

**ICANN
Transcription
Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group
Wednesday 19 October 2016 at 05:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-nextgen-rds-pdp-19oct16-en.mp3>

Attendance located here: <https://community.icann.org/x/eBy4Aw>

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

Coordinator: The recordings have been started, Nathalie.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Jamie). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. And welcome to the Next Gen RDS PDP Working Group call on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.

In the interest of time there will be no roll call taken. We will take attendance purely via the Adobe Connect room. So if you are connected via the audio bridge only please let yourself be known now.

Hearing no one, and as a reminder to all participants, please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noises. Thank you ever so much. And with this I'll hand the call over to Chuck Gomes.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Nathalie. This is Chuck. Welcome, to those of you who have joined our alternate time meeting for the third meeting of the month. I appreciate everyone on the call but in particular those that are calling in at less than desirable times. We hope that some of you on the call are benefiting from a more desirable time than you normally get. And that's why we do this.

So does anyone on the call have an update to your statement of interest? Not seeing any hands I will move on then to the second agenda item which is a couple status updates. And Lisa is going to provide those. Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thank you Chuck. This is Lisa Phifer for the transcript. Just giving a brief update on some work that's continuing going on on the possible requirements list. The code review that was undertaken by a set of volunteers, we've had several of those turned in on users purposes, data accuracy and also still a couple still underway on gated access, data elements and privacy.

Those who are still working on their assignments are aiming to complete those this week so that we can have the result of the code review available for the rest of the working group.

At this point the code review really is turning up additional codes that may be necessary for some of those in the possible requirements table rather than any wholesale changes to the codes that were already there. So it may be most appropriate to add those additional codes to the next draft of the possible requirements so we can look at those in context.

The other activity that's going on with the possible requirements list is completion of a couple of outstanding documents that needed to be reviewed for additional possible requirements. The documents on internationalization, that is the translation and transliteration that Jim Galvin is working on. And then still does GDPR, which Greg Shatan and Marina Lewis had volunteered

to work on. Those two sets of documents still need to be added to the possible requirements list.

We have had some forward movement on the privacy proxy, the PPSAI report, getting possible requirements out of those. Susan Kawaguchi is extracting those and we will have those shortly.

And last week of course Stephanie had turned in one set of additional possible requirements from another document. So hopefully we're making forward progress on completing the effort to get the possible requirements list as complete and as coded as well as can be in preparation for deliberations trying to wrap that up within - well certainly by the next working group call.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Lisa. And I want to express sincere thanks to those of you who are helping us wrap up some of these tasks. We're getting pretty close to starting our actual deliberation and the more complete our triage list is of possible requirements the less we'll have to go back and look at source documents and so forth. So thank you very much for that. And we look forward to seeing the completions of those tasks in the next week or so or couple weeks it takes more time.

The big agenda item for today is the continuing our work on the statement of purpose for registration data and RDS. And as you can see, that document is in the Adobe Connect room now. So what I'm going to do is go down to the specific requirements.

Now we're going to - after we finish off looking at the specific requirements, which is the last section of the document, we'll go back briefly just to take a quick look at what we've done so far just in case there are any additional comments on that. But for now let's start off with the specific purpose Number 1 for registration data and registration directory services.

Now we've made good progress on that one in previous meetings, in particular the meeting last week. And you can see it in front of there since nobody is in audio only I won't read it for you. You can see the statement there.

There's one minor edit that has just been made, thanks for making that, I was going to make sure we added an S to gTLD at the end. But I'll pause right now, looking for those that haven't been with us as we worked our way through this the last few weeks. The comments that were submitted on this are to the right. They're - they have a gray background to indicate that we've considered the comments and made a decision to either accommodate them or not. And you can see that when you read the comments there.

And I don't want to revisit a lot of the discussion that we had done Number 1 but certainly if somebody has a new concern or a concern that wasn't be dealt with but you still have a concern about let's talk about that right now. And Marc, I see your hand , so please go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Hey, Chuck. Thanks. This is Marc Anderson. I don't want to belabor this one either but the last two portions of this one have become, you know, extraneous. You can just end this statement, "A purpose of the gTLD registration data is to provide information about the lifecycle of the domain name," period.

You know, stating, "as specified by ICANN, ICANN's (unintelligible) diagram but that diagram may have variations," you know, basically those two statements cancel each other out and are meaningless. You know, so, you know, you can just end that statement, "lifecycle of a domain name," period, and it has the same exact meaning. Thank you, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. I spent quite a time last week talking about the redlined section that's shown in Statement Number 1 so I don't want to minimize the contribution, I think it was Elaine that pointed out that there is not purely one

lifecycle; there's some variations across gTLDs, so that's why that was added.

But what do people think about, I mean, do the last two - the two qualifications there in parentheses add essential value or should we just end it like Marc suggests? Anybody else want to comment on that? Go ahead Holly.

Holly Raiche: Just a comment, if we can get at that sentence but the rest of what we do makes it clear what we think is included within the lifecycle, then I really - I agree with Marc we don't need this.

Chuck Gomes: So you're okay with ending it after "lifecycle of a domain name," in other words eliminating the parenthetical?

Holly Raiche: I am, and the reason I am certainly is debate on this list and probably off this list as to what it actually means. But given that this is just a charter and it's got more parts to it, I am assuming that as we move down through the charter it will be clear what it is we think is in and out of scope. Because I mean, the other alternative is to just stop there and then have a very, very long debate about what is or is not in a lifecycle. There will be differences of opinion and I don't know how we're going to move on from that.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Holly. This is Chuck again. Anybody else want to comment? Is there – okay good. Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. Hopefully you can hear me. I think that - I agree with the deletion as well and I think for me the reason is because this begins a purpose of gTLD registration data. So this is not the purpose but a purpose. And rather than agonizing over what the lifecycle of a domain name may be and trying to cram everything into that as if this were the only purpose, we can deal with other purposes that may not directly relate to a

lifecycle of a domain. And listen, after all this is only Number 1, in a list that we have yet completed. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Greg. This is Chuck again. Let me ask this, if there is anybody on the call who is opposed to making the deletion of the parenthetical information there, would you put a red checkmark in Adobe? Otherwise I'll assume that nobody is opposed to that edit.

