ICANN Transcription
GNSO Next-Generation RDS PDP WG
Tuesday 31 May 2016 at 1600 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Next-Generation RDS PDP WG call on the Tuesday 31 May 2016 at 16:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The audio is also available at:

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-nextgen-rds-31may16-en.mp3

Coordinator: Your recordings have started, you may now proceed.

Michelle DeSmyter: Great. Thank you so much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the GNSO Next Generation RDS PDP Working Group call on the 31st of May 2016. In the interest of time today there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect Room. So if you're on an audio bridge today please let yourself be known now.

All right thank you. I'd also like to remind all participants please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And also keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. So with this I'll hand it over to Chuck Gomes. Sir, you may begin.

Chuck Gomes: Hello everyone. This is Chuck. My apologies for being a little late. I had some connection problem, not sure why. But anyway I'm in now so we won't worry about that. I don't think I heard anyone that is not in Adobe. If that's incorrect please let me know. And all you need to do is speak up if you want to talk instead of raising your hand so just let us know. Welcome to all of you to the

call. We have - the agenda is in front of you in Adobe there. And the first thing is to ask if there are any updates to statements of interest. So I'll pause just a few seconds and see if there are any hands raised or anyone speaks up.

Okay well let me start off by thanking those of you that have volunteered so far. We're making some good progress on our requirements list. And I'm very happy to see that. In just a moment Lisa will give us an update on our progress so far. And hopefully we'll get more volunteers either during or shortly after this session today. So let's go ahead and go to agenda Item 2 and start off with a progress update from Lisa. Hopefully all of you saw the latest version of draft two that she distributed earlier today. And that's already changed probably because they're - I see activity on the list which is great so and it'll keep changing as more requirements come in and as we get more volunteers. So let me turn it over to Lisa to give us a progress update.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks Chuck. This is Lisa Phifer for the record. I'll - I've displayed on the Adobe Connect screen the latest signup sheet as of roughly two hours ago. I believe this is fairly current. But you can always find the most current version of this signup sheet by visiting the link show in this - both in this document and in the meeting materials. At this point we have really quite a flurry of volunteers signing up for to Cover T and put documents over the weekend. So far we have 29 documents covered by individual volunteers. Either in a couple cases volunteers have actually completed their first assignment and gone on to a second document.

I note that there was a request to let you scroll the documents. So I've gone ahead and turned that on for you all. At this point as I said we have 29 documents covered one way or the other in terms of people volunteering to cover them. We have eight of those documents actually reviewed and submitted as possible requirements. And those are reflected in draft two of the possible requirements list that was circulated for me very late last night. I noticed that in the documents that we have covered although we have a fairly long list of key input documents that we've identified to date we only have

eight documents that had been identified as sub teams as being particularly relevant that still don't have volunteers. So we're doing a pretty good job of at least hitting the documents that the subteams have identified as particularly relevant to the work of this working group.

Just to recap that process that we're using the signup process we had originally envisioned that you would be able to sign up following the links, sign up yourself online. We encountered a permissions problem that was a permissions problem that applied to our entire wiki. And IT has been sorting that out with the direction of the GNSO secretariat. It was a holiday weekend so it's taking us a bit longer but we do expect to have that sorted out so that not only will you be able to sign up yourself but in the future when we have the need for working group members to edit documents we'll have the capability to do that as well.

For now however if you wish to sign up for a document and haven't done so already the way to do that is to just send email to the working group mailing list or to any member of staff and we'll get you signed up. We are asking that people sign up for one document at a time. That is and to encourage broad participation in this exercise and also to allow the maximum amount of parallel effort.

As you know the original due date that we set for this was today. And that has turned out to be fairly tight. And many of the volunteers that have signed up in the past few days have indicated that due date couldn't be met but with some small reasonable extension that they'll be able to cover the documents they've signed up for.

When you do sign up to cover a document what does that mean? That means taking the document that's linked to the key input document list, going through the document to identify what you see as possible requirements stated within the requirements and then either quoting or paraphrasing where

necessary from that document what you see as the potential requirements falling into phase one.

When you quote or paraphrase that potential requirement we ask that you identify which of the charter questions it is associated with. In some cases it's inevitable that the section you quote is related to more than one charter question. But when you can unravel the source document and actually pull out possible requirements that are specific to one charter question that will be helpful in the future as we try to actually deliberate on the charter questions.

