ICANN
Transcription
Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group call
Tuesday, 5 December 2017 at 17:00 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: https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-nextgen-rds-pdp-05dec17-en.mp3

AC recording: https://participate.icann.org/p1rszhnfiev/

Attendance is located on wiki agenda page: https://community.icann.org/x/MAByB

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

Julie Bisland: …good afternoon, good evening everyone. Welcome to the Next Generation RDS PDP Working Group call on the 5th of December 2017. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. If you're only on the audio bridge could you please let yourself be known now?

Okay, hearing no names, I would like to remind 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. And with this I'll turn it back over to our chair, Chuck Gomes. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Julie. And welcome to everyone. Does anyone have an update to your statement of interest? Okay, not seeing any hands or hearing anyone I'll assume not. Let's go ahead and jump into the agenda. You can see it in Adobe on the upper right there, and also in the notes at the moment so we're going to, first of all, complete deliberation on technical issue resolution as a legitimate purpose for collecting some RDS data. And first of all, we'll take a look at the poll results. Everyone has scrolling capability so the first - Page 2 of course you'll see the agenda and then on Page 3 a quick overview of what we've done.

And we have a possible working group agreement shown in the bottom half of Slide 3 there that the following information is to be collected for the purpose of technical issue resolution associated with domain name resolution, technical contacts or if no technical contact is provided, registrant contacts, name servers, domain status, expiry date and time, and sponsoring registrar.

Now in the leadership call yesterday, we spent over half our time talking about the comments that came in with the poll so we're going to spend a little bit of time today discussing the comments. But first of all, if you'll look at Slide 4, you'll see the results, the results are very strong in support of rough consensus for this working group agreement. You can see three of the items that were - everyone agreed and out of 24 people there was one person that said "no" on technical contacts; three that said "no" on registrant contacts and then one on expiry date. You can see the percentages - the lowest percentage is 87.5%.

If you scroll down now to the comments on Page 5 we'll start with those and respond to those. And certainly those that submitted the comments, feel free to jump in on the discussion. I want to, first of all, respond to Vicky's question in particular - understanding why postal address is excluded. And let me clarify and of course Jim Galvin, I don't know if Jim's on today, it doesn't look like he's on right now, is the one that proposed the wording the way he did.

So let me clarify, Vicky, that postal address isn't excluded as a collected item, what I believe Jim intended, and what we polled on was the fact that the technical contact that he is talking about there or the contact that he's talking about there should not be the physical address because in the case of technical issue resolution, a physical address would be a very inefficient way to deal with technical issues.

So the intent of wording it the way it was that the technical - excuse me - the postal address was excluded as the contact - the technical contact that was required for the purpose of technical resolution. It does not at all exclude postal address from being collected for other purposes. I hope that's clear, but if it's not, Vicky, please let us know.

And I'm just pausing a second to see Vicky's response in the chat. Go ahead Greg Shatan, you can speak.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: And by the way, Greg, we're going to get to your comment so you can talk now or you can hang on a few minutes and we'll get to it.

Greg Shatan: Yes, I'm commenting on this comment or this exchange. It's Greg Shatan for the record. I think the question, and I'll look at it as a question, is whether knowing where the person or entity is physically located is completely irrelevant to solving the technical issue. The issue is not necessarily whether you're going to send them something by mail, so it's not purely an issue of contactability, it's a question of relevance.

I'm not somebody who solves technical issues for a living, and if somebody tells me that it's never, ever relevant to know where the location is, as long as you have contact information and the other information we're told is relevant, then maybe I feel more comfortable with this. But my impression is that knowing whether you're dealing with somebody in China versus Tennessee versus the Netherlands could be relevant in a number of ways. So I think we at least need to have that as an open question. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. And I'll - anyone that wants to respond, and I'll call on Maxim next, but I certainly welcome input from those who are more technical than Greg and I on this. Notice Andrew's post in the chat, "The location of the contact is not the location of the servers." And that's a valid point. And on a

logistical issue, David, people's voices are pitch-sisted. Okay. Don't know what's going on there, David, I assume that's an Adobe or telephone issue, not sure what's there.

Notice Marika's comment, before I go to Maxim, that for the purpose of collection, the focus has been on what's absolutely necessary for the purpose, not what is nice to have, which is probably more relevant for the access question. I think that's an important point, lots of good chat going on. So maybe, David, my voice is sounding more bass because I'm still battling a little bit of a bug, don't know.

The - you're correct, Greg Shatan, that if we don't collect it you can't access it. We're not saying that we won't collect it, okay, we're just not - we're just saying here that it's not essential to collect it for this particular purpose but your point is well taken so I'm open to discussion there. And I put Maxim off long enough so let me let Maxim jump in.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. I had my share of experience as an engineer, as technical director of an ISP, I worked in hosting company, and I can say that the issue is that the postal address we collect is intended to be the means of communication. So we can have postal boxes, PO boxes, which actually addresses of the postal offices and have nothing to do with servers or most probably will not be allowed to install any kind of equipment there.

Home addresses and offices, in case of companies it could be one of the officers and it doesn't mean they do not install equipment somewhere else. We have technologies which can use multiple instances of DNS servers. For example, one installed in Australia, another in - somewhere in Africa and somewhere in Luxembourg. Yes, the same name of the DNS server.

So if it's intended to be the method of postal way of communication I'd say then we should leave it as is. And for technical reasons, it's usually it doesn't help. If the method to contact either human as a physical person or an

organization, and even for IP addresses, which are covered by other things like rights and others, usually a physical location is unknown sometime, sometimes even to owners of a domain. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Maxim. Lots of good discussion in the chat. I won't repeat it, you can take a look at it. Greg Shatan, I do have a question for you, you still are questioning whether it is necessary sometimes, do you - can you give us an illustration where it might be necessary?

Greg Shatan: Oh this is Greg Shatan for the record. I have to speak somewhat hypothetically but, you know, one thing is that physical location or address, which may not be the same thing, there may be a PO box, but that can help to more uniquely identify who you're dealing with perhaps although email addresses are unique, but you don't necessarily know who or where the person is that you're dealing with. It's kind of another point of information in terms of trying to ascertain facts around the problem.

