ICANN Transcription
GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group
Tuesday, 13 September 2016 at 1600 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GNSO Next-Gen
RDS PDP WG call on the Tuesday, 13 September 2016 at 16:00 UTC. 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. Attendance may be also found at:
https://community.icann.org/x/kRysAw
The audio is also available at:

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-nextgen-rds-13sep16-en.mp3

Coordinator: The recordings are connected. You may now proceed.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you, Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome
to the GNSO Next Gen RDS PDP Working Group call on the 13th of
September 2016 at 1600 UTC.

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

As a reminder if you can - to all participants to please state your name before
speaking for transcription purposes. Also, please keep your phones and
microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.
With this, I'll turn the call back over to Chuck Gomes.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michelle. And welcome, everyone, to our call this week. Let me start by just asking if anyone has an update to their statement of interest? Not seeing any hands raised or anything in chat let's move on to agenda item Number 2. And we're going to continue the discussion on the statement of purpose that we started working on in last week's call. There was some great discussion on last week's call. And even more discussion on the list since then. I personally think that the discussion about the domain name lifecycle has been really valuable.

Not that we've resolved it and defined it. But I do believe, whether we use that language in our statement of purpose or not, that it is really important that all of us on the working group understand what is in the domain lifecycle, maybe less important for us to define every little detail as it is to understand what goes on during the lifecycle of a domain name. So thanks a lot for the great discussion that's occurred on the list.

So what we're going to do to start with under agenda Item 2 is discuss the three questions that you see in the agenda. And it'll just be an open discussion to try and help us begin to get closer to a statement of purpose that we can reach consensus on. So the first thing, and I won't color the discussion any more than what's already been said on the list, and in our meeting last week. Let's just start with the first question and I'll just open it up for any comments or questions that people had.

And the first question, as you can see, what should be the criteria for a statement of purpose for an RDS? And just ask people to brainstorm either in chat or orally so that we can make a list. For right now let's just suggest possible criteria and then we'll discuss them and talk pros and cons and see which ones we can agree on. So who would like to start providing a criterion or criteria for a possible statement of purpose for the work that's ahead of us?

And I think - correct me if I'm wrong, Lisa, but wouldn't - isn't the question more what's the purpose of an RDS rather than what's the purpose of the

EWG? I'm sorry, I'm looking at the wrong one. I need to scroll back. So it is the purpose. We're talking about the purpose of an RDS not the purpose of the working group. Okay. In the first question. Anybody want to take a first crack?

I can get us started but I prefer to let others start it rather than me. Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. And this is Lisa Phifer for the record. I just wanted to respond to your question. Yes, I think what we are specifically looking for is the statement of purpose for registration data and/or for the RDS. I know that both were discussed in last week's call. But that is what we were -we are looking at now.

And I believe that your first bullet item here, "What are the criteria for statement of purpose?" is really stepping back and saying what should a purpose statement address? How should it be formed? And then as we move forward we'll populate that with what is the purpose of registration data or what is the purpose of the RDS?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa. This is Chuck. Somebody want to get us started? Okay, Elaine, thank you. So provide - and if we could keep a list over in the notes section of the possible elements of a purpose, first one being provide information about a domain name. Thanks, Elaine. Stephanie, go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks, Chuck. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I just wanted to - at the risk of being terribly repetitious, because I've said it before, look, a massive difference between the purpose of registration data, and the purpose of RDS registration data services, it's not even agreed that we need a directory.

So that's a really important distinction we need to make. The purpose of registration data is pretty limited. It's to - it's to manage the lifecycle of the assignment of a domain name, in my view. And the notion of whether we can

achieve all of the other needs that are associated with managing that system through a directory is something that I thought we need to debate as a (unintelligible), you know? Anyway, just pointing that out that sometimes we say it as if the two are really, really close. They're not, they're miles apart. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stephanie. This is Chuck. And I personally agree with you. And my own leaning is that -- and I'm open to discussion on this -- my own leaning is let's talk about what the elements of the purpose statement for the RDS for registration data services in our discussion right now. Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Chuck. Michele for the record. Yes, so I think this is where we start getting into, you know, the quite passionate and heated argument around what people currently have access to, what people would like to have access to and how they have access to things. But, I mean, ultimately, you know, if you're looking at this from a purely technical perspective, you know, there's certain amount of information that needs to be collected by somebody somewhere in order to create a domain name in such a fashion that it resolves.

Other information may be collected either intentionally or consequentially or whatever, but, you know, the actual bare minimum - I think somebody - I think Klaus put in the chat, provide information that it needs to operate a domain in the DNS. So a lot of the other information that's, you know, people can get and can get access to while it might be interesting and there may be valid reasons for it, for the domain to function they're superfluous.

So the question I suppose is, you know, what is - is the purpose of this RDS to serve something more than having a domain resolve on the Internet or is it just purely to update the - update the systems that exist currently to something a little bit more modern?

Now obviously there's going to be different views on that, but, I mean, coming back to the ultimate kind of question, I mean, what actual purpose does it serve? Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. Now in that, and we'll get to you in just a second, Greg. This is Chuck. In that, I'm not sure I heard an element of the statement of purpose. Did you say - now certainly we should add Klaus's to Elaine's, the information needed to operate a domain in the DNS would be added to Elaine's on our list.

So what - and I'm looking, is that - are those being listed in the notes over here? I'm looking…

Lisa Phifer: Yes, Chuck, we're keeping running notes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Good. And is it in Adobe?

Lisa Phifer: Yes, in the notes pod on the right hand side we've started both a list for suggested elements of the statement of purpose, which I don't think anyone has identified yet; and also suggested purposes for registration data, which I believe Elaine and Klaus's and Vicky's and also the comments…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Oh there we go. I was looking too far down. I'm sorry. Thanks, Lisa. Got it. That's appreciated. Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. It's Greg Shatan for the record. First, I'm not sure that we're answering the right question but I had thought the question about the criteria for statement of purpose was more about what should be in a statement of purpose, not what elements should be in this statement of purpose. I thought that was the - was actually Question Number 2. What elements from the EWG and what other elements need to be in the statement of purpose? But

in any case, this seems to be the discussion we're having and not about what makes a good statement of purpose.