Once you've done that extraction process you submit it by email to the full working group list and staff will consolidate those possible requirements into the possible requirements document. We're now at draft to covering the eight documents that are done so far. And as part of that consolidation process we'll take care of the unique numbering, both of the document you're pulling from as well as a numbering the individual requirements within the - each of the charter questions. So I know that was a question that was raised on email earlier today. And I think that's our progress update. Chuck, back to you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Lisa. This is Chuck again and just a couple questions, maybe a request and one question. Now the question is this. If a requirement that somebody submits that it duplicates another requirement maybe even from a different source document, that is also suggests the same requirement how will you handle that? I assume that people don't need to worry about that right now. They can just go ahead and submit them and we will match up those that are duplicates later on. Is that correct?

Lisa Phifer: That is correct Chuck. This is Lisa speaking again. That is correct. In fact it's useful when we get to deliberation to actually have the very similar, sometimes they're not word for word duplicates but even very similar requirements in the list. So we'll keep all of those in the list. And then when we get to deliberation we'll be able to as a working group take a look at those

requirements that seem very similar and see if they are in fact the same requirement where now we'll include all those in the list.

Man: Hello? (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: All right, somebody need to be on mute or trying to speak and not in Adobe? Okay anyway thanks Lisa for answering that. Now - and my next suggestion you may want to postpone till later in the agenda and that's perfectly okay so just let me know if that's the case. But you mentioned that there are at least eight sources that were identified in our summarizing of the documents as particularly relevant to our work that haven't had people volunteer for yet.

Could you identify those eight documents? And if you need a little time to get that done that's okay. But it'd be really nice if even on our call today we could get commitments to somebody to take a look at those to pull out any possible requirements from those.

Lisa Phifer: Yes Chuck, I assume you're asking me. And I do have a short list of those eight documents that I cross-referenced. I may have missed one or two. And the sub team members that covered them can always bring those back up but if you like I can list those now and we can go to the call for volunteers. I noticed that we also have another quick question in the list and perhaps we should answer questions before we call for additional volunteers. But that quick question…

Chuck Gomes: That would be fine. This is Chuck. Go ahead Lisa.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks. That quick question was from (Aiden) and he asks if the document doesn't specifically refer to the RDS should we capture the possible requirement and extend them to be relevant to the RDS? And my answer for that (Aiden) is that if you see that it would apply to either Whois or a next generation system then yes, refer - capture that possible requirement. And if you do need to paraphrase to cut to the RDS do so.

If you don't see that the requirement has anything to do necessarily with registration data or registration directly services then it may not be applicable. But you'll have to make that judgement call as you go through the document.

Chuck Gomes: Kathy Kleiman this is Chuck. We're always talking about possible requirements right now. So just assume that. Once we start deliberating and we reach some level of consensus then one it'll be a proposed requirement. But even then it won't be final as the PDP process goes forward. Kathy Kleiman go ahead and you have your hand up. Go ahead and speak.

Kathy Kleiman: Great. Thanks Chuck and thanks for clarify that. You know, I've had a problem with this word since the beginning because I think it creates unnecessary confusion. And I so wish we could come up with a different word. But calling it possible requirement if we could use that phrase would at least help.

So let me ask a different question because there are requirements today obviously in the Whois. So I just wanted to check because I'm hearing this question so let me check it with you that actual requirements today are not necessarily requirements tomorrow right? They would be listed as a possible requirement for tomorrow, you know, for the art and actual - let me rephrase it. An actual requirement today in the Whois would currently in our work be listed as a possible requirement for the RDS of the future question mark, is that right?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Kathy Kleiman. This is (Chuck). Yes that is correct.

Kathy Kleiman: Great, thank you.

Chuck Gomes: So okay I guess I don't need to - if I need to say more I can but it's an excellent question and I appreciate you asking it so very good. Any other questions that anyone has before Lisa identifies the eight documents that it'd

be really nice to get some - a volunteer for each one on? Okay, I assume that's your old hand Kathy Kleiman. If not, go ahead and speak.

Kathy Kleiman: Sorry Chuck, old hand.

Chuck Gomes: No problem. Okay, and while Lisa's preparing to identify the eight particularly relevant documents let me point out and follow-up to Kathy Kleiman's question that the - everything we're doing is really possible until the - even though there are contracts in existence right now with registries and registrars that have what in the agreements were called - the old agreements were called Whois requirements and are now called RDS requirements those can change. If we - this working group down the road is - recommends some consensus policy if approved by the GNSO and GNSO council and then the board approves it contracts can change. And each of us contracted parties -- and you know that I'm associated with a contracted party -- we're obligated to implement consensus policy. So if the requirements change we would be obligated to implement the changes.

