

**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group
Tuesday, 18 July 2017 at 16:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnsso/gnsso-nextgen-rds-pdp-18jul17-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p1sii1hykih/>
Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/SWfwAw>

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

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

Julie Bisland: Thank you so much. Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the Next Generation RDS PDP Working Group call on the 18th of July, 2017.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. If you are only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourself be known now? Okay, thank you. Hearing no names, I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

With this I will turn it back over to Chuck Gomes.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Julie, and welcome, everyone, to today's call. Let me, like always, ask if there are any updates to statement of interest. And I'll kick it off since we haven't had a call since my status changed. I did update my statement of interest so you can see the update online. I am no longer employed by

VeriSign. I retired with the last day of June 30 on my way back from Johannesburg.

I will be consulting - having a consulting agreement with VeriSign. And my statement of work will be to continue chairing this working group not on behalf of VeriSign in the sense that I'm representing them, but rather performing my neutral role of chairing the group and VeriSign is going to support me in that capacity.

Does anyone else have a statement of interest update? Okay, and I think we - we have a good number of people involved in today's call, that's great because we - we're going to cover a lot today, hopefully. So let's get going.

We're going to continue deliberation beyond the minimum public data set which we kicked off in Johannesburg. And a big part of what we're going to do is relate to the survey that I think 35 or so of you took. And let me say right up front that I really appreciate all of you who took the time to complete a very long survey, granted, we canceled the meeting to give - to give you a little extra time to do that. But still, it was a big effort.

And in my opinion, we gathered a lot of helpful information that will facilitate our deliberation going forward. So thank you very much for those who took the time. I know some questioned the value of it; after seeing the results I'm convinced that it really is valuable, not that it finalizes anything, but it will help us in dealing with various concerns as we move forward on the direction that was decided by the group in Johannesburg.

Let me get back over in Adobe to the general chat area. Going to the screen now you can see some new information is coming up. So the basic charter question, the high level charter question we're dealing with is what data should be collected, stored and discussed, but we're at a high level and the early stages of that. So we're really not talking about storing or disclosing data at this point.

Now you can see on the screen in front of you a nice summary of Questions 2-39. And hopefully most of you had a chance to look at the results. Let me thank Lisa for an incredible job, a huge job, of analyzing the results and preparing this document not only this page but the pages that follow it that was distributed and is posted on the working group wiki.

I'm going to turn it to Lisa. I know the - her document explained these things. But, Lisa, would you go through the color coding and what the numbers mean in support - you put a nice key down below that's helpful. But if you would explain what people are seeing on the screen right now and if you're not on the first page in Adobe, that's the place to be right now. Go ahead, Lisa.

Lisa Phifer: Sure, Chuck. This is Lisa Phifer for the record. So what you see in this table is an attempt to roll up the results from all of the questions with the exception of Question 40, which was to propose new data elements and we'll cover that separately.

But for Questions 2-39, what you see is the name of the data element that was the subject of that question and then the counts of responses. If you took this poll you recall that the response choices were strongly agree, agree, neutral, unsure, disagree and strongly disagree. So you're seeing then the counts of responses in each of those areas. And then what you see on the far right is a support column. This was an attempt to roll up that information to help us identify the data elements that had broad support as well as identify data elements that had more disagreement than agreement.

So in that column, the way that support was calculated was a strongly agree response counted as two, agree counted as one, neutral or unsure was zero, disagree was negative one and strongly disagree was negative two. So you're seeing a sum in that support column. Again, this is just to help us identify which data elements kind of boiled to the top and which data elements fell to the bottom.

So the items that are in - highlighted in strong agree had really significant support across the board and few points of disagreement, not no points of disagreement but fewer points of disagreement.

The items that you see in the support column shaded in a light red those were data elements that had more disagreement than agreement or unsure and so essentially fell to the bottom of the list. And then the items that you see colored white and yellow those are - I guess the yellow ones had significant agreement but also a fair number of unswers and disagreement and the ones shaded in white then were somewhere in between.

But in today's call I believe we're going to focus more on the outliers, the data elements that had strong support across the board and I'm not sure if we're going to also cover the ones that had significant disagreement.

Now I want to point out if you're looking at Page 1, if you tend to like graphs, Page 2 shows you - or actually it's Page 6 on this list but second page of the PDF, shows you the same thing in graphical format which helps you kind of visually see which data elements had more support, more strong support than other data elements. So again, that would be green for strongly agree, yellow for agree, gray for neutral unsure and then shades of red for disagreement so that gives you sort of a visual depiction of the level of support and disagreement.

Chuck, back to you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa. Again, thanks for the good work and making this easier for us to grapple with. So the first thing we're going to cover today are the green items, okay, the ones that had fairly strong support and fairly minimal disagreement. We're going to talk about those first today. First of all, let me just pause, hopefully all of you would have already raised your hands if you

had a question but let me just take a few seconds and see if anybody has any questions about the data or the poll. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Chuck. I'm not sure if this is exactly the right time to do this but I'm going to ask it anyway. And it's Michele for the record. Looking at the data elements that are listed here, there's a couple of - that I think might need a little bit of clarification or discussion to see exactly what they refer to because I'm not 100% sure that we all know exactly what they refer to.

Chuck Gomes: And...

Michele Neylon: Is this the time to have that discussion or do you want to put that...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Are any of those in the - marked in green?

Michele Neylon: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay then please bring them up.

Michele Neylon: Okay. So the one which really jumps off the page for me as being potentially problematic depending on a number of things is 39, original registration date. That I see as being quite problematic. I mean, if I take the domain even say Blacknight.com, which is, you know, our corporate domain, what date does that refer to? When it was the first time that the domain was ever registered at any time in the history of mankind? The first time that it was registered before maybe being deleted temporarily? I'm not sure exactly what that refers to.

Now if it does - if it does refer to the original registration date being, I don't know, let's say - I'm trying to think of an example of another domain, like a domain name that's been in constant use for a very, very long time, it will

never have really dropped so I just don't understand what value the original registration date would have if it's meant to refer to the first time the domain was registered without it ever having been dropped, because I mean it's something that's been - if it's of high value, you know, it's just - I just don't - I can see it being something that, you know, in some context maybe somebody would have a use for it; I can see it in other context people - trying to jumping to incorrect assumptions.