I think Vicky's, you know, said in our chat that what I was going to say largely which is that an element of the purpose of the RDS system is to provide an accurate point of contact for the - in order to contact the registrant of the domain. And I think concentrating just on the kind of the registrant registrar relationship is too narrow. Obviously, it's a necessary element but I don't think we should, in any way, elevate that over other elements and purposes for the RDS system. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: So would it be - combining what you said, Greg, and what Vicky wrote in the chat, would be appropriate to say that - to provide a point of contact for the registrant, the registrar or the registry? I mean, would you - Greg or Vicky, is that - I don't want to misstate what you're saying so I'm just asking for confirmation on that or a correction. Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Sorry, I kind of - was looking at the chat when you posited your posit. What was your - can you…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: So would it be accurate to - I tried to combine what you and Vicky shared in saying that a purpose statement - or excuse me - the purpose of the - a purpose of an RDS is to provide point of - a point of contact for the registrant, the registry or the registry.

Greg Shatan: No, I would say that's not correct. I would say that ultimately - maybe "and" rather than "or" but I think the - it should certainly identify the registry - registrar; the registry kind of comes along with the TLD so you really don't need to do too much with that. But really, the key piece is contacting the registrant. Obviously, you know, with privacy and proxy that doesn't

necessarily mean that the true registrant is identified, you know, by name in the RDS.

But it still needs to provide contact and it needs to be - and this may be getting out of our remit and into PPSAI remit. But if you do contact a privacy proxy contact, it should get all the way to the registrant as well. So it's really - it's all of that.

Chuck Gomes: So you would eliminate registry in what I said and say registrant and registrant - a point of contact for…

Greg Shatan: I'd definitely say registrar and registrant. You know, if - it's no - we could certainly add registry since, you know, one stop shopping in terms of information even if it's obvious and readily available, frankly contacting some of the new gTLD registries may not be as easy. And when you've got, as it scales, you know, now we have maybe, you know, somewhere over 1000, 1300 registries, we could have 13,000 in a few years if some people's predictions are right. So I think at that point actually you probably do want to be somewhat specific about the registry as things version. You know, this is just another version of Jon Postel's shirt pocket that will be outgrown.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. Klaus, I think - could be wrong but I think you're getting a little head of the game and getting into some of our requirements rather than elements of a purpose statement for registration data services or information. We will have to deliberate on what information is needed and so forth. Stephanie, go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks, Chuck. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I was going to elaborate on the point you just made, Chuck, so maybe brevity is the soul of wit here and I shouldn't, but, I was just concerned - Ayden made a very good point in the chat that what we - is a mechanism. And the way we conceptualize what this thing is, it's very hard to talk about it without conceptualizing what the beast is.

And if we're assuming automated processes, as opposed to what Jon Postel was using, the actual data that we're talking about can be a very minimal set because the processes that would upon authenticated contact get you into contact with the real registrant are nanosecond like processes.

So the actual data that we're talking about can be distributed, can be controlled by a number of different parties, which in my view, protects the registrant and reduces the risk of data loss. And can be released only upon appropriate authenticated access credential. So this has got to be a minimalist statement about what we're talking about here. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stephanie. Anyone else want to contribute to the first question? Marika, you shared something in the leadership call yesterday that I thought was useful. What would you say would be an element of the - of a statement of purpose?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. And I'm trying to remember what I said…

Chuck Gomes: You talked about boundaries.

Marika Konings: Right. I think one of the things we discussed was indeed whether the purpose statement is intended to set the boundaries for further discussion to kind of limiting - this is what the purpose is and beyond that, you know, we're not considering that. Or whether the purpose statement is setting the minimum standard and saying at a minimum, this is what we expect to be the purpose. But there may be other purposes that are added or are considered at a later point in time.

So I think that is one of the elements where the working group may need to decide what it believes the purpose statement should be whether it's indeed a - setting a limitation of, you know, what the framework is or whether it's a basis from which to start.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marika. And I think there's two things there in what you said that we can add to our list. One of them is to set boundaries for our requirement deliberation. And secondly possibly to define minimum requirements for our work. I don't know - I don't think I worded that very well. But thanks, Marika, I appreciate that.

So let's - Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. Just to briefly follow on to what Marika said, and I've added her notes back up in a section in the pod there under suggested elements of the statement of purpose because I think that really goes more to what - what is a statement of purpose about, not specifically what would the statement of purpose for registration data be.

So I understand that what Marika said is the statement of purpose could either establish the boundaries or the scope for policies and requirements about registration data or that they could establish a minimum framework upon which requirements and policies would expand.

Another thing that I remember Stephanie actually teaching me back in EWG days was that a statement of purpose probably shouldn't derive from the organization's mission, and should then be used as a foundation for looking at all future policies. So do the policies actually support that statement of purpose?

In this case, asking why does this data exist in the first place? Or asking why do we need a system to provide access or maintain that data?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa. Chuck again. So - and again, feel free to continue to make contributions in the chat or raise your hands. But let's take a look, if all of you would scroll up in the notes to the suggested purposes for registration data. I

don't like that title too well. I think it would be better to say suggested purposes of RDS rather than registration data.

But that's my own personal bias there. But so first one we have is provide information about a domain name and is there - and don't worry about overlap in these things, we can clean that up later. But we're going to - I'm going to use the raising your hand or disagreeing or checkmarks and red Xs in Adobe since everybody's on Adobe today to kind of get a quick feel for whether - what things we have agreement on.

So the first one, provide information about a domain name. Is there anybody that disagrees with that? If so, put a red check in the Adobe. And we'll just leave it there for a little bit. But is there anybody that disagrees with that that purpose of an RDS would be to provide information about domain names. Let me scroll down and make sure I see - and I don't see any red Xs in Adobe. Okay, let's then go to the next one.

And I don't think it's really an element of an RDS, it's more of a comment, massive difference between the purpose of registration data and the purpose of an RDS. I agree and you heard me say I agree with that distinction. But let's move that bullet to maybe up in the other notes rather than - because I don't think it's an element of a purpose statement.