I think it's probably unlikely to be used as the primary method of contact on a technical issue, but addresses don't only serve as a contact, they also serve as a piece of identifying information. So I just don't know whether it's ever useful to know kind of - to know you're dealing with and to identify them that way if the other information is entirely sufficient all the time, you know, so I'm really asking I can't think of an issue where it could be completely helpful.

But on the other hand I don't have the fund of information - I can't tell you the different reasons that a gas pipeline explodes either, also not part of my knowledge base, but so I'm kind of looking for information, anything I would put together would be kind of speculative and probably, you know, not entirely correct, so I'm looking to those for whom this is an issue. And if they say I don't care, I never look at it, never has it come in handy, I've solved thousands of technical problems, resolution and otherwise and it's never been useful to have - to know the address of the person to know what country

they might be in, all I need is this, that's fine. I'm - in this case I'm looking to be educated. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. And most the chat seems to say that the - that it's not necessary. Again, I want to call attention to Lisa - or again, I haven't done it yet, but let me call attention to Lisa's post, working group agreement 20A, requires the registrant country to be included in the RDS for every domain name registration. So if it's a matter of geographical location and particular country we've already got that covered. So I think that the chat is - there's pretty good consensus in the chat, somebody can correct me if you think I'm assessing it incorrectly, that the postal address is not essential for technical resolution. So rather than continue to spend time on it there's been a lot of good chat on that.

Maxim, is that a new hand?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Yes, it's - Chuck, it's new hand. I forgot to mention one important thing, most infrastructure - I mean, if company has more than one server usually reflected in sub level domains. And here we're talking about the second level so it's from technical perspective from the investigation of technical failure of, yes, loss of connectivity, it's irrelevant because all the information is (unintelligible) and like maybe lower level DNS. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Maxim. And let's move on then to Greg Shatan and Greg Aaron's comments, comments 2 and 5, and let me point out that I'm pretty sure we will come back to whether or not there is a legitimate - a purpose that requires the postal address be collected. So don't think that we've ended the discussion on that so I'm pretty sure we'll get back to it when we look at other purposes.

So on comments 2 and 5, our two Gregs, Greg Aaron and Greg Shatan have differing points of view. And somewhat related to the discussion on Vicky's

comment in the sense whether registrant contact is needed regardless of whether or not there's a technical contact. I'll certainly give either Greg a chance to explain their position if they would like, just raise your hand and I'll be glad to let you speak. So let's start with Greg Aaron.

Greg Aaron: Thank you, Chuck. This is Greg Aaron. I think a couple of meetings ago I had explained that one of our issues is that we can't force people to put the right data in the right places. A lot of issues that need to be solved do require the right person who's responsible for the domain to make that fix. For example, if there's a problem with the hosting, it's been broken into or something, the hosting providers needs to fix that. But a lot of times the hosting provider does not want to hear from - unnecessarily an unknown third party; they want to check with or hear from the person who's responsible for the domain.

                And then a lot of cases that person is the registrant. And in a lot of cases tech contacts may or may not have the requisite authority to deal with issues. And this is true not only in a technical realm but also in the legal realm. So we'll face this same issue when we talk about displaying contacts or various legal purposes.

                When Maxim says, well, you know, the hosting may be in various places or it may to be in the same spot that's listed, well, we can't solve that problem; we cannot force domain contacts to put in the exact right information and maintain it perfectly all the time. We need to be able to reach people who can solve the problems. And in a lot of cases that's going to be a registrant and I would prefer to be able to reach out to them and a technical contact. In a lot of case only the registrant may have the authority to fix things. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Greg, I'm going to follow up - this is Chuck - just so you probably have dealt with quite a few technical issues. Have you ever had to resort to contacting the registrant in any of those instances?

Greg Aaron: Many times.

Chuck Gomes: Many times. Okay, that's good. I think that's helpful. And that's kind of what Greg Shatan was looking for in our previous discussion too. Greg Shatan, it's your turn. And I think I kind of misstated saying that the two Gregs took different positions which isn't correct, as you can see. But Greg Shatan, your turn.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. Consistent with that clarification, my reasoning overlaps strongly with what Greg Aaron just stated. I would only add that technical contact, in my experience, can represent a variety of different technical vectors, and there's usually only one - I think there is only one technical contact so I've seen the technical contact be an IT or sys admin person, I've seen the technical contact be the registrar, I've seen the technical contact, you know, be perhaps a hosting provider, others I've seen technical contact just you can't even tell who they are. It's not necessarily - the technical issue may not be the issue that that particular technical contact deals with.

And on the - and the ultimate responsibility does come back to the registrant to sort out whether and how and who would do something, so it's all very nice and well if the technical contact works for resolving the technical issue but if it doesn't for whatever reason, you can't just be stuck there. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. Okay, well the - because these are tentative conclusions, we can still come back and revisit this if we want going forward. The poll results were pretty strong but let's keep in mind this discussion as we move forward. It may be resolved by other events and other decisions we make but rather than redoing the poll on this particular issue my suggestion is that we go ahead and move forward and keep this in mind and even in our notes observe what has been pointed out with regard - by both Gregs in this regard.

Greg Shatan: Chuck, this is Greg Shatan again. If I could just briefly respond…

Chuck Gomes: Oh sure, go ahead, Greg.

Greg Shatan: …the poll did not ask us whether "and" versus "or" was the question. It presupposed an "or" for registrant contact and only if the technical contact was empty. So we were not asked whether it was an "and" versus "or" so that's why both Greg and I had to put our comments in the comment field because there was no right - there was no choice that reflected this point of view so there as kind of a forced choice so I would not use this poll as any indicator that people thought "or" was right because there was no ability for them to vote differently unless they either answered "no" to that box, which would have been silly, or they put something in the write-in candidate box, which, you know, usually doesn't get a lot of write-ins.