So I'm just trying to understand where it came from, I mean, what's it actually meant to be and if I'm not the only person who sees the problems with it.

Chuck Gomes: Michele, this is Chuck. So you were on the EWG, I believe that all of these elements were in the EWG report. So can somebody else comment on his questions, not about the pros and cons of this one, we'll get to that specifically later, as we go through these elements marked in green, but can anybody else from the EWG share any insight in terms as to why this one was included there?

And, Stephanie, we'll get to purposes eventually and stuff like that so hang in there. Keep in mind that the agreement in our face to face meeting in Johannesburg was to create what some referred to as this made a list of possible elements for the RDS to start there and then we'll whittle that down or up or whatever we decide to do. Sam, go ahead. Are you on mute, Sam? This is Chuck. Not hearing anything. Okay, I don't know, okay. So Sam took his hand down. Maybe you can type something in the chat, Sam. Anybody have any insight in terms of why the EWG included this one as a list of possible elements on the list of possible elements?

Okay well possibly some clarity will come on that later, Michele. Now you had, I think, at least another one or maybe more than one that you wanted to flag in the green items. Go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Yes, thanks, Chuck. What was the other one? Oh I think this - I have scroll ability on this, don't I? I do, yes. Another one that I don't think it falls entirely into - or does it, hold on a second, sorry, I'm scrolling here and I'm trying to find the damn thing. The one which I think some of us really don't really care one way or the other about, but in terms of how useful it is and the technical contact realistically speaking for a lot of us, I don't think it's something we really care about. And I think people misunderstand at this stage what the hell it is because in many cases the technical contact just doesn't really serve any purpose. It's not a technical contact, it's just a contact. More often than not it probably ends up being the - a copy of the registrant or the admin.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. And again, we'll talk about that when we get to that one. But I'd like to just point out - I don't know how many of you glanced at the information that Greg Shatan, I think, sent to the whole list, I'm not sure whether it was the whole list or not, but the IPC identified elements that their members use in various capacities of the work that they do. And so I glanced through that with regard to the technical contact, and I did note in several instances that they do include technical contact information.

That doesn't detract from what Michele is saying, what we're going to have to find out from for example, the IPC users, is what they actually use that for and is it needed or is it more of a historical artifact. We will discuss that later. Okay, Steve, go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, thank you. This is Steve Metalitz. Just to pick up on one of Michele's comments, and this is something I noted in my responses to the poll, most of these or very few of these elements that are in the current Whois, which is most of the green ones, except for original registration date, I think, have never really been defined. And I know this has come up a number of times over the years, as to whether there should be a uniform or consistent definition or at least guidance as to who should be entered in as a technical contact, what characteristics should that person or function have. Who should be entered as the administrative contact?

Because I think they're entered very inconsistently now. And the reason I raise it now is because the value of this and the need to collect it and in some cases disclose it, will really vary depending on whether it remains as very inconsistent or whether there is some type of definition or guidance that is offered to try to make it more - it'll never be totally uniform but to make it more uniform.

So I think - I just raised it because I think at some point in this process, not necessarily now of course, this group will need to define the elements, not just list them, but define what is meant by them and provide guidance so that people will know what to enter there and what to collect and what should be disclosed. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Steve. And I think the one part of what you're saying that might be relevant now is maybe we could agree on a task for ourselves going forward to do what you just said, to ensure that there are consistent definitions of each of the data elements that we end up with. So I think capturing that and that as an action item as we move forward, once we decide on the elements and make sure there's a legitimate purpose and so forth, I think your point is well taken. And it is consistent with I think with what Michele is saying. So there are different understandings of what that technical contact should be. Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. I mean, I actually tend to agree with Steve, shocker. The problem I suppose with this is that at the moment all of the fields are obligatory. So you do - so you end up - so let's say in the case of a company that, you know, actually has staff and with different - that have different roles and responsibilities, then maybe if they're very involved with and understand the technical things, maybe they're populating those different contacts with different data and it is meaningful.

But I would strongly suspect, based on what I've seen with that with our clients, and with, you know, the clients of other companies, and what we see on a daily basis a lot of the time nobody really knows what those fields are meant to refer to. So you just end up with the admin, the registrant, and the billing, the tech, are pretty much going to be the same. They might be different but if they're different in some cases it's because the reseller of registrar X has a setting set in their control panel to set themselves to be the tech C for all domains on their account, for example.

And I think part of this is that - I don't think it's - we're going to be able to change how people use these elements in many respects, I agree, you know, defining what should be in there would be helpful, but maybe they should become more optional. I mean, there's no point in the technical contact being an obligatory field if the registrant doesn't have a technical contact or know what a technical contact is. I mean, ultimately if you want to - if you want to resolve a technical issue with a Website that's compromised and spewing malware onto the Internet, you're probably better off going to the hosting provider, which more often than not is probably going to be the reseller.

I mean, you know, having more useful fields in there would make more sense to me. And in many cases it's not going to be the registrant who's going to be the best point of contact. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Michele. Let's move on now, if you'd scroll down to what I think is the third page in Adobe, it's called Page 7 on the document that we're looking at, so just scroll down a couple pages, you'll get past the bar graph and then get to the third page in Adobe. And you'll see at the top of that page is a summarized list of the elements that are shaded in green in the support column. So all of these had scores of at least 32 in that support calculation that Lisa did. Doesn't mean there weren't opposition, as you can see, but that does a quick summary.

What we're going to do now, unless somebody thinks we should go a different direction, but what we're going to do now is we're going to take each one of these elements and we're going to look at them one by one starting off by focusing on the pink shaded comments for each one. So you'll see at the bottom of that page for the registrant name, that there are - and continuing I think on - yes, they're all on that page, you can see a dozen or so comments on that page for the registrant name.

Now there are one, two, three, four comments in pink, we'll come back to those unless they're brought up by the individuals who submitted them, but what I'd like to do right now is provide opportunity for those of you who don't think the registrant name should be a possible element in the RDS to share your thoughts on that.