Now I fully understand that there may be people not on the call that may be opposed to it. We will give them opportunity to comment after this call on the list during the rest of the week. So anybody opposed please put a red checkmark. And of course you're welcome to raise your hand too if you still want to comment. Okay.

So for now we will delete the parenthetical. And we will go on to specific purpose Number 2. Again, one that we spent a lot of time on last week. But just to give people a chance to comment one more time. Let's look at Number 2.

You can read it there for yourself. So anybody have any comments here? I'm not - what do we have been a Adobe window covering - there we go, okay, thank you. Now okay good. Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan again. I guess just briefly I'm trying to understand what the limitation based on agreed policy is intended to accomplish in terms of limiting this information about domain contact, domain names and name servers. Or is this circular and we're creating the agreed policy?

Chuck Gomes: Well, of course we have the task of creating domain policy depending on what consensus we can reach but there are also policies that – maybe already in place or that will be created by other working groups and approved by the Board that would impact this.

So just to give my response to that, in our call last week in particular, there was that recognition that any – and you'll see this not only here but in other purposes that are in this section. There was quite a bit of sentiment suggesting that that qualifier be put in there, in other words, we don't just provide information for information but that information has to be consistent with agreed policy.

Now whether or not that needs to be there or not we can talk about that. Does anyone else want to comment on that – on Greg's question, because it's a good question. Marc, go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. It's Marc. I'll take a stab at that. I think maybe that language there is a little bit of a concession to the point people, you know, both in previous discussions and, you know, in via email made that, you know, we're not, you know, there needs to be policy to decide or to specify what information will be provided and who will have access to that information.

You know, so, you know, I think it was, you know, a little bit of a, you know, I think, you know, there had been various other caveats proposed and that this language was sort of a generic compromise language that encapsulated or covered the concerns the other people raised, you know, about what – exactly what information will be provided and, you know, who or how that information will be provided, you know, as far as, you know, access to that information. So hopefully that helps give you a little context around how that language showed up there.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. This is Chuck. The – let me ask Greg a question. Greg, do you have a strong opposition to that being there?

Greg Shatan: I guess my concern is just trying to figure out what it's trying to accomplish or more for the point, what it's trying limit or prohibit. In thinking about what we currently have in Whois, in terms of providing information, and I guess providing is an interesting term. I mean, are we talking about – and I don't

remember what the first anymore whether collecting was covered separately or providing and, you know, holding information, you know, are all kind of parts of information while not necessarily in that order.

But trying to figure out what based on agreed policy is trying to fend off. This is – seems to be kind of a fence around things. And, you know, to the extent that everything we do is based on policy and anything that, you know, essentially gets, you know, decided at the end of this and making the recommendations go to the Board, etcetera, and then implement it afterwards is all based on policy.

I'm not sure what it really accomplishes but if it, you know, gives people warm and fuzzies then I have no objection to it, although as I said in the note, agreed policy seems to be an odd term. Is there another kind of policy? And if not, I would just either say based on policy or based on ICANN's policies or perhaps as Cal suggests, based on consensus policy, but then the question is are there – is there another type of policy besides consensus policy? And again, are we trying to, you know, are we being over or under-inclusive because we're trying to modify the term "policy."

And again, you know, trying to get back to the point of, you know, what is it are we trying to prohibit by saying it should only be based on policy or agreed policy or consensus policy or ICANN's policies or some other kind of policy.
Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Greg, for responding to my question. So the – I think Marc said it pretty well that some people were concerned that we're just providing information without any guidance. I agree with you that that is not needed because everything is going to be based on policy.

Now I also agree with you that agreed is probably not the best word, we could say approved policy. We could get more specific like you did and say approved consensus policy and so forth. I would suggest that saying,

“approved policy” would be understood to mean approved by the Board and of course the Board approved it after the GNSO recommends consensus policy. So but I think approved is a better word than agreed. Maybe somebody could come up with a different one.

With regard to your comment on providing or provide, you'll note that Rob Golding had comments about the word “provide” and thought there might be a better one, but none of us, including Rob, was ever able to come up with one that others seemed to think is better than provide. If you have a suggestion there, we could, we would be glad to entertain it and discuss it.

But we did talk about that quite a bit last week. And I asked for people to suggest alternatives. And in Rob's comments on the list he, you know, suggested something that none of them seemed to click with the whole group. So that's that.

It seems to me that, understanding that based on approved policy doesn't have to be there because it's going to have to be - that goes without understanding in terms of what we're doing. But, if there is an RDS it will have to be built on approved policy. So you're right, it doesn't have to be there. I think some people found it comforting to have it there and so I would say we leave it in there if there are no strong objections. It sounds like you are okay with that as well.

Is your hand still up, Greg, or is that an old hand? If it is still up feel free to speak.

Greg Shatan: Yes, Chuck, this is Greg again. Can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Greg Shatan: Okay. I think, you know, for the moment that's okay. Approved policy I don't know if there are policies beyond those approved by the Board. I think here

was mention of registry policies as well. I don't know if that fits in. And as far as provide, you know, in terms of kind of the lifecycle of data, providing is definitely a stage. I see Michele has suggested "manage" and that's kind of a separate stage.

You could manage a database and literally provide access to nobody. So I think those are both purposes. You know, managing the database is one purpose and then providing access to the database is a separate purpose. So and I don't know how granular we want to be but, you know, that's kind of – you collect data, you manage data, you provide access to data. Maybe those are the only three layers to the cake but we should reflect them all. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Greg. As I recall, some of the discussion last week was indicated that the RDS itself doesn't do any managing; the data that is they are can be used by people to manage various things but it didn't really do that. But that's just my memory about some of the discussion that occurred last week.

So if someone has - so I don't think manage works there because I don't think the purpose of - it may be to assist others in managing certain things, but I'm not sure the RDS itself has a purpose of managing information. But anyway we can debate that.