The next one is the purpose of registration data is to manage the lifecycle of a registration of a domain name. Is there - and of course we talked a lot about that last week and on the list this week. Don't worry about whether we agree at this point on what that lifecycle includes. But is there anybody that disagrees with that element? Again, red checkmark in the chat if you disagree. And we have a comment. Alan, jump in please.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, thank you, Chuck. I don't think I can disagree or agree without knowing what's in it. If we end up having some things that are not in the lifecycle that I believe are important reasons to have an RDS, then the answer is no. The

purpose is not just to support the lifecycle. So I think it's conditional on what is included in the lifecycle. Otherwise…

Chuck Gomes: Yes, good point, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: …we're in a quandary.

Chuck Gomes: Let's do this, just to keep things moving, let's put lifecycle in parentheses there or brackets, so that - because I think you're absolutely right, so but just for the sake of keeping things moving, yes, quotes are fine. Or brackets, whatever. But obviously that's a big issue. Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. And following on Alan's statement, it might be helpful if that second bullet point was changed from saying the purpose to a purpose. You know, as I said before…

Chuck Gomes: Good edit.

Greg Shatan: Yes, necessary but not sufficient. And I think that also goes to the question of, whether we're trying to lay boundaries or not, the lifecycle of the domain name is not a boundary that we should be laying as the purpose. It's one brick in the wall.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Thanks, Greg. Appreciate that. This is Chuck again. Marc, your turn.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. This is Marc. You know, I agree with what Alan and Greg said, you know, it's not the purpose, it's a purpose. And, you know, Greg said something as well, you know, the purpose of the data isn't necessarily to manage the lifecycle, that kind of - that's been bothering me the way that's written. And, you know, I don't think it's really to manage the lifecycle to provide information about the lifecycle.

And the data about the lifecycle is almost a byproduct of the management of the lifecycle of a domain name. And I hope I'm explaining that well but, you know, it sort of, you know, we've discussed this the last two weeks and it's sort of a nuance that's bothered me a little bit. You know, I think it's a little bit, you know, the cart leading the horse there. I don't think the purpose is really to manage…

((Crosstalk))

Marc Anderson: …it's to provide information on it.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. This is Chuck again. Sorry to interrupt. The - so anybody have a problem with making that edit in that second bullet? So the purpose of registration data is to provide information about the life - so that a lifecycle of a domain name could be managed or something along the lines. Let's not get - it's - edits like that and the changing "the" to "a" I think are helpful here. We can refine the wording in more detail later.

But critical things like that I think are very helpful. So if no on objects, and I'm just looking to see if I see any red Xs and I don't, let's change that to - it's not to manage the lifecycle but rather to provide information needed to manage the lifecycle or something like that. So if we can make that edit in the second bullet. And I'll let - the next Mark jump in.

Mark Svancarek: Hi. Mark SV for the record. As I said on email earlier this week, I think it was earlier this week, I'm still just not understanding the nuance that Alan and Greg and now Marc have about this, managing of the lifecycle and how this is. I'm sorry, I just don't get it. I wish I did. I'm trying really hard. I'm not getting (unintelligible). So I don't know if I'm - I must be in the minority I guess.

But if anyone could help me offline to really understand what is going on. Greg tried to explain it to me the other day and he just made me more confused. So I apologies for being obtuse but frankly I don't see what the

difference is or don't get the nuance. And I don't know if I agree or not is what I'm trying to say.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Mark. This is Chuck. And maybe you're all alone on that. I'm just kidding. It could be but…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …the purpose of an RDS in my opinion, is not to manage. I think that's what Marc just said is not actually to do the management of the lifecycle. The registrar would do that with support from the registrant and the registry and so forth. But it provides information that helps them do that. Does that make any sense? Go ahead, Mark, you can continue.

Mark Svancarek: Yes, okay so I get that that makes sense. It seems - I mean, if we're arguing about does the data do the managing? Well of course the data doesn't do the managing; it's, you know, but if the question is do we (unintelligible) data that isn't essential to managing the lifecycle, then what is essential for? Was kind of the point that I was trying to get at. And if that's not the point that people are trying to make them I'm still missing and I'm sorry.

Chuck Gomes: The - before we go on to the…

Mark Svancarek: I don't want to sidetrack this. I just want to say for the record I still don't get it. If people would like to talk to me about it offline that might be helpful. I don't want to derail on a topic that obviously everyone gets but me. So just there it is.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Mark. And I want everybody to feel free to do exactly what Mark's doing here, okay? We've got to be open enough so that we help one another. So let me ask the three people that commented on this, why don't you put some things in the chat that might help with regard to that. And of course

you're welcome to do it directly offline with Mark as well. But thanks for bringing that up, that's appreciated.

So let's go next to - and notice what's happened in the notes there that the alternative was put there and so the second and third bullet now are kind of alternative of each other. Let's go to Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Assuming if we're now on it is "a" purpose of having the RDS to support the management of the lifecycle, and lifecycle means what it normally means which is the diagram that's in the center pod, then I have - then there is no issue I think.

If we're talking about the management of the lifecycle being the only reason for the RDS data, then I think we have a very significant problem because we've had a dozen use cases which show there are other things that the data is used for and some - at least some of them, I think, will not receive too much argument that they are things we need to support.

Yes, we invented the data decades ago to support the lifecycle, and to support the technical management of the Internet. But the world has changed. I'm not sure if that answers the question or not though.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. And I think you're going to find me stopping anybody that at this stage of the game says any of these things are the only purposes or the only elements of a purpose statement. We'll get there where we're going to have to start narrowing it down. But let's not eliminate - make things too narrow too early. Kal, go ahead.

Kal Feher: Kal Feher for the record. I mentioned this in the chat but I thought I might clarify this. The - I think we need to think about the lifecycle as a collection of purposes, not a single purpose. It's evolved over time at Grace periods and a lot of the policies that are applied when a domain name is - has expired, all of

these have purposes either to protect registrants or prevent registrants from misusing domain names.

So imagining the lifecycle of a single thing or as a non-evolving thing might be the wrong way of coming to an RDS purpose. A lot of the things that we queried the current RDS for are - form part of the policies that backs the lifecycle. So things like IRTP where you need to collect Whois data well let's - that Whois data supports part of the prevention of the loss or malicious transfer away of a domain name.