Now before we do that though, because when I read through the comments I, again, found that some people were assuming display or access for some of these elements, and we're not there yet. Okay? We will get there. So what I want to clarify, the way Questions 2-39 were worded, and they were worded the same in each case, was like this: Do you agree this data element should be included in RDS data elements? That's all it said, didn't say it should be displayed, it didn't say people should be given access to it, didn't say it should be restricted or gated or anything else.

Keep in mind based on what we agreed to in our face to face meeting, that was suggested by the group, not by the leadership team, the leadership team supports it, but we are talking - we're not yet talking about those specific elements.

You weren't asked whether access should be provided to anyone, whether it should be restricted or unrestricted. Now, it's understood that if it's in the RDS it would either need to be collected from registrants or provided by registries or registrars as part of the registration system. So I think that goes without

saying if it's going to be in the RDS. Access and display will be discussed later. Stephanie, go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks, Chuck. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I maybe having a case of the holiday brain vacancy problem, but how did we define the conceptual boundaries of the RDS, exactly is the RDS? Is it the data that ICANN insists the registrar collect? Is it the data that we consider will be in a tiered access system? I mean, what is it? Obviously a registrar needs some kind of identification of a registrant in order to sell them, you know, to get the money from them. But it doesn't necessarily have to be a name theoretically, okay? So...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Stephanie Perrin: ...a little reminder of what exactly we mean by RDS would be helpful here. I guess that we're not talking about displaying it but we may be talking about holding it in a repository of a kind, virtual or otherwise. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: And I think, Stephanie, this is Chuck, and others are welcome to jump in, that the way you said it at the end is probably a good way to say it. It's a repository of data elements that may or may not be displayed publicly, that may or may not be given access to certain parties. And we don't know yet whether there's going to be a tiered access system, a gated access system. We're going to have to get to that point. Okay, obviously the EWG has recommended that. And we're going to seriously look at that recommendation but we're not there yet.

So it's a - we're talking about a repository of information that obviously would have some use or there's no use being in there. That does not mean, though, that it would be displayed publicly or that it would have - be displayed to certain people and not others. We'll have to get there. So I think you kind of answered your own question. We're talking about a repository of data elements.

And as suggested in Johannesburg, right now we're just looking at this super set and we're going to whittle it down or up or whatever we decide to do and then we're going to have to take that super set and dig down further. Does that make sense?

Stephanie Perrin: Yes. And just one further point of clarification, then I would further add - this is Stephanie again for the record - that it is a repository of data over which I can assert that it has some control, in other words, it will tell the registrars and or the registries that they have to have data available.

Chuck Gomes: I think that's...

((Crosstalk))

Stephanie Perrin: Right now they assert that control over the data that they ask the registrars to escrow including meta data and financial meta data and IP address and all of that, which is much, much broader than what we have been thinking of as the RDS...

Chuck Gomes: That's correct.

((Crosstalk))

Stephanie Perrin: ...follow my logic here?

Chuck Gomes: That is correct.

Stephanie Perrin: Okay. Good. All right then, I like actually the data elements of which ICANN asserts and has control because that covers a lot more turf. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Stephanie. Any other comments or questions? Now again, some of you expressed that you disagree or strongly disagree with the registrant

name being in this repository. It'd be great if you explained yourself now even if you put a comment in or if you put a comment in, to explain your comment. Stephanie, is that an old hand or did you want to speak again? Okay, not hearing anything.

The - Benjamin, you'll notice, said, "I disagree because of privacy issues." Benjamin, can you explain that? So you don't think that the registrant name should be in this repository of information that ICANN will maintain because of privacy issues, is that correct? Okay, not hearing from...

Benjamin Akinmoyeje: Hello?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, go ahead. Is that Benjamin?

Benjamin Akinmoyeje: (Unintelligible) to respond to that. Yes, this is Benjamin. Well, I feel depending on what the Website is supposed to do, if it's (unintelligible) Website, so in this case the way I understand it is the registrant is the owner of the Website, but if it's one - if it's the typical businessman who's registering like (Nira) in Nigeria, you don't need the personal name of the person, is just the business name of the company. So you note the business name as the entity, which can change beyond having an individual. So that's why I feel an individual's name shouldn't be there but an entity name might be there and it's a business. Does that make sense?

Chuck Gomes: I hear what you're saying. Now let me respond and I encourage others to respond as well. This is Chuck speaking. First of all, and this comes back to the point that Steve Metalitz made that we need definitions. Now in the case of registrant name, I think we have a definition, maybe it needs to be more clearly communicated. But registrant name is the name of - I mean, it's literally the name of the registrant in the registrar's and - excuse me, the registrar's database, registries also in the case of thick data, thick registries, and possibly in the future all registries.

So when we're talking about registrant name, it doesn't necessarily relate to a Website. A registrant may only use their name for email. So you need to think broader than just Websites. A registrant doesn't have to have a Website. Most probably do but the registrant name is a clearly defined element and - now that could be a proxy provider but the registrant name still has the precise definition. It is whoever is the registrant of record with the registrar. So please understand that. Rod, go ahead and jump in.

Rod Rasmussen: Yes, thanks Chuck. Rod Rasmussen here. So I actually had my hand up for a while but this is - this last point was a really, really exemplifies this. So I'm taking this from a - I'm going to design a database perspective, I need to know what elements maybe in it, it may not be for every entry we have one of these things in it. So for the example of being concerned about registrant name for privacy purposes, that's a policy issue where you may or may not put a value into that field but however, for many domain registrants, no matter what we decide on as far as gated and all this other stuff, that will be a field that we will be collecting for at least like commercial entities, for example.

So this is really a list of possible entries that we would have in an RDS system. And this goes to the questions around different kinds of contacts, etcetera, there's not a requirement necessarily that data is collected for every possible thing. And I think the discussion around defining what a technical contact is and all that is very valuable. We actually talked about this at length within the EWG, and we basically said, as far as when it comes to contacts, you could have just one, call it a registrant or whatever you want to call it and that would assume all the roles.

If you want to help people find the right resource to contact in order to solve an issue or buy your domain or what have you, you could add contacts that have those roles and put that in there. That's why these things are listed and listed out separately because you would have to have that potentially as something you would - you would collect and store in the database mainly

because whoever has that domain name wants that information in there to be accessed by somebody in the future.