I want to bring up another point here that we talked about on the leadership team this past week and that's the term "domain contacts." For those that weren't on the call last week we decided instead of listing all the different types of contacts that there are, whether it be registries, registrars, admin contacts, billing contact, technical contact, privacy provider or proxy provider or whatever, to just use that term.

Now I think it was Marie On the leadership team that made a suggestion that we might want to add a footnote to explain what we mean by domain contacts. And not necessarily provide an all-inclusive list because there may

be new ones in the future but to explain that all possible domain contacts are meant by that term.

Now would there be, I mean, is there anybody that would be opposed to adding a footnote like that after domain contacts so that it's clear, especially for those that aren't part of this working group as they see this document, what we mean by that? Anybody opposed to that? Okay.

Let me scroll down, make sure I see if there's any checkmarks or anything. Alright good enough. I'm going to suggest that we move on -- oh never mind, Marc, go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Sorry, Chuck. I may be splitting hairs here but I'm not sure, you know, what is, what's the problem we're trying to solve here and is there, you know, domain contacts to me seems like a fairly catchall term for, you know, the contact types we have today, you know, and any future contacts we may consider as part of this working group, you know, noting that the EWG spent considerable time on the topic of contacts and have a great deal of recommendations there. So I expect we'll be changing them.

But I guess I'm not, you know, I'm not sure what problem this footnote is trying to solve. It seems pretty clear to me that, you know, domain contacts are the domain contacts that are possible.

Chuck Gomes: Let me give you an example, Marc. This is Chuck. Like in my mind I never thought of a registry or registrar as a domain contact, but it could legitimately be. I think the problem we're trying to solve with a footnote is for those who have differing views of what domain contacts are. Like some people would think domain contacts are admin, billing and technical, and may restrict it to that. And in this case we are not restricting it to that.

So by providing a footnote that give some examples of what that includes that not limited to I think will help add clarity there so I think that's the problem the

footnote is trying - now I take a you're opposed to adding the footnote, is that correct?

Marc Anderson: I don't want to say I'm opposed to it, I just - I don't feel like this statement makes it anymore clearer for me.

((Crosstalk))

Marc Anderson: I get your point. I get what you're trying to accomplish. But, you know, we're saying okay domain contacts, well all possible domain contacts, so that's a pretty big catchall. I mean, we're not enumerating them here. So I don't know, I question whether, you know, I think it's either, I don't know, I question whether, you know, whether it's actually accomplishing what you're trying to accomplish with it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thank you. Andrew.

Andrew Sullivan: Hi. It's Andrew Sullivan. I'm wondering whether the difficulty here is that we're conflating two classes of contact and not being explicit about it. That is one class of contact is contact information directly associated with a domain name registration and the other is the contact information associated with all of the management's activities related to that domain name or something like that.

Because it does seem to me that what we are trying to do is get the superset of the contact that you would need to know about for the domain name administration itself plus the contacts necessary to understand about the registration and so one. And in that case we could put some, you know, words to that effect in this footnote, this proposed footnote, rather than all possible domain name contacts which I think addresses the previous concern.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Andrew. And I think you're right, were definitely conflating two broad categories of domain contacts. So unless somebody objects, if we add a

footnote, putting that in the footnote would seem like a reasonable thing to do. Let's hear from Lisa.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks Chuck. I just wanted to provide for context for those who weren't on the last call that the way that this particular statement previously read it actually listed out registries and, sorry, I typed registrars in the chat, but I meant to say registrants. Registries, registrants and someone had suggested adding privacy proxy providers.

And the direction that this group went in last week's call was rather than try to enumerate all possible contacts in the policy might end up defining to actually just shorten it all to domain contacts. But that created the problem that was just illustrated here which is that some people read domain contacts to be just admin and technical contacts as we have today in Whois.

So I think the idea this footnote was to indicate whether the wording of all possible contacts is appropriate, I don't know, but to indicate that domain contacts wasn't intended to be limited to those contacts that exist today.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa. This is Chuck. Appreciate that because that really does capture kind of where we were and where we were at last week on the call and why we did this.

Now Marika has asked Andrew a question. It looks like he's responding. I do think, you know, breaking it out the way he suggested might be helpful. For right now so that we don't spend too much time on Number 2 again I'm going to suggest that we go ahead and add a footnote along the lines - breaking it out along the lines like Andrew suggested there. And I see Maxim is typing in the chat as well.

And we'll put that in a new redline that will be produced after this meeting and we can discuss it on the list further. Whether or not the footnote accomplishes what some of us think it might, I don't think it does any harm. So let's put it in

there for now. Andrew, is that your previous hand or would you like to speak?
Okay, thank you. No problem. We all do it.

So okay Chuck still speaking. So let's - unless there are any more comments on Number 2, let's go to Number 3. And again I'll let you look at that rather than reading it for you. And by the way, the same issue comes up with domain contacts in Number 3. And we could just do an edit, or whatever, for the footnote there. Or maybe it's not even needed the second time around. So any comments on Number 3 before we go to covering new ground?

And let's change where it says, "based on agreed policy" of course to based on approved policy.

Stephanie Perrin: Can I jump in here? Can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: You sure can.

Stephanie Perrin: It's Stephanie Perrin for the record. And I apologize, the system still doesn't work so I can't read anything in chat and I'm having to look at the document that was last sent out by Lisa so I'm hoping I'm following correctly.

First thing is just a plea for some kind of parallel construction in these points. If we're going to start with a purpose of the RDS, can we continue that construction as we go along? I also think it's clearer but I won't give you the grammatical arguments for why I think it's clearer. So that would be a purpose of RDS. A purpose, one purpose.

Chuck Gomes: Yes...

Stephanie Perrin: And I'm objecting to the concept of approved policy because agreed policy encompasses policy that's coming from other places. It is not a given that the RDS is only going to include data as agreed or as approved by ICANN. There are other policies - policy in the most broad sense, in other words if we're not

going to put in applicable law and we have to have a broad construction that allows for that.

Chuck Gomes: Well of course, Stephanie, this is Chuck, one of the policies that we could recommend is - and it's actually in registry and registrar agreements already, that we could actually, in our work, recommended the policy that means that applicable law needs to be followed.

Stephanie Perrin: Right, the problem is...