So the purpose is the prevention of loss of that domain name, not the lifecycle, not even I guess in some ways it's the policy that the underlying purpose is what we should probably be articulating not the abstract representation of that purpose in its current state because it may evolve.

So I think there is a risk of being too abstract here, but we also don't want to be too simplistic in the way that we articulate our goals.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Kal. And this is Chuck. I have to say that in watching the discussion over the last seven days on lifecycle, I came to a conclusion that I think is somewhat similar to what you said in the chat. And I'm still catching up chat, everybody, so bear with me on that. But lifecycle - I really liked what Jim contributed last week. And of course it generated really valuable discussion on what the lifecycle means on the list.

But it's way too vague in my opinion to be helpful to say it's to support the lifecycle. It's getting better when we start saying it provides information to manage the lifecycle for whoever is involved in those responsibilities. But just saying that it's to support the lifecycle, to me, isn't very helpful as a guidance for us.

Now keep in mind we're not talking about - we're going to get specifically into purposes when we start our deliberation. What we're talking about right now

is what does a statement of purpose need to include or what is the purpose of an RDS itself rather than specific data elements and things like that. So Fabricio, I see your comment there. And again, we're going to talk about users and we're going to talk about data elements and so forth later on. So we're not excluding any of those things.

Klaus, I'm not sure who decides what is a conflict. Well, that's probably going to be developed in policy would be my reaction to that. And we're not at a policy development stage yet. Michele responded that the trademark holder certainly be one of the players in that or their legal representative. And Marc Anderson - there's only - I think there's only one paper, Marc, one white paper that most of us refer to and that's the one from June 1998 that the Department of Commerce published after responding to comments to the green paper, which was in January 1998.

And those papers eventually led, especially the white paper, to the formation of ICANN later that year. And thanks for providing the link, Fabricio, appreciated that.

And probably don't need to comment on that. I gave the actual dates, I'm sure the paper was developed in 1997, green paper, I'm pretty sure was published in January 1998 and the white paper in June 1998. That led to the - sorry to give you a little history but for those that aren't familiar with it, that led to four Internet forum for the white papers in the summer of 1998 and then ultimately the formation of ICANN in the fall.

So - and people - all those are - you can find those if you do a little search and they are important documents. They don't necessarily directly related, although Fabricio made a point, they do deal with the whole issue of Whois and so forth, at least in concept. I won't respond to all the comments. Sorry, Stephanie and Steve, while I'm kind of going through the chat I'm catching up. A lot of you can read some of this in the chat. So I won't go over that.

So Vicky, I'm trying to understand your comment there. I thought we were going through this as a purpose at least so we're not defining the purpose of data in this exercise right now, but rather what are the - in our development of a purpose statement for an RDS, what elements need to be there? So and you're saying the same thing that I've been saying and others have been saying, let's not be too restrictive on what the lifecycle is or even trying to find it exactly now.

I'm just still catching up in the chat. Since Stephanie since I caught up to your comment in the chat let me turn it to - turn it over to Stephanie now to comment. Go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks, Chuck. I was just going to comment on maybe the problem is the word lifecycle. And I really appreciated Jim's definition and explanations as well. The problem with lifecycle is that it may wrap in other policy processes that are dealt with elsewhere. We have to kind of think of this in my mind anyway as a - like a vital events record. So most governments have vital events records, birth, death, relevant address for the purposes of sending, you know, pension money and that kind of thing, your benefits.

But not a life event trapping. And the problem with lifecycle here is - and I'm sure my law enforcement and trademark friends will disagree wildly with this. But it's a point of contact. It's not a source of necessarily a source of all the information required for other policy processes such as UDRP and the rights protection mechanisms.

So I'm afraid the word "lifecycle" is a little wee bit undefined. And if you take an expansive definition then getting back to my concept problem you will have a bigger concept of what's involved here and therefore a demand for more data than a more limited vital event kind of concept. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stephanie. Let's go to Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, thanks. This is Steve Metalitz. I wanted to try to get back to your original question about elements or criteria. I mean, this has been a good discussion about possible things that should appear in the statement of purpose but I've just been thinking about what are the criteria for the statement? And I've come up with three that I hope would be useful.

The first is that - and I think, you know, we've used these to decide whether we had succeeded in coming up with an actionable statement of purpose here. The first is that I think we have to recognize, based on this discussion, that it's really a list of purposes. There's not going to be one single purpose or that's very unlikely that we'll be able to put this in the form of one single purpose.

The second criterion I would mention is that it has to be something - a statement that can be readily communicated to registrants and to others but I'm thinking particularly of registrants because if, again, if you look at the existing contracts, the registrant has to be told what are the purposes for which personal identifiable information anyway is being collected so that's part of this. And so this has to be a statement that can be communicated to registrants and others, other stakeholders too.

And then the third criterion that I would suggest is that we have to have a statement that is sufficiently clear that we can establish a relationship between a purpose and a proposed or actual use of this data.

Because without getting into what that relationship is I think there is a relationship - at least I would suggest there is a relationship between the purpose and the use that you could - in defining that relationship decide whether you want to accommodate that use or not because we've heard a lot about what are the use cases and people saying, well there are some use cases that probably shouldn't be accommodated.

And so we need something that enables us to line up a proposed use against our statement of purpose and say either there is a relationship there, one is consistent with the other, one furthers the other, one is not inconsistent with the other or we might say there's no relationship there. And if that were the conclusion then we might say that's not a use that we want to accommodate.

So I think the three criteria I'm thinking of are having a list of purposes, accommodating multiple purposes. Second being communicated - something that can be communicated readily to registrants and others. And third, something that you can use to establish a relationship between the stated purpose and a proposed or actual use. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Steve. And that, in my opinion, is right on target for what we are looking for in this particular question. Things that will help us develop a statement that satisfy those criteria and others that have been communicated. So to me that's very constructive. And I - thanks, Mark, for noting that you're starting to maybe see a little bit more where people are coming are from and so forth, but let me let you jump in now.

Mark Svancarek: Yes, at the risk of beating the dead horse, if we have concerns about the term "lifecycle" I say, again, that we have this diagram that's showing on the board and we can simply populate activities into the various phases. So if we wonder is, say, selling a domain to someone else an activity within a lifecycle we can say yes it is and it's during the registered phase.