So I don't think we can come to any conclusion from this poll that - or, as between the technical and the registrant contact is even the result of the poll much less correct. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: I think that's a valid point so we will make sure we don't conclude more than what the poll asked. All right, let's go on then, let's go down to Kal's comment - Kal Feher - there. Is Kal on? I don't - oh he is, good. All right, I thought I saw him. Didn't I - good. Kal, would you - I'd like you, if you would, to explain your comment. We spent quite bit of time talking about it, and we, you know, we thought on the leadership team that we understood your point but it would probably be helpful for everyone if you explained it for us.

Kal Feher: Thanks, Chuck. It's Kal Feher for the record. It was a comment I suppose mostly on the language or terminology that we used for those agreements, and I don't think I was the only person last week to encourage the focus on roles rather than our current labels, the labels that we use to define contacts today in Whois as it stands. And my point was that a contact given within the context of a technical resolution or differentiated access perhaps for technical resolution is effectively always going to be a technical contact.

And how you populate the details that you provide to someone within that context or within a - for a query within that context, that we could decide later and we might have a fall back mechanism where if someone doesn't provide a separate contact for each role then they effectively inherit that for the registrant contact. But presupposing those or aligning these agreements with the current labels might - it might hamstring us in the future when we come to talk about roles. So it might just be useful to be quite strict with the way we refer to our options so that we're describing roles or if we choose to describe labels then we make that very clear.

But to me these - the poll question was using the I guess the old labels that we know and love within Whois rather than the role-based context that might be more preferable to use in the future.

Chuck Gomes: So, Kal, this is Chuck. A quick question. Isn't, I mean, tech contact can be a role, can it not?

Kal Feher: Yes it can. But the way it was used in the poll I didn't interpret that especially given that we were talking about the registrant as well as the tech contact which suggested to me that we weren't actually talking about a contact given within the context of a technical resolution.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Okay, and so…

Kal Feher: …so if we were to look into the future perhaps…

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Kal Feher: …and have a differentiated access for people who would only ever want technical resolution, I could argue that any contact given within that context is always a technical contact. Now that might be - there might be more than one contact given but there are only provider to a consumer as a technical contact. And that's the role they're fulfilling in that moment. And maybe that's

being overly pedantic and probably not worth discussing at this point. I didn't expect to state too much about it.

Chuck Gomes: And what would - Marc Anderson asks a question in the chat there, and either Marc, or Kal, you can respond. So what would be the role-based nomenclature instead of the way it was worded in the question? Go ahead, Marc, if you want to answer that.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, it's Marc. I'll jump in. You know, you know, and Lisa's responded, party serving in technical contact role, party serving in technical contact role, I think is kind of - it's missing the point, it's the technical contact role, I think and, you know, this is something I've raised a number of times and expect I'll raise again, this is, you know, this is the EWG's role-based approach recommendation, so it's, you know, and Kal pointed out, you could actually, you know, people have said, you know, what if the technical contact isn't the right person or isn't accurate or, you know, there's many different types of technical contacts depending on the issue.

Right, having role-based contacts allows you to specify multiple technical, you know, contact points and assigning roles to those contact points. So I think, you know, Kal's point is just, you know, as we get down the road in this and start dealing with the nuts and bolts of putting together a future solution, you know, I think the role-based nomenclature would serve us well. I agree with Kal's point and, you know, to Lisa's question, would just be tech contact role, that's what I'd use.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you. Greg Shatan.

Greg Shatan: Hi, Chuck. It's Greg for the record, Greg Shatan. I guess the issue of tech contact role versus person kind of maybe begs the question of whether, you know, are we just talking about the - whether an email address that identifies a human person or are we talking about perhaps multiple technical roles and we're not really talking about whether there's kind of a personally identifiable

information, you know, thinking about Volker's reminder that we should never forget about the GDPR, not sure I completely agree with that but, you know, it is a fact of life.

But so I guess maybe we need to distinguish whether we're talking about roles-based - a collection of roles-based fields or are we just talking about the issue of identify - how you identify a person whether you identify them by their role or by their kind of personal name. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Greg. All right, is that an old hand, Marc?

Marc Anderson: New hand.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Marc Anderson: Can I jump in real quick?

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Marc Anderson: Just I think the quick answer is it could be both. It could be you provide a call center for example, you say, you know, call you know, call this, you know, call this, you know, call this, you know, this technical support hotline if you have a technical issue or, you know, it could be you have an individual person that you're identifying for particular roles. So the short answer is either, both.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you. All right, going to Mike Hammer's comment, and unfortunately I don't think Mike's on the call. He's not showing up in Adobe anyway. Want to point out - he suggested that update the date and created date should be included as well for this particular purpose. I just want to point out that those two elements are part of the minimum public data set that we already agreed on now. Is it worthwhile spending more time on this now? We thought maybe not, that, you know, it is in the minimum public data set. We've already reached a rough consensus agreement on that so unless

somebody wants to discuss that further I was going to give Mike a chance to comment but he's not on the call. So if there are no comments.

All right, so we did want to spend some time on the comments because they were all good comments and useful and as several have pointed out, we should keep some of these things in mind as we move forward including the comments on the role and focusing on that instead of maybe just a person which some may still think of that as. So let's keep that in mind as we move forward.

If there are no other comments on the comments, let's go ahead and move to the deliberation on domain name management, which is another one of the nine purposes that the drafting teams focused on. Okay.

If you look at Slide 6, it goes over the building block approach that we're taking for each of these and the first step is to agree whether the specific purpose should be considered legitimate for collecting some registration data and why, okay, so that'll be the first thing we'll look at with regard to domain name management.

Keep - for those that don't recall, by the way, this purpose was previously called domain name control and after the work of the team and working group feedback we changed that to domain name management. Okay, and so the first step really is to decide whether that purpose, domain name management, is legitimate for collecting some registration data before getting into the specifics.

And then once we do that, going on and identifying data elements that are specifically required for that and you can read the sub bullets A and B there yourself. And keep in mind that we're going to defer discussion on collection conditions or access controls which might be applied to each data element. We'll have to get there eventually but we're deferring that for now.

Okay, let's then jump into domain name management. And what I'd like to do, if you'd look at Slide 7, and maybe Slide 8 is - or 8 and 9 as well but let's start with Slide 7. And I'm going to turn it over to Susan to just give a quick review of this particular purpose. And before I do, Kal, do you have a question before we start into domain name management?