((Crosstalk))

Stephanie Perrin: ...that opens up a whole can of worms where applicable law isn't being followed. So what does that actually mean, you know?

Chuck Gomes: No, I guess I don't know.

Stephanie Perrin: I think it gives us down rabbit holes.

Chuck Gomes: I didn't hear that.

Stephanie Perrin: I think it gets us down some rabbit holes if we do that because there's quite a range of applicable law that I would argue is not being applied.

Chuck Gomes: Well okay, Chuck speaking again. Whether it's being applied or not, that's a different issue. That's compliance management. I don't think we can consider developing policy that if we're going to worry about whether it's going to be enforced or not. I think we have to create the policy and then it needs to be implemented and enforced.

But if we, it seems to me that is a rat hole we don't want to go down is whether we think - well I don't think that's being enforced now or I don't think it will be enforced so we won't do it. If we think something...

((Crosstalk))

Stephanie Perrin: Let me give you an example, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, please.

Stephanie Perrin: ... which is why I'm objecting. Stephanie Perrin again for the record. In the Whois conflict with law ICANN explicitly tells registrars that they have to show harm basically in order to comply with national law. And that particular policy, which is a sort of the key one, we haven't been able to change.

So the actual construction of how they show the harm is not congruent with national law. So what we have is ICANN creating a policy that says break the law. And then when you are harmed or caught, you know, then and only then will we exempt you from your contractual requirements. That's a big rat hole and we don't want to go there.

Chuck Gomes: Well this is Chuck again. And I'm going to get to David and Andrew here. But I think what you're talking about is an issue right now in the sense of I think registrars are reacting to the implementation plan for this very issue, compliance with local laws. And for the same reason you're citing, if I understand the registrars correctly.

So I think we're already down that rat hole in terms of current situations. And but I still don't see how we can govern our decisions based on that particular argument. It's not our job to manage compliance, but it's our job to recommend policies and then we're going to have to work on implementation of those policies to ensure that they are enforced. So I guess I'm still a little bit lost in terms of why you're opposed to "based on approved policy." But let me go on to a couple of other people. David, please.

David Cake: Yes, I mean, I really just wanted to clarify I guess Stephanie already has, that this issue of in accordance with applicable law is significantly complicated by the fact that there is an ICANN policy in place about how to deal with conflicts with applicable law and that policy in itself is the subject of some sort of debate and dispute at the moment.

And we would not want to – I don't think we – it's worth clarifying that we, you know, to what extent we are taking – we are committing to be bound by previous policy work on conflicts with law enforcement or not. If that sort of issue about how we deal with a conflict in or out of our remit, and, you know, are we – are we able to discuss, for example, how that policy might be replaced.

And my personal feeling is that without wanting to sort of jump in and expand our, you know, goal in any way it is within our remit to talk about how – having a policy that – how creating an RDS that is not in – that does comply with all applicable law – we can talk about how that policy might be created and that in itself may conflict with the way that is dealt with in the specific policy that Stephanie is talking about which sort of –which can be taken only to applying to previously created not new policy or something like that.

And there is the real issue here, I don't think about how we – whether or not we are committing to be able to discuss and replace the policies contained in that Whois conflicts with law enforcement policies. All I was really trying to say at this point. And my feeling is that we should be able to suggest totally – different ways of approaching it than that policy. Thanks. That's all.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, David. I want to ask you a follow up and also Stephanie. But my opinion, we can recommend changes. I mean, some of the things we recommend may result in changes to previously approved policy. Now those have to be approved by the GNSO Council and ultimately by the Board, but I don't – I'm not aware of any constraints that would prevent us from doing that if we reach consensus on that.

So my question for you and Stephanie is, am I understanding you to say that you would rather not – you would rather we remove that qualification based on agreed policy – or approved policy? I think Stephanie, you would rather that not be there. Are you saying the same thing? And I want you to confirm that. And you may just speak up, I understand the Adobe problems. And then, David, I'd also like you to answer that question.

Stephanie Perrin: I think I'd be happier without it. And shorter is always better. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, and I think that's what Greg was saying too. This is Chuck speaking. That he didn't think it needed to be there. So we can still consider that. We can still consider removing it. Okay? David, is that what you're – is that your view as well?

David Cake: Yes, that's my view as well.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, David. Okay. Andrew, your turn.

Andrew Sullivan: Thank you. It's Andrew Sullivan. I thought this was early on in the text but I'm unable to find it. That, you know, there should just be a sentence that says (unintelligible) is intended to recommend policy that in any way is inconsistent with local law and where such local law and any policy is intention then local law wins.

And I thought that was something that we'd – for some reason I believed that was already included in early text as a sort of rider before all of the – all of the details.

Chuck Gomes: It was...

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Sullivan: I'm unable to find it.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, it's not there anymore. It was.

Andrew Sullivan: Oh.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Sullivan: So it was there and I've missed it, okay.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, no you're correct.

Andrew Sullivan: It seemed to me that – it seems to me that, you know, this is almost a self-evident disclaimer that really needs to be at the top. And I don't understand how we can – how we can shrug that off. So that seems to me to be the way out of this that we state, you know, as an overriding principle that, you know, national law automatically applies in any registry, registrar or rather any registry – darn it. I hate these terms. Registry, registrar arrangement or any registrar registrant relationship.

And there's no way to avoid that implication of national law as long as one participant is involved. You know, I think we should, you know, state that as a disclaimer, not a principle of what we should do but rather a straightforward acknowledgement that we can't get outside of the legal frameworks in which individuals are working given that we are not actually working under some national framework.

We're, you know, we're ultimately bound by a series of contract law jurisdictions and what we have to do is present the minimal acceptable conditions for most people and acknowledge that some of those conditions are not going to be acceptable to some jurisdiction and then those

jurisdictions are simply not going to be able to conform to this policy. But we are not, you know, we're not some sort of international law creating body.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Andrew. Chuck again. And I believe where that was was what we previously called prerequisites for registration data - registration directory services. And we, if I recall, and I'm not real clear on this, my memory is a little bit fuzzy on this, but it seems to me we decided that that wasn't so much a part of this purpose statement as it is a requirement that we need to include when we can start deliberating on requirements. If somebody can help me out on that in terms of memory that would be appreciated.