And we could annotate this diagram with a list of activities that happen in the various phases. And assuming that nobody, you know, assuming that we agree on those things that have been annotated in then over time we have accumulated enough to actually say we have a detailed definition of what a lifecycle is.

So I am very worried to have the term "lifecycle" is becoming kind of a dodge. You know, we don't know what it is and therefore we can't use the term. I

think we actually know amongst ourselves I think we do know what it is. We just haven't written it down anywhere. And I think we have a very easy ability to write it down if we so choose.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Mark. This is Chuck again. And Alex, I think you hit an important point in your comments in the chat. One of the problems - and this is what began to bother me more and more during the week was is that the term "lifecycle" has a different meaning to a lot of people. The diagram adds a lot of clarity and is very helpful.

But if a purpose statement is going to help us as we move forward to deliberate on possible requirements of an RDS, then it can't be vague. We're going to have to have pretty precise meaning. I fully agree with that. And that's one of my elements. And I think it's already been covered - kind of covered maybe by what Marika added and Lisa added to that.

That - and kind of what Steve Metalitz said as well, in that our purpose statement should be helpful to us. It's got to be clear enough that it can be helpful to us. It'll be a measure we can use as we evaluate requirements. It won't be the only measure we will use, but it should guide us. And so if it's vague it won't and we'll have to have these discussions all over again. So the more specific it is the better.

Let's go to - let's see, I don't see any new hands unless that's a new hand, Mark? Yes, we want to avoid - if we have undefined terms, and that's a concern I have with lifecycle, it's got to be pretty precisely defined to be helpful for us.

Okay, it looks like I caught up in the chat finally. Okay. Elaine, you're up. If you're talking, Elaine, we can't hear you. Still not hearing anything. I see what you're saying in the chat.

Elaine Pruis: Can you hear me now?

Chuck Gomes: There we go. Good.

Elaine Pruis: Hi. Hey, Chuck, Elaine Pruis. So I am very concerned about our working group taking (unintelligible) or making any effort to define the lifecycle. We have a diagram in front of us that includes several different phases in different TLDs, registry operators have an opportunity to modify these lifecycles. So an auto renew grace period could be zero to 45 days or it could be zero to 30 days.

                 And in some cases the action on a domain is different across different registries. So I think we're really going in the wrong direction to try and define lifecycle. I think we need to just revisit what's the reason for including that thought in our purpose statement and getting to that.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Elaine. Take a note what Marika suggested in the chat. We may be able to avoid defining - I think as soon as we start defining it we're going to keep finding new elements that are part of it and we're never going to finish so I think your point is well taken. Marika's suggestion, and she's got a couple things in the chat there, we can just call out the specific elements that the RDS would be expected to support so that's an idea there.

                 And good - positive responses to that, Marika. You were successful on those comments. Just glancing ahead - all right so rather than continue on this question, it'd be helpful, I think if we - and we've only got about probably a little over 20 minutes to talk about this before we go to the next agenda item but keep in mind we're not trying to finish this today. But I think some good progress has been made and I'll have a suggestion as to how we move forward in about 20 minutes before we go to the next agenda item.

                 But let's go to the next question and if we could put up instead of the lifecycle diagram, if we could put up the elements of - or the what is kind of a statement of purpose from the EWG Working Group because the next

question is what elements, if any, from the EWG statement of purpose that's on the screen, should be reflected in a statement of purpose? So let me throw that open for discussion.

Are there any elements in here that you think should be in a statement of purpose? And if so, raise your hand and tell us why or communicate it in the chat. And if anybody has a good example of a statement of purpose to model our statement after, please feel free to contribute it either in this call today or on the list or even in chat now. Steve, go ahead. Are you on mute?

Steve Metalitz: I'm sorry. I'm here now.

Chuck Gomes: There we go.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. My reaction to this document is that this is not exactly a statement of purpose from - it's more a description of criteria that the system ought to have. It's - but if we're looking for - to me that's a little bit different than what, you know, than stating purposes of having the system.

And so for example, you know, I guess we would want to know whether you could - could you take this list and use it to decide whether a particular use ought to be accommodated or not? Maybe? And certainly I don't disagree with any of these criteria or any of these statements about what the system should deliver. But I'm just not sure that that's the same thing as a statement of purpose. But maybe especially people on the EWG could kind of clarify for me what or for others what - how this fits into the category of a statement of purpose. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Steve. This is Chuck again. And I think we started to kind of come to that observation in our call last week. But let me ask you this, Steve, would it be fair to conclude that you wouldn't include any of these in the - in a statement of purpose for the RDS? Not because they're wrong, like you said, but rather they're just not purpose statements.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, I think that's right. I think I agree with everything in there, actually, as what we should be trying to design into the system. It's desirable to design a system that has these characteristics. I agree with all of those. But I'm not sure that that's the same thing as a statement of purpose that we were set up to try to hammer out. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Steve. Appreciate that. It's Chuck again. Alan, your turn.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I do have problems parsing the third bullet which I think there's some words missing or something there. Enables a reliable mechanism for identifying the ability to contact registrants. I think there's some errors. But I think I understand the intent of it.

Like Steve, I agree with all these. I can't avoid getting the feeling that all the work we're doing for the last couple of weeks is an attempt to do something which will then make the rest of our life easier. And I think it's somewhat futile.

I mean, I think these are fine statements but they all hinge on the words "appropriate" used in a number of different places. And it's defining those appropriate that everything hinges on. So I think what we're doing right now is an interesting exercise. I'm not convinced it's going to help us do our future work any better. Sorry. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: You don't need to apologize, but I hope you're wrong. So you might not be but I hope you're wrong because obviously our objective is to do things that are constructive to our work ahead. Thanks. So does anybody think that any of these should be in our purpose statement? So far I haven't heard anyone say that. Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin for the record. Thanks, Chuck. I'm one of the EWG members. I would have to say not being a seasoned an ICANN participant,

i.e. a brand newbie, I didn't understand the nuances of when we were coming up with it. And of course I was blissfully unfamiliar with a lot of the policy, which I'm now painfully familiar with. So I think we have to put this in the context that the EWG was a strange creature mandated by the Board.