Kal Feher: Yes I do, Chuck. And Kal Feher for the record. I just wanted to - and pardon my memory, perhaps we've already discussed this, but I wanted to ask about the use of the word "legitimate" for collecting - or really particular for collecting some registration data. And the reason I ask that is that in - I was in one of the groups that analyzed the use of RDDS for proving domain name control for certificates. And we concluded that it was certainly useful but not strictly required. So I'm wondering how "legitimate" is used in this context, whether it means that this information is strictly required for this purpose or that it can be used for this purpose but if it's not available it's also fine.

Chuck Gomes: Good question, Kal. And I certainly welcome anybody to respond to that that would like. And so we will - and Lisa has her hand up and Lisa, we will also before we move onto Susan, record action on the recorded poll statement as a working group agreement, so let me take care of that right now, the one thing I forgot to do. So we're going to declare the statement that was polled as a rough consensus agreement. Okay, and that doesn't mean that, like I said previously, that we can't come back and revisit that and in particular take advantage of some of the input that was received in the comments and on today's discussion. But let's go to Lisa in response to Kal's question.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. Just making sure I'm off of mute. Kal, to answer your question, the approach that we're taking is sort of a two-pass approach where first we agree that the purpose itself is legitimate for collecting some data, not being specific about what that data is. Should we agree that the purpose is legitimate for some data, then our second pass is to look at the data that's absolutely required for that purpose. I hope that answers your question.

Chuck Gomes: And I think that - this is Chuck - I think that this, you know, legitimate is a decision we're making as a working group, in other words, and I think really we're going to make a distinction between - and we did in the last discussion - between required and useful. So I don't think, and anyone can correct me on this if I have this wrong, I don't think that we're going to suggest collection of any data that isn't specifically required for the purpose. In other words, we wouldn't collect something just because it's useful.

But if I'm wrong on that, I welcome correction on that. So I don't - Kal, okay with the responses there?

Kal Feher: Thank you, Chuck. I think that's a good enough response for now. I'll just note that our conclusion was that the RDS data was useful but not required but actually can let that play out…

Chuck Gomes: Yes, and I think that your team is not the only team that may end up with that kind of a result, okay, so that's a possibility that the working group will come to that kind of conclusion on other purposes. So that's okay, and we're going to have to make that distinction and deal with that. So Greg Shatan, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. It's Greg Shatan for the record. Hopefully not dragging us any further into the weeds, but just a concern about the concept of (unintelligible) whether if something is sometimes required I believe it should be considered required in the sense that, you know, there may be issues where you can get away without it and there may be other times when you can't get away without it. But if we make it - if we raise the bar too high on requirements, you know, we know that carbon is required for life on earth, I think, or oxygen, at least is required for human life on earth, you know, there's 100% failure rate in not having oxygen; but there are many other things that are often required. Is clothing required? Is shelter really required? Food, yes, I think that's required.

I don't know how far down we want to get, you know, to the point where we're basically just sitting in our underway o maybe sitting naked, you know, eating subsistence rations and that's our definition of required. I just can see that there could be some mischief around it. So I would say if that is something is never required then it's not required but if something sometimes is required in order to succeed then it's required. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: No argument from me, Greg. This is Chuck. I think your logic is right on there, so if something is required sometimes - we're not going to put too high a standard on that, but again, let's just take what you said, I think, unless somebody wants to disagree with that, I think it's correct.

All right, Susan, go ahead and give us a quick review of domain name management purpose.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks, Chuck. This is Susan Kawaguchi for the record. And the Drafting Team 2 reviewed this and thought about it and so domain name management, the definition is "Information collected to create a new domain name registration and ensuring that the domain registration records are under the control of the authorized party and that no unauthorized changes, transfers are made in the record."

So the tasks included create registrant ID, create domain name, understand DNS data for domain name, monitor domain name registration records for changes and correlate with activities, manage set of domain names, keep them under the same administrative control, transfer a domain name registration from one registrar to another or from one - from registrant to a new registrant, check registration database for status, existence of name when DNS does not work, check contact information for ICANN policy compliance.

And the users, these would include the registrant, the gaining and the losing registrar, registry, ISP and other operational contacts, domain name

operational contacts, potential other users are UDRP, URS, WIPO, ICANN, court proceedings and enforcement actions, reseller and registrant affiliates, new or gaining registrant, anyone attempting to interact with a domain name for legal action, ICANN staff, local law enforcement, GAC Public Safety Working Group and all of the data elements pretty much any of the data elements in the Whois record.

You know, one of my - my experience in domain name management it was crucial - the Whois record, the public availability of that record to double check and verify when, you know, the accurate status of the domain name oftentimes when things would go wrong that's where I would catch it first and that's where it wasn't in my registrar account necessarily because somebody had hacked in or done something unlawful. And so it didn't - it oftentimes did not show up anywhere else in the beginning, you know, at the very start except in the Whois record so that was one of the use cases we were thinking about but there's obviously a domain - creation of a new domain name requires all of the data elements too.

So, Chuck, that's all I have.

Chuck Gomes: So is - and focusing on Slide 7 through 10, does anybody have any questions or any clarifications needed? Now we discussed this purpose a few weeks ago with the drafting team so I don't want to redo that, but if there's any clarifications, any questions, now would be a good time to ask them. Steve Metalitz, you're first.

Steve Metalitz: Oh yes, thank you. This is Steve Metalitz. One use that I thought would be included on your domain name management, but I don't see it specifically listed, is a company that wants to get an authoritative list of what domain names it or its employees control. And, you know, in other words they just want to identify what's in their portfolio. Does that come under Task 3 here or is that a separate task that ought to be listed? Or maybe that's covered by some other use case and if so I apologize for raising it now.

Chuck Gomes: Susan, you want to respond to that or anyone on the drafting team?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, I mean, I could imagine it being under 3, to manage a set of domain names so that way you can verify what you own and that you still own it, which is sometimes a problem. And you know, so management takes - is very broad term and managing a set of domain names is fairly broad. But I would think that it is encompassed there.

