on the slide, the first bullet titled RDSP PDP Working Group Wiki Workspace. There's a menu on the left-hand side of that landing page. It's a drop-down menu. It's got a number of subpages to the wiki that are also accessible. And there you will find links to the background documents and information which does have the general background of the GNSO PDP on the different board motions, the expert working group reports and the issues report that - this working group's charter.

And there's also another page titled additional key inputs. And this has a number of I can say quite a large number of documents that might be interesting for working group members to go through. Those studies Lisa mentioned the RAA, the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and the registry agreement are also linked on that page. But we briefly mentioned the procedure for handling Whois conflicts with national laws and on a couple of working group calls. That's also over there, different communiqués provided by the GAC that are relevant to Whois and the correspondence between ICANN and other groups such as the Article 29 Data Protection Working Party.

So all that information is present on the wiki under the Background Documents and Information link as well as additional key inputs. But it's also important to note that this wiki is a very good resource for following-up the work of the PDP on an ongoing basis. As you will have noted staff does circulate action items and notes after every call that the working group participates in and for every call there is a dedicated wiki page that also where we also post on those action items and notes as well as the documents and materials that are used for those calls. The recording in transcripts are available for folks who have not - were not able to attend and would like to catch up as well as every time there - like as Lisa mentioned we - the working group does conduct polls almost on a weekly basis so the results for those polls are also captured and posted on those wiki pages.

So I would encourage folks to really try to familiarize themselves with this wiki space. It's a great resource and it's a great ongoing resource so it's says something you will take a look at once and then not need to refer back to. And of course if at any point in time you do need help navigating your way through this you could always reach out to Lisa, Marika or myself and then we'd be happy to help.

That is the end of our presentation now and we would be happy to take questions at this point? Thank you. So if anybody does have questions

please feel free to raise your hand in the Adobe Connect room. And you can do that by clicking on the little button at the top of the screen with a little figure with his hand raised.

Lisa Pfeiffer: Seeing no questions at this point we are at the end of our 30-minute time slot. You can feel free to contact any member of staff with questions at any time. This is not your only opportunity to ask questions. I believe that you've seen all of our email addresses and postings to the working group mailing list and please consider staff resource for you to call upon if we don't know the answers. We will try to at least point you to someone who does.

All right with that we'll wrap up. Thank you all for attending and look forward to working with all of you on our PDP working group. Recording can stop.

Michelle Desmyter: Thanks Lisa. Again the meeting has been adjourned. Operator would you mind stopping the recording?

END