But I think it's really important to disentangle the need for a field or for data to be in there for some domains versus all domains required. So that's a really important distinction as we go through this if we could keep on the former like are we going to need this for something? If the answer is yes, then it's in. We'll figure out who has to actually put stuff in there later. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: So, Rod, I'm going to come back to you with a follow up question. This is Chuck. Give me an example of a registration that would not have to have a registrant name.

Rod Rasmussen: So one of the things that we talked about doing in the EWG was around that high, what we call it, high risk domain registration where you would actually have an organization that would be a stand-in for people at very high risk.

Chuck Gomes: So that's fine. But it would still have a registrant name, would it not?

Rod Rasmussen: Yes, fair enough.

Chuck Gomes: It may not be...

((Crosstalk))

Rod Rasmussen: I'm not - yes, I'm not arguing...

Chuck Gomes: It's like a proxy...

((Crosstalk))

Rod Rasmussen: Right, right. I'm not arguing for getting rid of registrant name, I'm not doing that at all, what I'm saying is that the value in that field may or may not need

to be collected by, you know, a registrar, for example, if you've got some - so this is kind of the...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Rod Rasmussen: ...a corner case example, but if the registrar is the high - is the service provider for high risk people, they would put their own stuff in there automatically and wouldn't have to collect it. But you'd still have a value in the system, and it would be them. So, you know, from that perspective sure. It's when you get into other ones, you know, what are you going to do, right?

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. And that's what I was trying to clarify. This is Chuck again. So there would be something in that field and probably the example you gave is a good one too, where somebody may be at risk and the EWG report covered that pretty well. But a proxy registration is a good example. You may see in the registrant name field the name of the proxy provider. Now we have a totally separate policy that we don't need to get bogged down in, in this group that has developed some consensus policy with regard to how to deal with those.

But the point I'm trying to make is, and you confirmed it, I think, is that there will be a registrant name. That doesn't mean that may be the actual user of it, if there's a proxy involved or if there's an organization that's protecting someone who's at risk, things like that. But there will be a registrant name even for natural persons. Am I incorrect on that? Okay, let's go to Marc.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. It's Marc. And I think that, you know, the comments that, you know, Benjamin and Rod and you just made sort of touch on the point I was trying to make in my comments here is, you know, if the registrant name field is going to - is going to be used for, you know, who, you know, the privacy or proxy provider is, then doesn't that become redundant with the privacy and proxy field? You know, and looking at the registrant name and the registrant organization, you know, in some ways I feel those are redundant.

You know, we've talked about how domain names are either registered to a person or an entity. You know, and we've had conversations within this group, although I don't think we've come to any conclusions, that potentially registrations to a person are treated a little bit differently than registrations to a company or a legal entity. So I wonder if, you know, registrant - it should be registrant name or organization or registrant name, organization or privacy proxy provider.

You know, it feels like, you know, maybe part of the confusion we have is that, you know, if it's privacy or proxy registration, then the privacy and proxy provider is putting their name in the registrant name field and then, you know, we have Field 29, a little farther down and it's for the privacy proxy provider. You know, it just feels like, you know, again I feel like I'm close to the points other people are making that, you know, maybe we just need to be, you know, clear on the usage of these fields. But it does feel to me like they're a little bit of overlap and redundancy and how we're using these fields.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. This is Chuck again. So if there is a proxy registration am I not correct that the proxy provider would be the domain registrant name in that case? So you're right, maybe, and we'll come to this later when we get to the suggestion for the proxy provider, maybe we don't need a proxy provider name since it's going to be in the registrant name. The point I'm trying to make is that there is a registrant name. That could be an organization, it could be a private entity, it could be lots of things, but there will be one that is captured and if somebody wants to find out the actual user of it they may have to pursue other avenues to get it, but there will be a name there. Let's go to Alex - or excuse me to Michael.

Michael Hammer: Thank you, Chuck. Michael Hammer for the record. So just to point out when we say data element registrant name, this is just a label. So in the case of a proxy provider, it may not be the proxy provider's name is in that field. It might be a code or identifier that they use for whoever registered through them.

Also, in the case of, for example, the company that I work for, we have lots of domains. And the name of the registrant contact is Domain Admin, that the organization is the organization's name. Right? And that's just - so name is a label that is useful for identifier purposes but it doesn't have to be a real person behind domain admin as a name and the email address domainadmin@. There's a number of people who work in that group.

Right, so I think that, you know, we're getting too hung up on privacy and what does it mean for a prox. I agree with others that we should have clear definitions of the intent and use of the various fields, but I don't think we should get that hung up at this point in terms of uses and privacy. We can kick that can down the road.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Michael. I think I agree with you. And maybe it could be called registrant label. But there is going to be a registrant name of some sort, don't necessarily conclude that that's a personal name, or an organization name, or it could be something like Michael just shared, so but there will be a registrant name as part of a domain registration. Okay. Marc.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. Marc again. You know, I don't disagree with anything Michael just said. You know, I completely agree with all that. But you know, from a historical perspective, there's a period of time where people put Mickey Mouse in the registrant name field. It was a very popular registrant name that people used. And they referred to as Mickey Mouse registrations. You know, so I you know, I agree with what you said but I think there's, you know, there's a danger there where people just start putting nonsense in these fields. And so, you know, again I'm not disagreeing with what you're saying but, you know, I think there's a line we have to look out for there. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: So, Marc, you're jumping ahead to our fifth question in the - our statement of work, our charter, and that is accuracy. So we're going to have - we'll have to deal with that. Let's, like I think it was Michael that said, let's not overcomplicate this right now. For every registration there's some label, and I

kind of like that term, there's some label that's called the registrant name. And another thing I'd like to point out, and this has to do with the registrar transfer policy, for those who think that you don't need a registrant name, in the RDS.

The registrar transfer policy requires, and those of you that worked on that policy, some of you are on this call, can correct me if I misstate it. But there's a dispute resolution policy in the case of a registrant - a registration transfer and to resolve a dispute, you have to know who the registrant is because they are authoritative. Now in some cases that may require some - several steps like in the case of a proxy provider or whatever. But to not know who that authoritative person is, would not allow the dispute policy to function. Go ahead, Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Chuck. Michele for the record. Just picking up, I mean, you're looking at kind of these worse case scenarios, another one is if the registrar implodes, they go out of business for whatever reason or they have a catastrophic disaster of some kind. The data escrow requirements at the moment mean that there is a way for somebody to rebuild that data set so that you can see okay, cgomesconsulting.com was registered to some guy called Chuck Gomes. If you don't have that, there's no way to work out who a domain name is associated with. I mean, that's - and that's a problem.