What we were doing is different than what we're doing in this PDP. There is - my caveat about the concept of lifecycle dragging in various other policies covers this. And we had already decided that the Whois didn't work and we needed an RDS. That was a pretty early decision. And we're not there yet, right?

So I just would like to interject that note of caution. These things sound good but we'd have to unpack them all from that overall wrapping. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stephanie. This is Chuck again. Lisa made a suggestion that the fourth bullet might be one that could be included in the statement of purpose. What do people think about that?

I see a plus one there. Anybody - anybody disagree with including that? Now keep in mind, we're not finalizing a statement of purpose today but we're trying to set enough of a framework and some guidance so that we can start formalizing one.

Stephanie, is that an old hand? Okay, so you disagree, Stephanie, let me make sure I'm interpreting that red X and you can speak up if you'd like, so you don't think the fourth bullet should be included in a statement of purpose, is that correct, Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: If I may, Chuck? Stephanie Perrin for the record. It's my least favorite bullet because it includes the most other extraneous policy decisions. So for instance, issues involving registrants includes other problems and issues. Consumer protection, huge debate there, exactly what data do we need to support consumer protection? I would argue it's a government responsibility

that has been covered by many governments and we don't need to have ICANN move in there and do it.

Investigation of cybercrime, ditto. We're talking about registration data, registration data is not gathered for the purpose of investigation of cybercrime. That is something that happens and the decision about where to put that data, whether in the RDS or in - leaving it in the registrars and registries' hands, is a whole other question.

And IP protection, arguably the rights protection mechanisms have sprung up without suitable policy. They were almost mandated by the white paper that Sam has mentioned several times, without a policy process. So, you know, what can I say? To me that's the policy (unintelligible) bullet right there. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stephanie. Let me ask you one more question. Would you be comfortable with including just the first phrase in that item, supports the framework to address issues involving registrants.

Stephanie Perrin: I think it's pretty vague, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, that's all right.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I asked for a response and you gave it, that's good. All right, let's go to Marc Anderson.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. This is Marc. And, you know, I want to say I agree with what Steve said earlier about this. You know, I don't disagree with anything that's in there but it just doesn't - it's the way it's written does not seem like a good fit for what we're trying to do. And, you know, I think it was probably a good fit

for what the EWG's mandate was. You know, they we trying to, you know, design, you know, a new system, a system to replace Whois.

And, you know, if that's your mandate, you know, Bullet Point 4 seems like a good fit. You know, a new system should support a framework to address issues involving registrants. But, you know, it's subtly different than what we're trying not do and, you know, I'm just having a hard time looking at what's there and forklifting it into what we're trying to do. It just - it doesn't - it's subtly different but it doesn't seem quite right. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Certainly that statement is without any qualification, without the normal weasel word that is used there of appropriate or selected, it's far too wide because it's clearly not used for anything. I don't know whether it belongs in the statement we're trying to craft right now. Certainly it has to be something that's going to be addressed ultimately.

Again I'll say I think we're trying to find ways that we can avoid defining what the appropriate is and I think ultimately it's going to come down to that. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Alan. So I think we've talked about that enough. So let's go to the third question under Agenda Item Number 2, are there any other elements that need to be reflected in a statement of purpose that we haven't discussed? Mark.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. This is Marc again. I actually wanted to mention something that Elaine said in chat earlier that kind of blew past. She, you know, she mentioned, you know, one of the - one of the, you know, a purpose is to - is to look up if a domain is available. She put it if someone is going to buy a domain they use Whois to look it up.

And, you know, that's, you know, that's a purpose. You know, to, you know, back to Steve's point, you know, what - there are multiple, you know, there are going to be multiple purposes. We're not going to define a purpose. We have to recognize that there are purposes to RDS. And one of those is, you know, summarize what Elaine said, you know, an availability check.

You know, so I sort of made a note of that and it seemed to have gotten lost in all the, you know, all the chat so I just wanted to bring that up now. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. Any other comments on Agenda Item Number 2 on the elements of an RDS purpose statement? Okay so what I'm going to suggest, but if people have alternative suggestions, I'm really open to them, okay, so but I'm going to throw this out to see if you're supportive of it.

We have a whole bunch of information that's been shared in our notes from the chat, from the oral contributions and so forth today, on this idea of a purpose statement. So I'm going to volunteer, if there are no objections, that the leadership team take this information and come up with a strawman statement of purpose and that's all it would be is a strawman, that we can discuss in the call next week.

Is anybody opposed to that approach? Now we could let others do it instead of the leadership team but I'm just volunteering the leadership team. And by the way, I did clear this with the other leaders except for Susan yesterday, she was not available. But I'm open to other suggestions.

The idea would be for the leadership team to try and put some of these thoughts together in some sort of way and then let the full - and send it to the full group before the meeting next week and then critique it on the list and then critique it in our call next week and maybe totally change it. So this would not be a - we would not assume that what the leadership team does is right or best, but just to try and pull some of this together.

Anybody opposed to that? And Marc Anderson, is that a new hand?

Marc Anderson: Yes, Chuck. It's a new hand. I guess I want to, you know, ask a question. And, you know, I'm not opposed to that at all but I guess my question for the leadership team is do you feel you have enough input? You know, one of the things that's been mentioned a couple of times and one of the things that, you know, I feel pretty strongly about is there are multiple purposes that are going to need to be accounted for.

And so, you know, to the question of the leadership team is do you feel that, you know, you have enough input and that the potential purposes have been, you know, discussed and raised enough for you to be able to take a first crack at a purpose statement? Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Good question, Marc. This is Chuck again. Before I respond does someone else on the leadership team, including staff, want to respond to that first? Please raise your hand if you do.

Lisa Phifer: Chuck, this is Lisa Phifer.

Chuck Gomes: So here's my response. Oh go ahead. Go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: You maybe scrolled down and not see my hand.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, you're absolutely correct. Thanks.