But for now, go ahead Lisa.

Lisa Phifer: Sure, Chuck. Trying to reassemble the thread myself. Lisa Phifer for the record. What was done in the previous call was that we deleted the overall goals for the statement of purpose that we did retain a section on goals for each RDS purpose. And Point 3 under the goals for each RDS purpose is to provide a framework that enables compliance with applicable laws. That text is in this document still in this section prior to the one that we've been looking at.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Maybe it would be helpful to scroll back up to that on the screen. Yes, there is. You know, I just looked at that and I blew right past it so it is still there. Worded a little differently but if you look at the goals for each RDS purpose, Roman Numeral 3, it says what Lisa just said so it is there.

Okay. Now let me let Greg talk and then I'd like to close off Number 3 if we can including Stephanie...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...and David's suggestion. Go ahead, Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. It's Greg Shatan – thanks, Chuck, Greg Shatan for the record. Just briefly, more responding to what David and I think Stephanie's point was, with regard to the, you know, based on approved policy, I think that if we are going to have it in one place we should have it in both places, if it provides comfort in one place, it provides comfort in both places.

I don't think we can distinguish between them. And even if it is sort of a kind of surplus-age at least, you know, or state the obvious and least states that we're not going to go beyond policy which, you know, is - if not self-evident still comforting. So might as well just keep it in both places, you know, for the current purposes and at this time. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Chuck, are you still there? We cannot hear you. You may be on mute.

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry. One of the things I discovered was that when Greg and I are - both have our mics open we get the echo and so I needed myself and forgot. So what I was asking was if you're supportive, no wonder I didn't get any response, if you're supportive of leaving "based on approved policy" in Purposes 2 and 3, but a green check mark in the Adobe room please.

And when we get to oppose, Stephanie, you of course can verbalize that. But I'll get there next. Okay so I'm seeing three people definitely for five or six or so. Okay, so now please remove your green - well you can leave your green checkmarks there.

Now those who are opposed to having that there, in other words, you would like to delete, "based on approval policy" in 2 and 3, would you put a red X in the Adobe? And, Stephanie, I assume we can count you as a red X there even though we can't see it. And David, okay.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, I'm a red X, thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so we got a couple. And then a lot of you apparently don't - there's a new red X so we're kind of splitting it. Okay for right now let's put that in parentheses or brackets in both 2 and 3 noting that there is some disagreement on whether we need that were not. Okay.

All right, you can remove your Xs and checkmarks. And let's move on to Number 4. It's a new Number 4 from the previous version so go down to Number 4. And, Stephanie, since you - you're not able to function in Adobe, I'm going to -- well I see you're in Adobe but I don't know if you can read what -- Stephanie, are you able to read what's on the screen in Adobe?

Stephanie Perrin: No, Chuck. Sadly...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I don't want to read it if you can yourself, okay but I will read it. So Number 4 was one proposed by Alex, and I'm glad Alex is on the called. He proposed this a couple weeks ago. "The purpose of collecting, maintaining and providing access to gTLD registration data is to provide a record of domain name registrations."

Now, let me just make a quick edit to this, following Stephanie's suggestion that we have parallel construction. He recalled that when Alex did this we still have the wording as you see at the beginning of this one, and we can make it a purpose of the RDS is, just like the others. But the main point here is to provide a record of domain name registrations.

Let's discuss that. And Alex, would you like to make - your comments are shown there but if you would be willing to just give us a brief explanation verbally as to why you suggested that, that would be appreciated.

Alex Deacon: Yes, sure, Chuck. This is Alex. So it was a few weeks ago now but I think, you know, I had tried to, you know, kind of pop up one level and just kind of

think holistically of what we were trying to do. And this came to mind. I think the change you just made make sense. A purpose, clearly, using the same construct there is a good idea.

But essentially I think, you know, this is a good high-level purpose of what the RDS, well is currently used for and will be used for in the purpose. So I thought I would post it for consideration. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Alex. And it seems to me, and I welcome others to correct me if I'm seeing this wrong, that it is saying something different than the first three, even though there is kind of overlap on all of them to some extent. Let's discuss it. Marc, go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. This is Marc. My first thought is reading this, you know, the original statement, you know, the purpose of collecting, maintaining and providing access to gTLD registration data is to provide a record of domain name ownership. You know, that has one meaning.

And the edits you made actually change the meaning altogether. You know, so you're defining, you know, the statement originally was defining the purpose of collecting, maintaining and providing access to gTLD registration data, which is not the same as the purpose or a purpose of the RDS. So I think those edits have actually, you know, those were fairly material edits to the statement itself.

And I actually think that goes backward, you know, that takes us a step backwards looking at the original versions of purposes 1, 2, 3 and 4, I think we had originally had something along those lines. We said "a system to collect and maintain information about gTLD registration data." I think that was in the original language of, you know, of purpose - of the first purpose or maybe it was the second purpose. I'm trying to read through the edit notes on here to find it.

But I think this actually, you know, reintroduces one of the original statements we had gotten away from. So I'm sorry, I look at this is a little bit of a step backwards. We are rehashing ideas we party discussed.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, Marc, let me - this is Chuck. Let me respond. First of all I want to correct what's in there Adobe right now on Number 4 so it's, "a purpose of RDS is," and it should be, and correct me, Alex, if the edit I tried to make, if this isn't what you agreed with me on. But I think it should say a purpose of RDS is to provide a record of domain registrations."

So a lot of that that's in there now. And the reason they did that is because, you're right, Marc, we used to -- the way the earlier ones were worded was "the purpose of collecting, maintaining and providing access," and we actually decided to move away from that construct and to just do like you now see on 1, 2, and 3, "a purpose of RDS is to provide a record of domain registrations."

So you're right, if we left that in there, and the reason that happened is just timing. Alex was just using, and correct me, Alex, if I'm saying this wrong. Alex was just using the same wording that we had on those earlier ones. So, Alex, go ahead and comment.

Alex Deacon: Yes, Chuck...