Okay so it looks like Lisa is identifying in the chat documents that haven't been covered. And so to the extent that we can do it on this call what I'd like to see if we can get any volunteers. Now I know that some people are - because we restricted it to one at a time there's probably someone in the wings for SAC 51 if nobody else gets it but we're trying to spread the wealth and let multiple people participate. So let's see if we have any volunteers. And you can either raise your hand -- and I'll get you in just a second Mike -- or volunteer in the chat. Okay Mike your turn.

Michael Palage Thanks Chuck, Michael Palage. I just wanted to follow-up on one point that you had just raised with Kathy Kleiman about the contractual requirements. So there already have been certain registries, .nyc, (joeberg) that have made changes to the RDS requirements and have added additional fields. So I think it's always important. Your point is very valid if ICANN was to make a consensus policy that becomes mandatorily binding on all contract parties as

opposed to individual registries choosing to add additional fields that may meet their business requirements.

So I think it's always important that we kind of keep that perspective that what we're - I think what this group is talking about is perhaps establishing what our mandatory baseline requirements versus what a particular registry operator may want to do in adding other fields. So just wanted to point that out.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Mike. This is Chuck again. And of course Mike knows this stuff very well. But it - probably to add a little bit to what he's saying, when we recommend consensus requirements and they get appropriate approvals there is the possibility that there could be individual carve-outs even in the consensus policy for certain situations. So we shouldn't feel overly restricted and think that there can't be an exception. The exceptions are not supposed to be the rule.

But like he pointed out there are situations with particular TLDs because of their specific needs that they do need to have a carve out. So that's certainly a possibility down the road. So thanks Mike for pointing that out.

Michael Palage   Thanks Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: And good information going on in the chat. And it looks like there's a request Lisa for an email with the list. I'm sure that's doable. And it looks like we've got a volunteer for one document in there. Sorry, I'm having trouble keeping up with the chat.

Lisa Phifer: Chuck just this is Lisa Phifer just to follow-up on that request, there was an email sent roughly an hour before this call with just the list the…

Chuck Gomes: Just the list of the eight?

Lisa Phifer: Oh I'm sorry, just a list of the eight? No, we can do that as well.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, let's do that.

((Crosstalk))

Lisa Phifer: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. This is Chuck. So thanks Lisa. Yes, do just the eight zeroing in on those. And let me say and Mike I'm assuming that's an old hand. If you leave it up I will call on you in just a second. The reason I'm - I think it's a good idea to focus on the A I think all of us as we were reviewing the many documents that many of you prepared summaries for and everything we found some documents that were more current than others and had more up to date information. So it won't be surprising in our list of volunteers for the various sources not all of them will probably be covered because some of them may have been superseded by a more recent document and that's okay.

And also it's possible that we may discover some later that we add and that's okay too. We want to get as complete a list as possible early on here because our next step in our workplan, Step 9 is to reach out to the community again with a second outreach. I know number one is still going on -- that's okay -- and let them take a look at the requirements that we've come up with so far and contribute as well. So that's good.

And I'm - Lisa I'm going to probably rely on you to capture the one's we've covered and the ones we haven't. And we'll get out a list - I say we, it should be Lisa. So I should say Lisa will get out a list right after this call showing which ones if any are remaining. In fact Lisa if you can kind of keep tally on this call which ones are covered and which ones not we can hopefully get some other volunteers for some of those. Thanks again for those of you who are volunteering right now. That's great. The last item under Number 2 is to

talk about next steps and due date. Before we go there though let me give it to Lisa.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks Chuck. Just to follow-up on your request I have kept a tally. I'm not doing as good a job as Marika usually does on our notes today but we'll follow-up in the transcript and embellish. We do through have a list of people who have volunteered in the right-hand corner of those of you on AC under the agenda notes. And I've left three items with question marks. Those are the three remaining items I believe that had been identified as sub teams as particularly relevant but are not yet - are still looking for a volunteer.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much Lisa. That's great. So the three are European data protection directive 1995, the European data protection I guess that's a regulation 2016 and the Greenleaf book. So and just looking in the chat so anyway so if anybody wants to volunteer for one of those that would be great. And while you're thinking about that let's talk about next steps and target date. And Lisa do you want to jump in there or you want me to take that one?