You know, the I mean, you run into these kind of issues all the time as a registrar where somebody registers a domain name say back some time in the mid-90s or early 2000s, don't update - don't update the domain name, the company names change, people change, registrant to email addresses are no longer valid. I mean, trying to untangle that mess is lots of fun and we all make huge amounts of money from pouring thousands of man hours into untangling that mess.

And not having, you know, some of this data collected would make an already interesting challenge just plain impossible. I mean, I think the key

thing, and you said this earlier on, I mean, we're talking about the collection of data, we're not talking about disclosure or display. So from my perspective, I mean, unless you have some way of mapping a contact ID to something then you have to have some kind of way of collecting the registrant name.

And otherwise I just don't see how you can resolve a lot of things even just in terms of just solving disputes between, you know, people within the same company. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. And to keep this thing moving, I want to very quickly look at some of the comments, and Stephanie, I'm probably going to come to you in a minute because you're one of the pink comments in this. But note that Ayden says - and several of us have already addressed this, "Individuals are entitled to protection of their personal information." Nobody disagrees with that. We're not talking about that here. We're not talking about giving you their personal information. If a registrant name is a personal name, we're not saying that that should be given out. So please be clear on that. We'll get to that point and how to deal with it. Their name should not be displayed. Nobody said it should be displayed.

Now, I have to beg to differ with Ayden - and sorry he's not on the all, he says, "If indeed it is collected." If you don't collect the registrant name, then as Michele and I pointed out, there are some things that can't be managed. That has to be available somewhere. Now it may be available for very limited purposes, for example, the case I gave with regard to a domain name transfer from one registrar to another, if there's a dispute on that, the registrant is the ultimate authority. And so if you don't have that, if you haven't collected that, you've got a problem or the domain transfer policy has to be changed.

And after the many, many years of work on that, that doesn't sound like a very good idea to me. Stephanie, you had a negative comment there. Nobody's disagreeing that individuals are entitled to their - protection of their

personal information. I think you get that already. And nobody has said that it should be displayed. In some cases a registrant name may be displayed, in others it may not.

But you say, "Voluntary for those who are commercial," so in other words what I understand you to be saying is that we don't need to have it in the RDS unless it's a commercial organization and then it's optional. Again, if we don't have it, there are some problems. We can't manage transfer disputes, we can't do the things that Michele was talking about. Does that make sense to you, Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie for the record. I think my concern was that we were not really defining what we mean by a name. And a pseudonym or numbered company or whatever, there could be all kinds of methods of registration that do not involve using a privacy proxy accredited registrar, that would still enable you to manage a transfer to respond to court cases, etcetera. So I think I'm really commenting on the lack of clarity here in terms of what exactly we mean by name and I won't wax poetic and quote you Gertrude Stein. But, you know, these things are important.

Chuck Gomes: So you're still not clear on what we...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...what we mean by a registrant name?

Stephanie Perrin: Well, I mean, if I start up a little company and I'm not an accredited registrar and I basically operate a pseudonym service, and somebody uses my pseudonym to register, and they wind up in a transfer disagreement, but we can legally prove who owns that pseudonym, is that not a sufficient name, you know?

Chuck Gomes: I didn't say that it wasn't a sufficient name.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, no so discussing you know, name, I think is - and somewhere else in the discussion I commented that we really needed to talk about what we mean by these data elements before we try to register whether we agree or not because we're not all crystal, crystal clear on what we mean by a data element. I agree, we have to have some kind of a name as I said earlier, in order for a registrar to sell something to somebody, they have to have - they have to know the money's good, they have to have some kind of payment scheme, blah, blah, blah. But getting back to designating the database, exactly what input you put into that field we haven't really discussed and defined.

So yes, I take your point, we need something in there...

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So I wonder if it would help us if we - and who was it, was it Michael earlier that suggested this, may have been, that maybe we should suggest calling this field registrant label because a lot of people seem to be thrown off by the word "name" they automatically translate personal information with that. And it doesn't - in registrar systems for all gTLDs, that name in many cases, is not a personal name.

And it can be. So I mean, would it help us to - would people not get thrown off if we called it registrant label? That can be a personal name, that can be an organization name, that can be a pseudonym, that can be - and it is in reality today, in registrar systems all over the world, there's a registrant name for every domain name registered. And that's what we're talking about in this field. And what we're saying is whatever that is should be in the RDS. Now what we do with it in the RDS we haven't gotten to yet, please remember that.

And is anybody - I mean, anybody - now obviously people are so used to that term "registrant name" but that doesn't mean we - since it seems to throw so many people off, is anybody opposed to changing it to registrant label and we

could make that a recommendation just to kind of a practical logical recommendation, not one of our major recommendations, that the term be changed to registrant label. Anybody opposed to that or have a better term?

Okay, Michele.

Michele Neylon: I'm just looking at - Michele for the record. I'm just seeing some of this stuff in the chat here. I mean, dropping the term "name" is one suggestion that people have put in which is say just registrant. Personally label is fine by me as well. I really don't care. Though I can see some people might have a problem with label. I mean, you know, ultimately it's just a field. It's just a field, that's all it is. I mean, and if people keep on conflating that field with something else, which is not intended to cover realistically, then simplifying it by just dropping the name that might be the way forward. Swapping it for label, I can see some people having issues with it but I still wouldn't have an issue with it personally.

Chuck Gomes: We could just drop the word name and just say registrant. But we are really talking about some sort of a registrant label, there are different kinds of information, would it - Steve, go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, this is Steve Metalitz. I supported the, you know, the idea of saying registrant but if we're going to get - you know, I raise this issue about defining what these fields mean. I wasn't necessarily saying we needed to do that at this point. But if we are going to do that, that's really what you're suggesting, Chuck, you're suggesting that change it to registrant label and define that.