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Alex Deacon: Yes, this is Alex. So I think looking at the, you know, the details for this purpose, if I remember it was response to – I think it was Lisa who reminded us of the board resolution, which asked us to define the purpose of gTLD registration data. Right, which is separate from or different from, you know, RDS itself.

So I think if you look at my original purpose it's focused on gTLD registration data, not so much in RDS in general. I suppose we could wordsmith it to be

that, but I think my original intent was specific to defining the purpose of why we need to or should collect gTLD registration data. Does that make sense?

Chuck Gomes: I think it does. This is Chuck. So you would say, A, purpose of gTLD registration data is to provide a record of domain name registrations, is that correct?

Alex Deacon: Yes, that's right. I think that's closer to my original intent.

Chuck Gomes: That's fine. I want to make sure we capture what you – and so he and the others we said a purpose of registration data - or registration directory services is - you're saying gTLD registration data, I think that's probably still okay but I'll throw that open to discussion in terms of that.

That the important thing, in my mind is that, is to provide a record of domain registrations. Do people agree or disagree with that, but that the purpose of registration data? Andrew, go ahead.

Andrew Sullivan: Hi. It's Andrew Sullivan. I keep putting my hand up and down because I don't actually understand this discussion. If the question whether the RDS is to provide information about current registrations or is it something else?

Chuck Gomes: I think that's it.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: They don't necessarily have to be current, I mean, it could be -- we could end up with an RDS that show some passed information too. But the point is it's a record of domain registrations.

Andrew Sullivan: So that is – (unintelligible) in my question. So it seems to me that one possible requirement here is that it provides information about whether a given name is registered; and a second question is whether a given name

has been registered. Those are two different issues. And I think - and my opinion is that at least the first of those is almost certainly a purpose, and it's an open question (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Do you think that the second one is not?

Andrew Sullivan: I simply don't know. It seems to me that it's a possible thing that this is, essentially the distinction between Whois and who was.

Chuck Gomes: Right, right, okay got you. Yes. And that's going to, I think, have to fall out when we're talking about RDS requirements. So we may not recommend that there be any who was in there. But this seems generic enough that a record of domain registration, what the record is is going to be determined by any policies that we recommend. We're back to the qualifier of, based on approved policy, but that's another issue that we won't go back to right now.

So, I mean, is there anybody opposed to the formulation for Number 4 that on the screen in Adobe right now? And Stephanie, for your benefit it says, "A purpose of gTLD registration data is to provide a record of domain registrations." Is that an old hand, Andrew?

Stephanie Perrin: If I could jump in, Chuck?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Sure, go ahead Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: It's good enough at this point. And we need to save some time to find over Item 5.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, okay. Thank you. Appreciate that. Marc.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. This is Marc. I don't have any issues with Number 4 but I want to jump on something Alex said. I think Alex introduced a new purpose that isn't covered by anything we've discussed before, and that's, you know, I think we focused our conversations so far on discussions about, you know, domains that are registered.

And Alex pointed out that that's, you know, that that's not the only purpose, you know, there's another purpose in identifying if, you know, if a string is registered or available for registration, if it's not registered at all. You know, so I think that the purpose. You know, I'm thinking maybe that's a new purpose altogether that we haven't covered so far. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: So, Marc, a question for you. Don't you think that the way this Number 4 is worded is that it could be encompassed in Number 4? It just says, "provide a record of domain name registrations." It doesn't get any more specific than that. It seems to me what you just said could be included in that. Now I'm not opposed to adding another one that just in my own personal observation it seems like that's broad enough that it could be inclusive in that. But if there's value in making it more specific and you want to suggest that, I will take that as a suggestion.

Marc Anderson: I'm thinking as I go here, and I think maybe it's broad enough, "provide a record of domain name registration," but maybe, you know, what's implied there but not stated is, you know, "provide a record of domain name registrations," you know, or, "if the registration doesn't exist," or, "the string is available for registration." I think, you know, I think the point there is, you know, one of the most common use cases for who is today frankly is to check if a string is available for registration. And it's a very, you know, common use of Whois. And so I would assume that that would be a use of RDS as well is to check, you know, is the string available.

And so, "provide a record of domain name registration," that's true if the string is not available and it's registered. But, you know, it would also provide an indication of a string that's not a domain name registration. I apologize...

((Crosstalk))

Marc Anderson: ... I'm thinking on my feet are a little bit as I go and I'm, you know, I'm not sure that was completely clear but...

Chuck Gomes: So let me try and accommodate what you're talking about and see if others supported. So what if we were to add to Number 4 a comma at the end of that statement and then said, "including whether or not names are available."

Stephanie Perrin: It's Stephanie, Chuck, can I jump in here?

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Stephanie Perrin: Is it not the case that if a name is registered it's either not available or you're going to have to make an offer? If it isn't in the list, i.e. purpose is to provide a record of registrations, if something hasn't been registered it's available, right???

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: That would be my assumption. That's why I made the statement I did...

Stephanie Perrin: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...about it being broad enough.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ... have the clarification I don't have a problem with that.

Stephanie Perrin: I would resist any attempt to try to imagine names that are not available but are not registered such as, I don't know, country code names, you know, second-level strings that people are trying to protect because we do not want to broaden the RDS into including everybody's trademark that can be registered, okay? They weren't heading with this?

Chuck Gomes: Yes I do.

Stephanie Perrin: Let's keep the black and white.

Chuck Gomes: So you would leave it just as it is without adding anything?

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, I think as soon as we start adding qualifiers to it there will be exceptions to that. Oh yes, it's not in there but that doesn't mean it's available.

Chuck Gomes: Right. Okay. Thank you. Andrew.

Andrew Sullivan: Hi. It's Andrew Sullivan again. Thank you. I proposed something in the chat for how to word this. There is a potential issue here because of so-called variant names. So it does seem that distinguishing among available versus registered versus not available for registration is a possible - a distinction that we want to make.

And I will tell you all that not available for registration could well be a useful output from a variant system, that is you've got, you know, different internationalized domain names. And one of them is a variant of the other. Just set aside whether variants are real or not. And, you know, it's useful information to know that some so-called variant is not available for registration to you because the registering party exerts a claim over a different string because of some other thing that they've registered.