Lisa Phifer: And I do think that the actual list of purposes will probably be - continue to be discussed for quite a long time here. But I think maybe what we have is enough direction to try to build a framework around which that purpose statement could be fleshed out. I think we have identified what some possible elements are if we can find some examples of statements of purpose from, you know, other domains, boy that was a bad word here in this context, other

aspects of, you know, systems that contain data that is made accessible to other parties.

We could use that to provide a framework and then maybe we can start filling in that framework. I think the comments that were made about the EWG's purpose statement is not really framed as a statement of purpose - aren't spot on but maybe we can give you a framework that looks more like a statement of purpose against which to build the actual content of that statement.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa, you - this is Chuck. You said that really well I think. In answer to Marc's question I think that we certainly have enough to get a start and to establish maybe a framework and a start. And then that can be built on. And critiqued and changed and so forth. But this discussion has been fruitful enough in my opinion that we have quite a bit to work with.

Okay, so we will do that. And by the way, if anybody like - I think it was Lisa that suggested in that chat quite a while ago - if anybody has an example of a statement of purpose, for something totally different than this, that you want to share with the group, please put it on the list as an example of a good statement of purpose that might provide us guidance as well.

Okay, let's go then to agenda Item Number 3, and hopefully all of you saw yesterday that Lisa distributed the next version of our possible requirements list that's been triaged quite a lot. Lisa and Susan did a lot of work on that. It includes contributions from dozens of you in the working group in a variety of ways.

And it's a big document but one that we will be going through as we do our deliberations. So it's important that we all have a good feel for it and how to use it and how to maneuver in and around it and find things and add things and so forth.

So what we're going to do in the next part of our meeting is ask Lisa, and hopefully the document is being uploaded, at this time, but ask Lisa to just give us an overview, walk us through some things so that all of us can study it in more detail and make constructive contributions to it so that it becomes a tool that is very helpful to us as we actually do our deliberation in Step 12 of our work plan.

So now that it's up there let me turn it over to Lisa to go over this. And while she's doing it, please feel free to raise your hand if you have questions of - when she's going over particular thing, if there's something that's not clear raise your hand right then so that we - hopefully your question can be answered.

Again, our objective is to make it easier for all of us to use this document going forward and certainly to have a good understanding of what's in it and how it's structured.

Lisa, you're up.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. And this is Lisa Phifer for the record. The Word document that we distributed yesterday which you see a few slides on your screen. I'm actually going to use slides to talk to since the document itself is so long. Just to give you an overview of the changes that were made to that document, relative to the previous version that was distributed which was Draft 3 that was triaged and that was just previously distributed around the middle of July.

The changes that have been incorporated in Draft 4 now are really twofold. One is that Draft 4 contains additional possible requirements. Those additional possible requirements include all those that were submitted by working group members as well as some that were gathered during our meeting in Helsinki and our cross community session. And also some that were provided by the Registries in their response to outreach 2.

These are additional possible requirements that were submitted since Draft 3 was published and they have been populated into the draft just like we did the other possible requirements so they've ended up at the end of each of the tables for each of the questions that submitters mapped those possible requirements into.

So what you see on the screen right now happens to be just a one bit of - it's Page 26 of the document but one bit of the users and purposes table that shows some additional possible requirements. And you'll see many other possible requirements that were mapped to the other questions in our set of 11 actually 12 questions because we have another requirements question.

So when you review the document you want to look at the tail end of each of the lists to see the new possible requirements that were submitted and for each of those possible requirements we've done a triage effort, which means that we've identified some of the dependencies between those requirements and possible requirements in others. We've applied a keyword and then we've applied a coding.

And I'll come back to the keywords and codings in a minute. But so you'll find all those additional possible requirements. If you look at Annex A of the document, you'll see that there are a number of new source documents that are listed starting with Number 47, the Article 29 Working Paper 33. And those are all the source documents for the additional possible requirements.

All those requirements are actually posted on your - the suggested possible requirements are posted on your wiki and that sign-up sheet for every document there's a link to the email where the submitter sent it to the full working group. So that's where the new possible requirements came from.

And then I want to call your attention to some of the possible requirements. And I've just got one page pulled out here, that's Page 93, that shows just a

couple of possible requirements with question marks in the phase, coding and keyword column.

And the reason why those question marks are there is that when we attempted to do triage for those possible requirements Susan - neither Susan nor I really found what the direct relevance was to the RDS. And rather than leave those out we have included them. But as you review the document, you might want to take a look at the items that have those question marks and consider for yourself how they're related to the RDS specifically as opposed to the domain name system or gTLDs.

So those are the additional possible requirements. The other major thing that you'll find in Draft 4 is you'll find that the right hand side of those tables has changed somewhat. And previously we had a group as the right most column, now we have two columns, coding and keyword. The codings are the codings that Stephanie had suggested to this group and had gotten some support in our previous working group calls in early August. So that's the column you see labeled C. Those are the codings that Stephanie had suggested.

And then the column labeled K is what previously we had as groups; now we call them keywords. And the - what we've done is we've made them all lowercase, the keywords all lowercase to avoid confusion with the codings. But that column actually really hasn't changed. Those are the groups that were previously there now called keywords.

Now what are the definitions of those columns? How do you know what A, under coding or A under keyword means? Well for that you need to go to Annex B. Annex B is a new annex in the document. It's at the tail end of the document so you'll find it pretty easy to flip to. And Annex B contains both the definitions for the codings that Stephanie had provided, as well as the definitions for the keywords that Susan had provided.

So now that we've actually incorporated this information into the same document, you can see for yourself as you review the document whether the keywords make sense, whether the codings make sense, whether any changes are needed. And that's where I want to direct your review.

As you review the document, as I said, look for those new possible requirements, especially the ones with question marks and think to yourself how they are relevant to the RDS. Look at the phases and the keywords for the new possible requirements and think about whether they accurately reflect the possible requirement. And then in particular you want to look at that new coding column to see whether they're correct.

And one of the reasons that I'm suggesting that or calling that out a little bit more prominently is that Stephanie provided a mapping between the keywords, formerly groups, the keywords and the codes that were in Stephanie's hierarchical list. But sometimes when you actually look at an individual possible requirement I know I've found as I was actually doing that mapping just following the keyword, the code mapping, that there were some possible requirements that probably didn't really match the code that was assigned to it. So you'll want to take a look at those at the individual possible requirement level.