If that's what we're doing now then we probably should be prepared to do that for you know, for the 11 or 12 that are on the list for today and everything else. It does have to happen at some point. But I wasn't necessarily suggesting it has to happen today. I think it would make it a much slower process. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: I think you're right. But thanks, Steve. I appreciate that. So it seems to me - I haven't heard anyone give a convincing argument that the registrant or registrant label or as it's stated right now, registrant name, should not be in this RDS system, okay, this collection of data. So I'm going to stick my neck out and say okay, so we're okay - people on this call are okay. Now that we've clarified, I think, and Steve's right, we're going to have to come back and probably for the sake of everybody else that's going to read our report, make sure they understand this. And part of that may be changing this particular identifier, this particular element. So that should be captured.

Rod, go ahead.

Rod Rasmussen: Thanks, Chuck. Rod Rasmussen again. So and I'm not arguing about the registrant name, I want to try and get it across this concept around especially how we treated it in the EWG and may not have come through clearly the contacts are contacts, and they have various attributes to them. One is a name, one might be a phone number, one might be an address or there's various things that are associated with a contact.

One of those things is a role. One of the important roles is registrant. And in fact there's some defined roles based on the current legal agreements, we can make recommendations about what those should be and have had discussions around - today around defining those roles better.

But if we can treat things as contact entities, that have these data element attributes attached to them, and then a role or multiple roles attached to those contact entities, it might help move this forward, right, because then we're talking about - and instead of going down each data element for - like the admin contact and the tech contact and the - I don't know, the social media contact, whatever it is, we decide what are appropriate types of information to collect to make contacting work and then assign roles to those various contacts.

And I could see a whole concept we talked about separating domain registration from contact registration all that good stuff that we have in the EWG, but it's a mindset, right? Instead of thinking about we have 100 different fields that we have to look at truly there's about 10 fields per contact and then roles get assigned to that. I'm hoping that people see that as a positive way of moving this forward in the more rapid fashion if we can actually think of it that way. And from a design perspective it makes them objects that are much more easier to work with, from building a database and all this other stuff that allows for a whole bunch of good stuff. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Rod. And I think that's a helpful suggestion going forward, so that we don't have to spend this much time on every one of these contact roles. Now I'm going to suggest to staff, and staff, I think you know this anyway, but you have the option of declining this task.

But because a lot of good points have been made in the last half hour or so, with regard to this particular role that we're talking about, and even the term role might be useful, the term label, if staff could take a crack in the next week or so at starting a definition to - about registrant name and then we could follow that kind of pattern for other contacts that we're going to be dealing with over the next several weeks, that would be - and it's just kind of capturing some - a lot of the things that people have said to get the clarity that's needed on this particular element.

But like Rod said, probably we can apply what we've learned on this one to other elements going forward. If staff wants to change that, yes, and I'm fine with starting with the registrant definition that we already have, okay. But I think adding some examples and sharing some of the things that people have said today would complement that and help, because we've had a registrant definition for a long time. Obviously that didn't solve our problem. Maybe we didn't emphasize it enough.

But so let's move on, to the registrant organization, the next one in green. And I think just a comment first of all, somebody had said, well there will be times, I don't think this was the case with registrant name, but with registrant organization this is one of those that is - will not apply in all cases. So what we're asking here is really if there is an organization that a registrant is associated with should it be in the RDS is really what we're asking here.

And again, we had a lot of people think it should be, we had several people that didn't, we had two people disagree and four strongly disagree. And we had three people that commented that they disagree. So I welcome those people and any others that disagree to speak up first. Why do you think this should not be an element in there, assuming it applies. Marc.

Marc Anderson: Chuck, this is Marc. I think I might have put disagree in here just because of, you know, the point you just made in some cases, it doesn't apply. And from the poll, I didn't really have a sense, are we talking about all, you know, all fields if they apply or are we talking about all the fields that must be collected for a domain name registration to occur.

And so I guess my hesitation there was just really, you know, clarification and, you know, I think Rod in his earlier comment, you know, made, you know, made a real good point about looking at these, you know, as fields that, you know, could be collected and, you know, I think we just need, you know, clarification you know, I think based on the discussion earlier you know, most people felt that registrant name or whatever label we give that field you know, must be there, otherwise you can't have a registration.

But registrant organization you know, in some cases it's there, some cases it isn't. You know, I see Lisa is saying in chat, "Marc, data elements may or may not be mandatory to collect." I agree, I just I think you know, I think you know, for my comfort level I need to understand which do we feel we must collect and which do we feel we may collect. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: So thanks, Marc. So this is Chuck. So it seems like on this one we could put a parenthetical after registrant organization as applicable, something like that because obviously, I mean, there are individuals that register, I mean, there are millions of individuals that have registered names and they're not doing that as part of an organization, they're doing it as an individual. So I think we could clarify that.

The - anybody else want to comment? So thanks, Marc, for clarifying yours, that's very helpful. There are a couple other people - Ayden is not on the call. Stephanie, any more comments or have you kind of covered it? Is this similar to your previous comment, Stephanie, since you're on the call?

Stephanie Perrin: Sorry for the delay getting off mute. It's Stephanie Perrin for the record. That kind of covers it. I mean, basically many organizations, human rights organizations, don't necessarily want to put the organization in. And identifying a human without the organization then reduces the level of risk for that human as a contact point. So they may want to just have an individual, they may want to find a pseudonym. So that was exactly the same kind of thing, thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stephanie. This is Chuck. So this one might not only be as applicable but might be optional is what I heard you say. Sorry to put words in your mouth but you know what I'm getting at I think. Yes, so there may be cases where this is an organization associated with the registrant but it may not be desirable to display that.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, and I'd just like to point out that all of my objections to defend organizations that are in need to keeping their identities quiet and individuals who have privacy rights, that doesn't preclude in the design of a database, collecting data elements for organizations who clearly benefit from having more contact, more clarity about which parts of the organization. So in other words, when we were on the EWG I basically was told that Facebook

needed, you know, all kinds of things that the average individual doesn't need. But we need to make sure that these things are optional, thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, so this could be collected even in the cases where - with an option to not display it. Does that make sense? Now in some cases maybe it doesn't even need to be collected and we'll have to get down to that level of detail, but is there anyone on this call that doesn't think that registrant organizations should not be a part of the RDS if it's applicable and if there's an option to not allow it to be displayed? Anybody disagree with that?