So it does seem to me that we've got to have a sort of try - sort of three values information that comes out of this. And it also seems to me that that really is a fundamental value of the RDS.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Andrew. And my response to that, and this is my personal response okay, is - and I think I'm having more sympathy for what Stephanie was saying. So when we say whether it's registered, whether it's available for registration or unavailable for registration, we're starting to get into requirements and saying, okay so where does the reserved name, does the RDS then have to show reserve names, names that no one is allowed to register or names that the registry reserves?

I think Stephanie is right that as soon as we start going down the path of being too specific here we are getting ahead of the game in terms of requirements. And where would reserve names fit? I guess it would be unavailable for registration. So we are now seeing the purpose of the RDS is to show what names are reserved. That could be a requirement we decide later on. I don't know that we can say right now that's the purpose of an RDS.

But I'm just one person. Even though I'm the chair, I'm just one person so I will go with the group on this. But I wanted to point that out. Greg, you're up.

Greg Shatan: Thank you. Greg Shatan again. Let me turn down my speaker volume, maybe that'll help Chuck's echo. I think we are kind of creating a slippery slope that doesn't really exist. I don't think anybody who has suggested that a purpose is to determine availability is really -- is suggesting an absolute kind of clearance as to availability against reserve names and blocks names, you know, other such things.

You know, the fact of the matter is, you know, if you go on a Whois today on Go Daddy and you put in, you know, (scanalangadingdongboo.com) and put it into Whois and, you know, press a little button, what you get back is yes, your domain is available. Buy it before someone else does.

The fact of the matter is that people use this to check, quote unquote availability. Then they see it available, which doesn't mean absolutely registerable. That's not the same thing. It's not in the Whois database, it is not registered to another registrant.

So maybe the problem here is that we are defining availability or that, you know, we're trying to be too accurate in defining the term "availability" and this is just essentially a knockout type of search. We know that it's not registered to another registrant, whoever that person might be, because you, you know, you look at Whois and it's null; there's, you know, nothing in the database to match that string.

That's all that people who are talking about availability mean by availability. Nobody is suggesting this should contain all sorts of - it should contain, you know, non-domain name registration data sets. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: So Greg, this is Chuck, what would you do with Number 4 (unintelligible) right now?

Greg Shatan: I pretty much leave it as is. I mean, if we want to put a footnote that says availability means that the string does not appear in the Whois database, and does not imply that the name is actually registerable, technically registerable, putting aside claims notices and all that other stuff.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Okay. Okay (unintelligible) audio is off now so I'm not echoing. So thanks, Greg. Let's go to Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Chuck. Michele here. I think there's a bit of confusion between Whois lookup is and what a domain check/domain availability lookup is. They're two totally different things. If you go to a registrar's Website, be that Go Daddy, ours, or anybody else's, we are not using Whois to see if the domain is

available or not. We're using a combination of EPP and other things to see if a domain is available for registration or not.

Using Whois for that is not reliable for a multitude of reasons. I mean, there's been quite a bit of backwards and forwards in the chat around this. I mean, some of the registries will put reserve names in Whois marked as reserved but not all of them do that. Some of them will put in the other kind of statuses into Whois that not all of them do that.

So as a registrar, we have to load list of names into our backend systems in order to give people as correct answer to the question, can I register this domain, as possible. So, I mean, I think there's a confusion between Whois as in the technical Whois service and domain availability checks. And confusing the two is not helping.

I mean, for some registries, for example, you know, we use things like a domain availability check just gives you a binary yes/no type answer. Using Whois is not reliable. It is not reliable, and I just wish people would stop saying you can use that for availability. You can't.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Michele. Marc.

Marc Anderson: Hey, Chuck. It's Marc again. You know, I think I inadvertently opened a little bit of a can of worms there. You know, I apologize to everybody for, you know, speaking without thinking through what I was going to say first.

You know, I think, you know, I agree with, you know, a lot of what people have said here, you know, including Michele. You know, I think, you know, I've been convinced by the conversation that the purpose of RDS is to provide a record of domain name registrations, you know, and that's it.

Any assumptions you make about things that are not in the RDS, you know, you do so at your own risk. I think that's, you know, the purpose is not to

provide information about non-domain name registrations; it's just to provide information about domain name registrations and that's it. So, you know, I think, you know, again I apologize if I took us off on a little bit of a tangent there. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. Okay, so let's look at Number 4 the way it's worded now on the screen, and Stephanie, that qualifier has been taken out so it says, "The purpose of gTLD registration data is to provide a record of domain registrations," period.

Is there anybody that is opposed to that as a purpose? Would you put a red X in Adobe or speak up if you can't put a red X in? I'm not seeing any red Xs. So I'm going to conclude for now but that's okay. Now we only have about five minutes so I at least want to allow a few very brief comments on Number 5.

And this, Lisa, added this in the chat I think last week based on discussions we had last week. So it says, "The purpose of RDS is to provide an authoritative source of accurate data." Oh, and Greg, I see you disagreed with Number 4, is that correct? Greg Shatan.

Greg Shatan: Yes. Yes, I do disagree with the removal of that. I think we're ignoring, you know, the real world. And maybe people shouldn't be looking at Whois to see if they are out of luck in looking at, you know, potential domain names. The fact of the matter is they do. And if there is some other availability tool that is in Whois, you know, maybe people need trained to go there.

But, you know, that's a, you know, maybe we need to look at that and how does that interact with the RDS if at all. You know, the bottom line is that people who are looking to register a domain or five domains or 10,000 domains, maybe those were looking to register 10,000 domains have other tools at their fingertips. But somebody who is looking to see whether, you know, bumpcitydrugs.com is available, because that's what they want to call

their Website, because that's their new little business, you know, a lot of them go to Whois.