Chuck Gomes: Susan, this is Chuck. Is it fair to say that the drafting team wasn't trying to be all inclusive in its lists of tasks and users and so forth, it - I would think that it's quite reasonable to expect that that was not the intent but to give enough examples for understanding, is that right?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, definitely.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thanks Steve, for asking that. Any other clarifying questions? Okay, then let's go down to Slide 11 and the question is asked, "Is domain name management a legitimate purpose?" and you can see on the slide the criteria that we've been using and there may be other criteria that you want to apply, and I think that's okay if we as a working group agree to that.

So what makes a purpose legitimate? And you can see we've gone over these before, does it support ICANN's mission? Is it specific, etcetera, and in this particular case we're going to I mean, does domain name management satisfy these criteria effectively? What do you think? Let's just open it up for discussion. How would you answer that question? Is it a legitimate purpose for collecting some data, again, our next step will be to look at specific data elements like we did with technical issue resolution but does anybody think that it's not a legitimate purpose for collecting some data in the RDS?

Marc, go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. The silence is killing me so I'll jump in. So I'm looking at the set of questions and, you know, and sort of glaring at my screen because, you know, I feel like this is a legitimate purpose but I'm having trouble explaining why I think it's legitimate, so I think maybe we need to spend a little bit more - a little bit of time drilling down into explaining why it's legitimate, you know, just sort of, you know, my gut tells me it is legitimate and, you know, I like the presentation that Susan gave, but, you know, looking at these questions you know, recalling the criteria, you know, it doesn't, you know, it's not - not obvious how it fits into some of these. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: So, Marc, just to put you on the spot, so do you think it supports ICANN's mission?

Marc Anderson: Not having the mission in front of me…

((Crosstalk))

Marc Anderson: …I'm not sure I want to answer that one.

Chuck Gomes: If you go down on the slides at the end - near the end or at the end is ICANN's mission so feel free to do that since you have control there, but go ahead.

Marc Anderson: I'll just defer answering for now I think.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Is it specific enough? If not, where should it be more specific? And we can go one by one, any comments you have - are any of those not - which of those criteria is it not clear that this particular purpose fits? Kal, go ahead.

Kal Feher: I think my problem with this purpose - sorry, this is Kal Feher for the record. My concern with this purpose and the fields or the data elements we've

identified is that it seems to be a - perhaps a (unintelligible) one to prove ownership and second to prove either management or some kind of control. And I think within different contexts that they individually are legitimate reasons to gather data and present it to people, but combined I think can think of a lot of reasons why data elements would not be reused in both contexts. For example, for domain name control, there's not much point in having a postal address unless that's how you were trying to prove that a person was managing a domain name via…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: So, Kal, you're jumping ahead a little bit, okay? I think you've answered…

((Crosstalk))

Kal Feher: I'm sorry, perhaps I misunderstood. I thought at the start of these - this presentation we called this domain name management and control. Is that incorrect? Did I mis-hear?

Chuck Gomes: Well, no we're calling it domain name management which includes control.

Kal Feher: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Okay? So - but where you're jumping ahead is you're getting into specific data elements. We're going to go there and hopefully on this call if we have time. Okay, all we're asking - and I thought I heard you answer the question that domain name management, as defined here, including control, is a legitimate purpose for collecting some data.

Now, once we agree on that, assuming we do, we will get down to the specific data elements such as postal address.

Kal Feher: Right, sorry I was just using that for illustrative purposes. My main concern was that we've combined management or control with ownership, and I do feel that they need to be discussed separately.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I don't know that that's a problem. When we go through - does anybody see that as a problem, to look at - and so you're separating it into what, domain name registration and domain name control?

Kal Feher: Yes, and I just see Andrew's comment there. I'm thinking more in terms of when we - and again, at risk of giving exact examples, when you're talking about a transfer of a domain name, it's very clear that only the person who owns the domain name should be authorizing that. When you're talking about control of a domain name, (unintelligible) control of the domain name is regularly delegated to possibly someone within your own organization and often to a separate organization that may carry out activities, legitimate activities on your behalf.

So there are clear scenarios where control and ownership or, if you want to use a different term for possessing or having the commercial ownership or management of a domain name versus the technical management of a domain name, we could come up with that. But it is still worth, in my mind, separating the two.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you. Andrew, go ahead.

Andrew Sullivan: Hi, this is Andrew Sullivan. Thanks. So I think the distinction that we're talking about here is the reason we have different kinds of contacts. And so they're all different kinds of control, each kind of control relevant to a domain name is instantiated in a different sort of - in a different sort of contact. So for instance, the delegation of day to day control over a domain is really the technical control over the operations at that domain name. But that doesn't - you don't delegate to really anyone in the organization the legal control, the registration control over the name; on the contrary, that is a registration

typically by role or something like that because you don't want the registration to be controlled by somebody who might leave or go to work for your competitor or whatever.

So - and in fact, why people get into trouble with that if they're not careful about the registrant of a domain name as opposed to say, the technical contact or the administrative contact or whatever. So I don't actually think these are different things, but they're different dimensions of control and those different dimensions of control accordingly have different kinds of contact data associated with them. And that's the reason that you have to collect those different kinds of contacts. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Andrew. Anybody else want to respond to Kal's concern? Okay, so let me go back to the question at the top of Slide 11, "Is domain name management a legitimate purpose?" And if you want to - if you want me to ask the question domain name registration a legitimate purpose, and is domain name control a legitimate purpose, we can do that. Anybody - is there anybody on the call who thinks that either one of those is not a legitimate purpose for collecting some data?

Okay. I'm not seeing anyone so can I - can we pose a - and this is a possible poll question, okay, that we'll follow up this call with, that domain name management is a legitimate purpose. Now, how many of you think we ought to break that into two questions, "Is domain name registration a legitimate purpose?" And then separately, "Is domain name control a legitimate purpose?" If you think that, would you put a green check in the Adobe please? If you don't think that, you're welcome to put a red X. So there are a few people and Kal obviously.