Okay, go ahead, Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: The option should be to not collect it as well as to not display it because if you don't collect it then there's no way that a hostile government can come in and demand it.

Chuck Gomes: And that's - I'm glad you clarified that. This is Chuck. So should there be two options, one, to not collect and one to collect but not display or do you think that it just should be an option to not collect? I'm not advocating one way or the other, I'm probing.

Stephanie Perrin: Well I think we're not at that stage in our deliberations but that gets us down into...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Stephanie Perrin: ...comparing this as to (unintelligible). But yes, maximum optionality, how about that?

Chuck Gomes: Okay. That's fine.

Stephanie Perrin: Because you can't - you can't force me to identify the organization, if I'm not going to give it to you I'm not going to give it to you.

Chuck Gomes: Right, agreed.

Stephanie Perrin: Unless you require it by law. You know.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So any objection to moving on from registrant organization with those qualifiers? Okay, let's go to registrant country. And on registrant country there were two disagrees, three strongly disagree, anybody that disagrees or strongly disagrees like the comment on registrant country? Stephanie, is that a new hand?

Now Rod - Rob, I mean, said that address is private data and country is obviously part of address. Is the country of a registration private data? I don't know. And the fact that it's private data doesn't mean that it shouldn't be in the RDS. Now we may not be able to display elements of it but Rod, go ahead.

Rod Rasmussen: Yes, this is Rod Rasmussen again. I'm just going to make a point that I think any argument that we don't collect it because it's private data it - or basically is around policy around whether or not you collect it, not whether or not you have a field in the RDS to accept it for those who, A, want to, or B, you know, have a requirement to do so. So, you know, I think we can short circuit a lot of this by pointing that out.

There is an interesting issue on country for a contact for things like multinational corporations, right. We actually run into the problem of I have multiple countries that I do business in or what have you. So that can be interesting, although most countries do - or most companies do have a primary listing of where they are but there is an interesting case where it's like how would you design this if you wanted to say, you know, I'm Facebook and do business in 120 countries, how do I actually do that, right? So that's an interesting thing to put to the side probably from an implementation perspective but something to think about.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Rod. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Chuck. Michele for the record. I agree with what Rod said. I mean, the thing with the multinational is always an interesting one but I mean, it's the same like Google Webmaster tools you have to tell it sometimes you know, which country you're targeting, can only choose one.

The other thing as well is, you know, depending on the TLD, it might only be open to registrants in a particular country so collecting that is a perfectly valid. Again, it's collection, not - it's not mandatory display so you know, I'd like to see - understand what kind of Internet we'd end up with if there was no way to contact anybody. I just don't understand how it would work. Again, this is - it's collection, not display and that's the bit that I'm having problems with.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

Michele Neylon: I'm all for collection.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Michele. Any other comments on registrant country? Again, Tim, go ahead.

Tim O'Brien: Hey, hello everyone. Tim O'Brien. In regards to country, I have to agree with the other comments that have already been mentioned. I was going to also add to that organizations or companies that are multinational, what I've typically seen is they - whatever location is their headquarters for their technical staff is where they've put that registration information because that's where they registered everything.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Tim. Anybody else? Okay, so I think we're okay with registrant country. Let's go on to registrant email address. Again, it looks like Rob and is Rob on the call, let me - doesn't look like it, okay. Yes, none of us would disagree with him that email addresses are private personal data. But we're

not saying you know, when and where or ever an email address would be displayed. But again, if you don't have a means of contacting the registrant in certain instances, you've got a problem.

So if there's a name - a domain name transfer that occurred, illegitimately, you have to be able to get a hold of the registrant who's the authoritative part of the registration to be able to confirm whether the transfer was valid, whether they supported it and so forth. So if you don't have that, good luck in terms - so anybody could transfer a name illegitimately and the dispute resolver which I think now is ICANN staff, under the new transfer policy, they're stuck. So there's a need for it.

Now that doesn't mean that that email address has to be broadcast to everybody else, but at least the dispute provider needs it so they can get in touch of the - with the official registrant.

Any discussion on email address? Can we move on admin contact and contact ID? Okay, Marc, go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. This is Marc. I don't actually object to email address but I just want to, you know, your, you know, the comments you were making made me think that, you know, is you know, is it necessary to have email address or is it necessary to have the ability to contact the registrant? And I was actually thinking about this because around the time I filled out the poll I had a doctor's appointment. At the doctor's appointment, you know, I filled out some paperwork and they asked, you know, what's my preferred contact mechanism?

And you know, my choices were, you know, email, email, phone or text message, I think, you know, they would call or email me or text message. And, you know, and that sort of got me thinking about how it applies to the work we're doing here and you know, you made me think of that now. You know, is it necessary that you have an email address or is it necessary that

you have the ability to contact the registrant? You know, so you know, my preferred mechanism happens to be email so that's what I selected. But you know, is that what our requirement is or is it the ability to contact the registrant? Is that what our real requirement here? So I don't know, I guess that's just my musings here, but food for thought.

Chuck Gomes: It is food for thought, Marc, so I mean, could it be registrant preferred - you'd probably need a couple fields, but a registrant preferred contact method and then you would have to follow that with a whatever goes with that, a phone number for text, an email for email, etcetera. But so I mean, that's something that might not be a bad thing for us to consider as we look at implementation and even as we look at this particular field, maybe it's not - doesn't need to be email but there has to be a means - I think everyone - I hope everyone would agree that there has to be a means of contacting the registrant.

And so I don't know how we - we might want to put a qualifier with this one that - because it really is, some people don't use email so that's- it's a good point. Tim, go ahead. Tim, are you on mute? It looks like you're on mute based on what I see in Adobe. There you go, well, okay no hand anymore, okay. All right, anybody - so it seems reasonable to put a qualifier on this to not forget what Marc is saying. I don't know how we best do that but let's try and capture that because maybe looking forward, and - it's registrant contact method and applicable address, something like that.

Rod, go ahead.