So that's, you know, that's the issue. So I think that's just a reality of how people use this, potential registrants of all types. And it's not, you know, trademark owners. It can be, you know, buygoodstuffhere.com. This is just a real world issue. Ignoring the fact that people are going to Whois to do this, you know, I don't think helps us unless we provide, you know, an alternative in the world for all the people who want to register more domain names.
Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Greg. This is Chuck. And I don't know why we didn't get the echo there, that was nice. But I would say that the way Number 4 is worded doesn't at all prevent someone from using the RDS for that purpose. I think all that most people are saying in the chat and verbally is that that's not really the best way to do it, and so it's not a purpose because of that; we wouldn't call that a purpose of the RDS.

If it's used for that, there's nothing to prevent that. And we will have the option when we develop requirements to in fact put that as a requirement if we think it should be. So let's take a quick look at 5.

“A purpose of RDS is to provide an authoritative source of accurate data.”
Now accuracy, we've talked a lot on the list and over the last few weeks and certainly on the call last week. And all Lisa was doing, and Lisa, you're welcome to comment if you want to add anything to what I'm saying, was to throw this out as a way of dealing with that concern by many in terms of accurate data.

We have time for a few comments on this. Anybody want to comment on what is now shown as purpose Number 5? Go ahead, Marc.

Marc Anderson: Thanks Chuck. This is Marc again. I guess I was kind of hoping somebody else would jump in first. But since nobody else is I'll start. I guess I don't agree that a purpose of RDS is to provide an authoritative source of accurate data. You know, I think, you know, and I'm not saying we wanted to provide inaccurate data, you know, I'm not advocating for bad data. You know, I certainly don't want one thing to be construed as that.

But RDS is, I think the purpose of RDS is to provide information about what the data is, you know, what data is in the system whether it's accurate or not. And I think there are other mechanisms that have the purpose of getting to accurate data or ensuring that the data is accurate. You know, there is a, you know, Whois accuracy program in fact that, you know, that's the purpose of getting accurate data.

The purpose of RDS is just to provide, you know, display the data that is. So I, you know, you mentioned that we had this accurate discussion a number of times now and, you know, I have objected every time. I think it's, you know, it's just to display the data; it doesn't have a direct role in the accuracy of the data. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Marc. Anybody disagree with that? Speak up please.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie. If I may jump in here?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Stephanie Perrin: I agree totally. And I want to pick on authoritative. Even in the EWG I think we never got past agreement that the registrars were the authoritative source of data. So there's no way the Whois will ever be the authoritative source of the data. It's a record. It's not the authoritative source of accurate data. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Stephanie. Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan again. I am in favor of 5. And we can, you know, quibble about the words authoritative, what that means, but, you know, clearly we should be striving for accuracy, not striving for inaccuracy. You know, this is not to say that we are going to reach perfection. There are, you know, clear limits any real-world scenario as to what – how much accuracy can be achieved. But in terms of, you know, we want good data in there. I don't think it would be acceptable to registrars if the data that was needed to run people's credit cards was inaccurate, you know, beyond whatever tolerances are built into that.

So it, you know, should be the same. And we have long discussions about, you know, fault tolerance of accuracy and all that. And I'm – we're not talking an absolute here or at least we shouldn't be but we're also -- the idea of trying - of kind of, you know, avoiding accuracy as, you know, a feature of this, you know, again just seems bizarre. I know people don't - there are people who for various reasons don't want an accurate database. I just I continue to not get it as to why that, you know, shouldn't be dealt with here.

And in terms of authoritative, you know, it is supposed to be the one database where everyone is entering stuff. So to that extent it is the authoritative database just like the list of, you know, attorneys registered to practice and New York State that's kept by the, you know, appropriate, you know, court body as the authoritative list. You know, there is a place where, you know, stuff goes and this is - it's got to be good stuff and it needs to go somewhere. That's it. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Greg. Chuck again...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: Whether it's one database or many, you know...

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I'm going to go to Andrew and then for very brief comments because we're over time. And I want to point out that I don't think anybody has (unintelligible) data, nobody is advocating an accurate data so let's be clear on that. So – and Andrew, you took your hand down, if you really still want to speak put it back up. Susan, go ahead.

Susan Kawaguchi: I just wanted to say that I would not feel comfortable removing 5. And I could go either way on authoritative but a purpose of RDS is to provide a source of accurate data, it is imperative to our work.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Andrew, go ahead. Thanks Susan.

Andrew Sullivan: I thought that, you know, we were heading in the right direction and then we were not so I put my hands back up. I'm sorry. I think that this Item 5 is incredibly dangerous particularly as stated here. If we put, as a sort of preamble statement that, you know, we assume that the data in the RDS ought to be as accurate as possible then I'm okay with it. But I do not believe this is a purpose. I think this is incredibly dangerous statement of purpose because it lends itself to enforcement practices as part of ICANN and registrars and registries and so one that are incompatible with the way that the actual DNS system works.

We cannot conceivably claim that the purpose of RDS is to provide an authoritative source of accurate data. At the very best it can provide an authoritative source of the best data we have. And if we are going to include in this working group's output a number of requirements that entail accuracy provisions, I think that we are well beyond our remit.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Andrew. This is Chuck again. And I've got to wrap it up. Sorry for going over. We're going to continue this one next week. Our meeting next week will be at our regular time. And the comments that have been shared will be added to the comments in the table here for next week. A redline will be put out using the latest language, the latest changes for the previous parts

of the document, in particular the only thing we changed tonight was in this last section.

And so the rest of it will stay the same. And then the comments will be added for Number 5 so Number 5 will be continued next week. Very quickly, Marika, can you give us a quick update on the planning for Hyderabad?

Marika Konings: Yes, Chuck. So this is Marika. Just a note that the schedule has been published and our meeting is, as confirmed before, starting on Day 1 at nine o'clock in the morning. I think we're planning to run until 1:00 although in the schedule currently lists us until 12:15. If I'm not mistaken I think the meeting is taking place in Hall 6.

And staff will be working with the leadership team on developing the agenda and related materials for meeting.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Marika. Again I apologize for going over but thanks for the good discussion, we made some I think reasonably good progress today. Please continue the discussion on the list especially after the new version is sent out so that we can hopefully save time on our discussions in our meeting next week. With that said, is there anything else I need to cover? If not, meeting adjourned. Thanks.

END