Is anybody - okay, Greg Shatan doesn't think it's necessary. A lot of people - I assume the lack of response probably means you don't care one way or the other. If I'm making a false conclusion there let me know. So the question again, is, should we separate this question in a poll - in a follow up poll to this

meeting into two - instead of one question, "Is domain name management a legitimate purpose?" Should we separate it into, "Is domain name registration a legitimate purpose?" And secondly, "Is domain name control a legitimate purpose?" and I'm getting a mix of responses. Marc, go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Trying to interpret what Kal said, I'm not sure you're getting the question exactly right. And, you know, I think Greg brought up the use case that, you know, you can have, you know, you can have an ownership, you know, a company purchases a domain name and somebody at that company may be responsible for managing that and you don't want a situation where that person leaves and takes the company's domain names with them. And I think that's sort of the use case that Kal is sort of hitting at.

And so, you know, I agree with, you know, Greg's point, you know, there you know, I think they're both aspects of the same question, or the same topic, but, you know, I think Kal brings up a really good point that we want to make sure it doesn't get lost as we're looking at this purpose because I think it's important to, you know, to make sure there's the ability to separate out ownership and control.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Marc. Susan, your turn.

Susan Kawaguchi: Susan Kawaguchi for the record. So in my opinion, if you are managing a domain name then - and - for the registrant and you are, you know, and my experience obviously is for corporate registration, is that then you make all of those choices who the registrant is going to be when you first register it, who would be the admin contact, and the technical contact.

Now for the most part, in my experience, is you only - you always use a roll account and it was very, you know, and we also had, you know, distinctive rules around what entities owned the domain name so that was pretty clear. And then occasionally due to, you know, working with a vendor or partnering

with someone then, you know, the domain management would make a
decision on who the technical contact would be.

For the most part all three of those roles were the same contact information.
But in cases - some cases, you know, a third party might actually have
technical control over the domain name and that is something that was
thought about, made a decision about and allowed. So to me domain
management is a large umbrella and it definitely covers domain name control
and it - the domain manager has all that decision making power, and to, you
know, allow different contacts and to change those contacts if the
relationship, you know, changes.

So I don't see a need to separate this but I'm not sure it would be harmful to
separate it either.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Susan. This is Chuck. And like Lisa points out in the chat, we would
have to come up with two new definitions which we're not going to take the
time to do if we do that. It seems to me that it's very important to separate the
two as we move into more detail and look at users and data elements. I don't
were any particular advantage of separating them for this question. If
somebody can help me see the advantage I would appreciate that.

For now, let's clear the Xs and the checkmarks in the chat so we know what
they're applying to going forward. And Kal, go ahead.

Kal Feher: Chuck, I think David was first.

Chuck Gomes: Well I called on you, go ahead. I saw - your hand came up first on my screen
so go ahead and then we'll get to David.

Kal Feher: Okay. Thank you. Kal Feher for the record. Trying to address the concern of
splitting the question, my concern is that later we will have - we will be
discussing the data elements associated with these purposes and they will

have - we will have very different reasons for collecting those data elements, aggregating them into one umbrella purpose I think will make it very hard to have a nuanced discussion about those data elements.

So to my mind both purposes are actually legitimate so that's the only thing we were going to ask people then perhaps we can skip separating the - separating it out. But I think what happens next and if that requires us to combine the discussion of data elements into one single conversation I would be concerned.

Chuck Gomes: And agree, Kal, this is Chuck. The - I'm fully on board with you. When we get beyond this question we're going to have to look at both areas distinctly and it'll probably - it may involve different users, it may involve different access and so forth. So totally agree with you. Let me go to David and then we can go back to Lisa if she still wants to speak. David, go ahead.

David Cake: Hi, David Cake speaking. So all I just really wanted to say is that - I'm supportive of what Kal is saying and so I realize in the - what Lisa - Susan said about, you know, how these things work in a space is a very accurate description about in the sort of small enterprise sector, for example, it's not at all uncommon to have people who definitely know that they can own their domain name and are very clear about it but literally have no idea who is in effective control of it and they, you know, it may be anyone of three vendors that - or more vendors that they got to do various things or is performing various technical services for them.

But really there is quite a distinct difference between control and ownership and as Kal was saying, the different data elements and the way in which we use them and whether or not they - you know, whether or not they're acquired - differs significantly between the sort of cases of ownership and control. And I agree that we should, you know, it's probably best to separate that discussion at a relatively early point so that it doesn't become confusing later on. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, David. This is Chuck. Lisa, did you want to add anymore?

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. The only point I wanted to make was that I think that's probably what's important is when we get to the data discussion that we note whether each item that is considered required is required for registration, for control or for both and then based on that we might take a different decision about splitting out the purpose.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, that makes sense to me. If everybody look back at Slide 7, the drafting team came up with a definition for domain name management so that we're consistent and clear. I suggest that we poll on the question, "Is domain name management a legitimate purpose?" that's on the later slide based on this definition.

I am fully on board with everything many of you said, that when we dig down further on this it will be critical that we distinguish, so I have no argument at all with that but so that we don't have to take time out and come up with new definitions for two sub purposes of this, I think we should ask the question using this definition and hopefully - and what I've heard on this call, that there is - there have been no objections - nobody saying no, this domain name management, as we've defined it, is not a legitimate purpose.

So I think there's agreement on this - with those on this call at it is a legitimate purpose. Next week, I doubt if we're going to get much done today, we might have a little time, we're going to have to dig down, and again, let me repeat once more, I agree that we're going to have look at these different things because they will involve different users, they will involve different criteria, and if we go to gated access, different, you know, different forms of access. So point's well taken, if there are no strong objections, let's just do the poll question using the existing definition and existing term, "domain name management."

At least everyone on this call, I hope, understands the important points that have been made by Kal and others on the different uses. Now, David, is that a new hand?

Okay well that then takes us to Slide 12 on what data elements or - and again, these could be - some of these could be roles - some not, these are actually data elements here, are necessary for this purpose? And let's just talk about that. I've seen some talk in the chat. The - let's - what do you think, I mean, in term - I think I saw a chat earlier that all the data elements are needed for this purpose. And that's a possible conclusion that we could come to.