Rod Rasmussen: Thanks, Chuck. Rod Rasmussen. And there's a good chat going on here, I think Stephanie also chimed in on this that, you know, if you think of your contact program you have in your computer where you're using Outlook or something else or for those of us old fashioned people have a Rolodex, you know, with information written down on how you contact somebody, sometimes you have a phone number, sometimes you have an email, sometimes you have both, sometimes you have their IM. And so the idea

here is collecting the information you need in order to make contact, I think that's the whole point of having a contact, hence the name.

The - and the methodology of how you do it or the number of ways that you may do it in a preferential order you know, if you can't get me via a phone call, drop me an email, right? We all have relationships with people like that. And just the same concept here, so we can think of that paradigm - I think it's useful for what we're trying to do.

Now, that said, I believe there are particular policies and rules set up in the ICANN process that require things like an email address that works and a few things like that. So if we come up with an easing of the, you know, the - you don't have to have an email as long as you're contactable by instant message or what have you, smoke signals, it doesn't matter, then we have to take a look at where that might affect existing policy and vice versa with the policy and we have to maybe drive some of what we want to do.

That's important to keep in mind as we go through this. But I think that if we keep the concept of the contact information is to enable contact and how you do it is not as an important is that you were able to do it in some fashion I think we can make good progress. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: So - okay let me let Marc go ahead and then I'll make my comment.

Marc Anderson: Yes, I know we're getting late but, you know, I do think this is an important point - sorry, it's Marc Anderson again for the record. And, you know, we do have this as one of our purposes for registration data is I think it's Purpose 3 is to facilitate communication. And I'd also like to point out one of the things the, you know, ICANN does I think it's twice yearly the Whois accuracy reporting, you know, their system. They recently came out with a new update on that.

And one of the things they focused on there is contactability, you know, so I do think, you know, it's a really important point and I don't want us to lose that thread. I'm cognizant of the time though so I'm going to cut my comments short here.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. So is there anybody on the call that disagrees with what is number 16 here, the registrant - and maybe rephrasing it, registrant contact address understanding that it may be - it may not be email. Now we can deal with the details of that, the implementation of that and so forth, later. But is there anybody that doesn't think we - there needs to be in the RDS registrant contact information? Steve. You're on mute, Steve, at least according to - there we go.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, this is Steve. I don't disagree with that but of course - but I would be very hesitant to go to a system where we have, you know, one method of contact only and the you know, the registrant chooses which one because the advantage of having multiple - it facilitates contactability if one of them becomes obsolete or isn't working, then you have other potential means of contacting the registrant. So in this case I think redundancy is a virtue and I would not want to see that eliminated. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Good point, Steve. I remember back in the late 90s when we started billing - or mid 90s almost, we started billing for domain name registrations at Network Solutions, and we were mailing the invoices and they came back because the addresses were no good and we had nothing to contact them. So all we had to do was - we had to put the domain name on hold so it wouldn't resolve so they would contact us. It was terrible way to do it but we had no alternative. So your point is well taken.

All right, well we're just about out of time. What I suggest we do in our poll for the coming week, and it'll be a much shorter simpler poll, is state the agreements we've had on the first several of these elements and suggest strongly that people listen to the recording and the discussion and look at the

chat and so forth because I think a lot of misunderstandings were clarified on this call. And if nothing else the poll will reveal whether there's still people in our group who possibly weren't on this call who still are misunderstanding what we're concluding here.

That said, let's see, we don't really have time to cover the next one because I think the next one will take quite a bit of - maybe more time admin contact and contact ID so we'll pick up on that next week. And I think we - at this point it's probably best to just jump ahead to agenda item 3, confirm the action items and propose decision points.

Staff, can you help me out there? I should look over at the notes. Any questions on what the action items are? Amr, go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Chuck. Yes, this is Amr from staff. And yes, my understanding the action items for next week versus the poll you just mentioned, just sort of revisit the data elements discussed today and make sure that all working group members are on the same page in terms of understanding the intent for collection of each one of those data elements. Also incorporating the clarifications suggested today.

Another action item for staff was to take a first stab at defining what a registrant is of a data element and we're dropping name from that label I guess, apologies for using the word label. So we will be proposing a definition based on the one present in the RAA and also taking into consideration the discussion that took place on today's call.

Chuck Gomes: And then probably we want to add to that...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...some qualification to the registrant email address in terms of a registrant contact thing just so we don't lose that concept as well. I'm not sure how to

best word that but I'm sure you understand what I'm talking about, Amr. Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Lisa Phifer for the record. I think to that point, Chuck, Rod Rasmussen gave a good intro in today's call about the proposal the EWG made on a separate contact structure. And possibly staff or Rod or maybe in collaboration we could provide a little overview on what that contact paradigm would look like or what it did look like in the EWG report as a starting point for this group to then springboard and you know, either adopt or define its own variation of a generic concept of contacts.

Chuck Gomes: So, yes, that sounds like a good idea to me, Lisa. So great. Any other action items? Okay, we made some progress and I think the progress we made on the first element will help us going forward on the others as I think it was Rod pointed out. So that's excellent. Thanks, everybody, for the contributions.

And again, thanks for doing that poll because the results of the poll and we'll continue to use those results of the poll - the big poll going forward on this, and so we didn't get to the new elements, we'll have to cover those later and then the plan though would be to - if we decide to consider any of the suggestions on Item Number 40 we'll do a poll similar to what we did on the 38 elements to give people a chance to weigh in on the new ones that are suggested if they look like they're viable.

Is there anything else we need to cover now? Did I miss anything? Staff, let me know if I have. Our next meeting is a week from now same time and station. So we look forward to continuing this. As far as discussion this week, I think the things to - certainly we want discussion about the decisions we made on the elements up to and including the - what is now called registrant email address. But we can also discuss - have further discussion on the other contact - other elements that are in green.

So maybe staff maybe one more action item would be to send out a message saying that discussion topics for this week would be related to the poll items and then the remaining green items would be good discussion topics. And I think there are probably enough in - remaining in the green ones that that's probably a good limit for our discussion topics for the week. Anything else? Okay, went a little over, sorry about that. Have a good rest of the week. Thanks again for the good contributions. And we'll talk online and in our meeting next week. Meeting adjourned. The recording can stop.

Julie Bisland: Thank you so much. Today's meeting has been adjourned. Operator, would you please stop the recordings and disconnect all remaining lines? Thank you. Everyone, have a great day.

END