And then of course finally as we try to wrap this up, not that we'll never add to the document again, but as we try to wrap up this phase of our work to prepare for deliberation, are there other source documents that are really important to include that we still have missed and we know we have a few outstanding assignments still on our assignment sheet, documents that still haven't been incorporated. But for the most part we've got most of the documents that have been identified previously.

The outstanding assignments that are still being worked on, pertain to internationalization, privacy proxy and the new EU GDPR, the new data

protection law. So those are some significant omissions that still need to be added. But are there others that still need to be added?

And then finally I wanted to point out that in addition to the Word document that was circulated staff will prepare and circulate an Excel version of the document so that like we did with Draft 3 in the triage version you'll be able to filter on the columns and we'll provide both instructions on filtering as well as a short how-to video on filtering so that you can make use of that worksheet.

Someone asked me earlier today when we'd have that worksheet, and expected to have it in the next day. And that's it for my summary. Any questions?

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Lisa. And thanks to Lisa and Susan and Stephanie who were major contributors. And of course all of you with regard to the source documents and possible requirements from those source documents. This has been truly a team effort. And one that we're going to be wading our way through this in the months ahead and coming up with recommendations on possible requirements for an RDS.

So the Excel version is going to be really helpful. I want to comment just briefly on that. And one of the things that staff has done, and I think it was primarily Lisa, is prepared a little video on how to use filtering on this. It's a - in the Word version of the document, as some of you may have noticed yesterday, or today is 138 pages long and there's a lot of detail in those 138 pages. So how are we going to effectively find things and move around and check things?

Filtering is going to be a resource that'll help us a lot on that. And as - once the Excel version comes out, we'll spend a little time talking about that and hopefully all of you - I think the video I watched yesterday was just a little over six minutes long and was very helpful because I'd never used filtering in spreadsheets before.

It did help a lot. So I think you'll find the spreadsheet version will help us as we're doing our work, and we need to look somewhere else it'll make it a lot easier. So I'm not seeing any hands. So and Maxim, let's see what Maxim's question is. Why do we use separate sheets? You mean the individual tabs, the worksheets as part of - for those of you not too familiar with Excel, there's an overall workbook that can include separate worksheets in a workbook and each tab in the spreadsheet is a separate worksheet.

And the plan right now is to provide a separate worksheet or tab for each of the 11 questions and introduction of the work plan and a variety of other things. So it would be broken up that way. That's to help us find things rather than looking at all 138 pages every time you're looking at something.

I'm not sure that answers Maxim's question. If not, please speak up and clarify. And it'll be possible to do searches and so forth and we'll go over that. So, Lisa, do you want to comment?

Lisa Phifer: Yes, Chuck. Lisa Phifer for the record. Maxim, the main reason for using separate tabs is so we can focus on a particular question at any point in time. And the way that the unique identifiers are constructed it's not easy to use a filter, for example, to see all the questions - excuse me, all the possible requirements that are in the category UP. So that's why we split it out into separate tabs.

That said, Chuck actually asked yesterday if it would possible to have - to be able to filter on all the possible requirements at once, and we could do that by adding another tab that has the consolidated list of absolutely every possible requirement in it if you should like to do that.

But I'm looking at ways to make the worksheet more efficient to do that. A consolidated tab is certainly an easy way to accomplish that but I'm also mindful that replicates the possible requirements on another tab and that

could add to the maintenance challenge. But we're looking at trying to do that.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Maxim, for the suggestions and the questions there. And we can - we may discover things as we're using this that we can improve. So we'll try and make it more user friendly and useful to us as we go. Any other questions or comments as we head to the end of our call?

Okay, let's go then to Agenda Item 4 and Marika, you're probably the best one to talk to the face to face meeting. And we - a decision has been made on the timing for the face to face meetings. Unfortunately, it didn't go in our favor in terms of those who are going to be participating remotely. But it was all done randomly. So, Marika, you want to talk to that please?

Marika Konings: Yes, thank you, Chuck. And as Chuck mentioned at the end we basically had to do an online straw drawing to see who draw the shortest straw which we ended up with which means that the face to face meeting for this working group is scheduled on Day 1 of the ICANN meeting in Hyderabad, which is the Thursday the 3rd of November from 9:00 to one o'clock local time.

Of course we'll need to work on the exact agenda and I'm sure we're going to fit in some breaks. But that is in principle the timeframe that has been set aside for this working group to conduct its meeting.

And then in addition to that there will likely also be an update to the GNSO on Day 2 which is Friday the 4th of November, I think that's currently tentatively penciled in for 10 o'clock local time. But that's of course, you know, working group members are invited to attend that but it's an update that is typically provided by the chair or the chairs of the working group.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marika. So keep in mind, if you haven't made your travel arrangements for Hyderabad and you are planning attending in person, that our meeting will start at nine on the first day on the 3rd of November so make

your travel arrangements accordingly if you can if you're going to be there in person.

Apologies to many of you especially in North America and South America, if you're participating remotely it's going to not be very good times. The afternoon session would have worked - been probably preferable to more people but we lost the random thing there and so the PDP working group on Subsequent Procedures for new gTLDs will have the two o'clock shot - slot on that day. So we finally got that finalized and so hopefully everybody can plan accordingly.

And then our weeding, our meeting, excuse me, I've been talking too much, I apologize for that. Our meeting next week will be on Wednesday the 21st for most people. It'll still be the 20th for me. But it's going to be at our alternate time to accommodate those especially in the Asia Pacific region and so forth. So some of us will have a less desirable time but hopefully we will do that with a good attitude and in deference to those who have an undesirable time almost every meeting. So please keep that in mind.

And let me just ask if there's anything else that we need to cover before we adjourn? Thanks for the great cooperation and discussion today. And look forward to another working group call next week. And making some more progress. The leadership team will do its homework and send something out later in the week on a strawman statement of purpose.

Thanks, everyone. And the meeting is adjourned and the recording can stop.

Michelle DeSmyter: Great. Thanks so much, Chuck. Again, the meeting has been adjourned. Operator, please stop the recordings and disconnect all remaining lines. Have a great day, everyone.

END