But let's just open it up for some general discussion. We're not going to get through this part today because we only have a little over 15 minutes left. But we could at least get people thinking and sharing some initial thoughts about what data elements are necessary to collect, not to give access yet, and not who gets access, but to collect for this purpose. Who would like to start that discussion? Marc.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. It's Marc Anderson for the record. And I note that this list on Page 13 shows, you know, all the current Whois records except - or output except registrar abuse contact email and phone and the URL of the ICANN Whois inaccuracy complaint form, so it's basically all the forms in the existing Whois. And I don't think the you know, I don't know to the extent that this discussion group really looked beyond the existing fields, so maybe that's my first question is, you know, did you consider you know, fields outside of the Whois that we know today?

You know, is there any consideration to what, you know, what would be, you know, starting with a blank slate, what would be the fields that you would want to have in order to fulfill this purpose? So I guess I'm asking a question back to the review team that looked at this, did you just consider existing

fields or was there any consideration for sort of a blank slate approach to what fields would be ideal for meeting this purpose?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. Susan, or someone else from the working group, would you like to respond?

Susan Kawaguchi: Sure, this is Susan Kawaguchi for the record. But, Maxim is also on the call and he might - or others that were on the team. I think we did. We went through the data elements and decided that, you know, especially in some circumstances that there was a reason for all of the existing data elements but didn't come up with anything else except maybe splitting out, you know, the purpose-based contacts, some of those responsibilities that are encompassed by the current roles.

So like legal contact or - I'm sort of blanking on anything else right now. But so we did consider that but I'm not sure we gave it a tremendous amount of thought.

Chuck Gomes: And this is Chuck. Let's keep in mind, like has been said in previous calls, we're not restricted to what exists today. It makes a convenient starting point but if that distracts people we can use a different approach. So don't be - don't feel restricted by what you see on Slides 12 and 13. So now is there - let me go back to the chat a second. Was there a question I missed in the chat that we should deal with? Marc, did you have a question in the chat that didn't get answered? Or is that what you just brought up? Go ahead, Marc.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. Marc again. You know, I guess, you know, again I don't really want to hold us up unnecessarily you know, but back on - on Slide 11, you know, there's, you know, "Is domain name management a legitimate purpose?" You know, and the criteria what makes a purpose legitimate, you know, I want to reiterate, you know, I don't feel that domain name management is not a legitimate purpose, I feel that it is a legitimate purpose, but if somebody asks me to the question, "Why is domain name management

a legitimate purpose?" I don't feel real comfortable with my ability to answer that question.

And I guess what I'm hoping we could get to as a group is to provide a better, you know, or provide me a definition that I could use if somebody puts me on the spot, you know, to sort of help justify why we're saying domain name management is a legitimate purpose. So again, I'm not, you know, I'm not arguing against it by any means, I just - I just feel like we've sort of, you know, just all agree that it's legitimate and haven't really defined why we think it's legitimate.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, Marc. Andrew, go ahead.

Andrew Sullivan: Hi, this is Andrew Sullivan. So I'll take a stab at that. This is the registration - this is the access method to the registration database. And the registration database literally only exists for domain name management; that's its whole point. Out - without this question of who has the registration and how - and where are they running the technical services of that, you wouldn't have any need for a registry. So if this isn't a legitimate purpose, then it's not clear to me that there is any legitimacy to having a registration database at all.

And so you know, I think it reduces to that simple matter of the fact that you have this registration database precisely because you've got a distributed operation and the distributed operation requires a place in which people can register the nature of their control over the subordinate domain name space, that's what it's for. So that's the reason this is a legitimate operation, if you don't have this kind of - if you don't have this kind of management, you don't get a large distributed database of the sort that the domain name system is. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Andrew. Greg, you're next.

Greg Aaron: This is Greg Aaron. Seconding what Andrew said, this is also explained pretty well in the EWG report. Now Lisa Phifer just posted a definition in the chat room, but a huge hole in it. What it says is, "Creating a domain and then ensuring that no unauthorized parties change it." So what's missing here is the ability of the authorized party to maintain and manage the domain name which includes making changes to it, keeping the contacts correct, changing name servers and so forth. So this definition is lacking something really important right now.

Chuck Gomes: And make - Greg, which definition are you referring to? Is it on one of the slides?

Greg Aaron: Lisa - I said Lisa posted it in chat.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, let me scroll down. I see I'm up too far in the chat. Okay, so…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …information collected to create a new domain name registration ensuring that the domain registration records under the control of the authorized party and that no authorized changes, transfers are made in the record. That's the definition you're referring to, Greg?

Greg Aaron: Yes, and it's that "no unauthorized changes, transfers made to the record." So again, what's missing here is the ability of the registrant to manage its domain name, to make any changes to it once it's been registered.

Chuck Gomes: Oh I - okay good. Is everybody following? I wasn't, as you could tell, so the - so that's interesting. Discussion on that, any disagreement with Greg on that? Kal?

Kal Feher: I think this comes to the heart of why I'm struggling with this particular very broad purpose because the definition contained there describes what I think

we referred to as (unintelligible) control of the domain name where you can prove that you are the owner of the domain name and manage it in a way sort of transfer it, for example. And those are - and I think there's very clear reasons for certain data elements for that.

But there's other reasons like lifecycle reasons. You might be emailed by someone - or the registrar typically regarding your - the expiry of your domain name, and today that still goes to the registrant's email address, although it could go to a privately registered communications channel as well.

But then separately we've got data elements here that include things like domain statuses and name servers. And they really have no connection at all to the legal control of a domain name which is why I think having this very broad purpose is going to make discussing these elements very challenging because we're each individual nuanced purpose is going to inherit quite a lot of unnecessary data elements.

Chuck Gomes: So, Kal, thanks. I'm going to - please take a look at the last alternative that Lisa put in the chat to see if that helps solve the problem. And again, let me say there's no reason why we can't take these pieces apart when we get down to more specific deliberation. So - in fact we'll probably have to as you have pointed out several times. But my question to you is looking at that alternative - the last alternative that Lisa put in the chat, does that help and does that deal with - and, Greg Aaron, I'd like you to comment as well, as to whether changing that definition as suggested there helps deal with the concerns that are being expressed.

So I don't know who wants to respond first. Greg, let's start with you since you first raised it at least in this specific sense. Greg Aaron.

Greg Aaron: It's working a lot - hi, it's Greg Aaron. It's working a lot better. I could probably find even better language in the EWG report but this is a start.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thank you. And Kal.

Kal Feher: So long as the - there is a deliberate choice to exclude technical control or technical management, because everything that's described in there is more a legal or commercial management. So if that is a deliberate choice then I agree with it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Alex. I see the hand went down. You're still welcome to jump in, Alex, if you'd like. Okay. Not hearing you, I guess you're okay. Okay, Greg Aaron, help us fix it. And one of the things we try to avoid is doing a lot of work…

Greg Aaron: Chuck, I'm not going to try to do that here…

((Crosstalk))

Greg Aaron: …here at the end of the call but, yes, I'm not going to try to do that here at the end of the call. Like I said, we should probably go back and look at the EWG report, there's probably been some good work done on this.

Chuck Gomes: So, one of the problems we deal with in making progress in this working group is we can end up like we are right now on just about everything we do, which means it takes three or four weeks just to make a little bit of progress, and that means this working group will last 10-15 years. How do we manage this in such a way that we can deal with the critical issues, and I'm not minimizing the points that are being made, without dragging it out for 10-15 years?

                 My suggestion would be that we use the alternative definition since that's all we have right now, and do a poll to find out whether indeed people believe this is a legitimate purpose so that we can move on understanding that we will fix the definition going forward. If we have to delay doing a poll and assessing agreement not only of those on the call but also those not on the

call, we're just pushing this thing out forever, and we will - most of us will be out of the ICANN environment before we ever reach any useful conclusions.

And again, I'm not minimizing the points being made, but somehow we have to be able to keep moving and fix things on the fly without having to have everything perfect before we can make any decisions. As long as we're perfectionists in everything that we do, with a group this size and this controversial, it will be impossible to move forward at a reasonable pace.

So my suggestion is that we do a poll on this based on the alternative definition with the stated understanding that we will fix the definition as needed, but we won't stop and defer the poll because that just pushes things out. And if we do that on everything, I've made clear what that means. Greg Aaron, go ahead.

Greg Aaron: Thank you, Chuck. This is Greg. Yes, you phrased two different problems. One is do we think this is a legitimate purpose? By all means, let's dispose of that question; it seems like an easy one I think, to answer. As far as wordsmithing, not enough (unintelligible) is taking place between the meetings, and what you see as people having to bring up oftentimes very legitimate important points during the calls this group is not putting stuff down on paper between meetings and taking care of that in the interstices.

So my suggestion is to work in some different way because sometimes this language is actually really important and we will have to get it done in some way or another at some point in time. And this is not the reason why this group is going to go on for 10 years by the way, this group has other problems.

Chuck Gomes: Well this would cause it to go on for 10-15 years so I'll disagree with you on that in addition to the other reasons. So okay, Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. Lisa Phifer for the record. I just wanted to - in response to Greg's observation, the drafting teams are actually are an attempt at trying to promote more work on actual production of texts in between our calls. And in this case Drafting Team 2 did actually start with a template that contains the EWG report definition. And they moved on from that definition and put forward the one that we see here so, you know, we've had this call but also a couple of calls where we reviewed the Drafting Team 2's definition to, you know, try to put forth some suggested additions or ask some clarifying questions.

I think what Chuck is saying is you know, we need to continue moving forward with the text that's put in front of us and if we have concerns about that text that comes from a drafting team we need to raise that early on. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa. Marc.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. I just - I agree strongly with what Greg said. You know, there's, you know, some of the wordsmithing is critically important. The problem is we're not doing any of that between meetings. You know, the chat between meetings seems to be monopolized by ideology discussions and not the work, you know, of the working group. And we need to find a way as a working group to figure out how to, you know, contribute and do some of this wordsmithing between meetings and focus on the larger issues during the meetings.

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

Lisa Phifer: Apologies, old.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So the leadership team will take these points - and they're good points, I don't want to minimize anything that anybody made, but I am, as you can tell, very concerned that we figure out ways to deal with these issues without

dragging every little issue out for several weeks. So the leadership team will take all this into consideration. We will do a poll on "Is domain name management a legitimate purpose?" And we'll try and figure out a way to couch that that doesn't step on anybody's toes and realizing that we will have to refine some details as we move forward.

That said, we are over time. We did make a little bit of progress. We have lots more to make. The - so please watch for the poll and respond to it, and it's important people on the call as well as those not on the call respond to the poll so that we can document the progress that we do make. I don't think there's - again, the leadership team will take a look should we include the EWG definition, the drafting team definition, we'll try and do that in such a way that - as good as possible without having to come back and revisit it with the whole group before doing the poll.

So that said, is there anything else we need to cover? Our meeting next week is at the same time next Tuesday, our regular time and note that Julie put that in the chat. And we will continue our discussion of domain name management next week including hopefully getting into data elements in particular. And hopefully even by the we will have a little bit of progress in the definition itself.

Anything else we need to cover? Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. I just wanted some clarity about which version of the statement we're going to poll on this week. Is it the one as produced by Drafting Team 2? Is it the alternative that includes enabling management of the domain name registration? Or both?

Chuck Gomes: It's a good question. I think that - let's work that offline as a leadership team and - rather than me trying to make a command decision right here because I probably would mess it up. So let's discuss on list on the leadership list - I guess my leaning is to include maybe multiple definitions but get an answer

to the question, whichever definition you pick which is domain name management a legitimate purpose, I keep hearing people say yes and I keep hearing people say that we're going to need to break that down further when we proceed, and I agree with that, but I would like to confirm that domain name management, however we end up defining it, is a legitimate purpose.

So, Lisa, let's work on that on the leadership list immediately after this call and try and come up with something. It probably won't - it won't be perfect, everyone, okay, so please don't look for perfection. We're not that good. So anyway, let's - if that's the end, let's go ahead and adjourn the meeting a few minutes late, and thanks, everyone. Let's keep plugging away. Meeting adjourned.

END