Lisa Phifer: Sorry Chuck that actually was an old hand. But I would like to set the stage for that conversation by saying a fair number of the people that volunteer over the past several days did so because they had summarized a document previously for a sub team and said that they were willing to then pull some possible requirements from it. But virtually everyone said they couldn't do it of course by today and that they would leave - need probably at least another week to do it. So just to set the stage and I did get that feedback from a number of people.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. So thanks Lisa. This is Chuck again. So the - another week was kind of the feeling. So if we - in other words if we made it to the target to the 7th of June does that work? Anybody that that doesn't work for you can speak up or raise your hand or talk in the chat. Okay so let's - I'm not seeing any objections so let's make the target the 7th.

Now if you can get those in this week that gives Lisa more time to update everything for our meeting a week from now. If you can't it's not going to be a showstopper. But the sooner you can get them in the sooner we can have things ready for next week. And in the meantime that allows us to probably go ahead and we'll start with the Leadership Team on that and start drafting the second outreach message to the community to hopefully go over with the full working group a week from now. Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks Chuck. I just wanted to note that Holly Raiche mentioned in the chat that she could do SAC 54 earlier and definitely appreciate anyone who can get their assignments done earlier and spread the workload out a little bit. Another thing that is helpful to me as I incorporate everyone's inputs is if you submit to the full working group list a Word document or something of that nature to that I can copy the text down easily. I know we've had at least one submission that came in in PDF form which is fine for everyone else to read but it's a little harder for me to grab the text out of a PDF so Word documents are great.

And the other thing is to the extent that people can structure their documents into the charter questions it also makes it a little easier for me to pull in. I can certainly structure your documents that way when I pull it in. But it just makes it a little faster for me and I appreciate the effort if you do that.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Lisa, Chuck again appreciate you making those points. And I think everybody in the working group by now recognizes what a fantastic resource Lisa is to our working group and all of our efforts. So anything we can do to make her job easier will of course help us as a whole working group so thanks for those pointers and requests -- much appreciated.

She's tremendously flexible and puts up with all of us including me, probably more me than anybody else and our different needs and that's great. But if we can help her that'll make our work go all the better. So thank you very much for that. So Lisa is there anything else on next steps? I think next steps

then and we'll try and finalize at least at this point in the game finalize our Version 2 of the requirements list. And in the meantime the Leadership Team will start working on a - and you can put this down as an action item for us Lisa. The - in the meantime the Leadership Team will start taking a crack at an outreach message number two which is Step 9 in our work plan. And Then hopefully we'll talk about that on the call next week and then we'll be leading up to the step - Step 10 as the finalized app but actually probably we'll be able to move ahead to Step 11 which where we get into determining how we're going to determine consensus in the working group, a step that we need to do before we get to the actual deliberation in Step 12. Any questions or comments on agenda Item 2?

Okay and sometimes when I'm leading a meeting I'm not real good at keeping up on the chat so don't hesitate to call me out on that if I miss something, especially when I'm doing a lot of talking myself. All right, so let's go to Agenda Item 3. Most of you probably saw - maybe all of you probably saw some comments from Greg regarding the - Greg Aaron regarding some concerns he had about the list of requirements. There's been some good discussion on that both on the Working Group List and some between Lisa and Greg as well that's been I think very helpful.

And so that's what Agenda Item 3 is about. It's an approach for how we might triage the possible requirements I assume once we start the deliberation or some of it may be able to be done before. I'll let Lisa lead into that. And then if Greg wants to - I don't know if Greg's on. I'm looking real quick. That doesn't look like he's on but anyway Lisa would you take over for this agenda Item 3?

Lisa Phifer: Thanks Chuck and Lisa Phifer again for the record. And this came from Greg Aaron, yes Greg Shatan. We do need to be careful about that too. And Greg did send his regrets for this call. He was unfortunately traveling during the time of our call. But Greg Aaron had observed when looking at the initial possible requirements list that the initial possible requirements actually

straddled all three phases of this PDP, those three phases being the phase we're in now, that is establishing fundamental and cross-cutting requirements that would apply to any registration directly service or to registration data that the purpose of identifying those basic or foundational requirements, excuse me, fundamental requirements is just to answer that big question that will be facing us as we move through phase one which is why do we need registration directly services, why do we need registration data. And based on the question of why do we need a next generation directly service or can Whois be modified in some way to meet those agreed upon requirements?

Now right now we're looking at possible requirements. But eventually this working group in phase one will get to the point of having to try to reach consensus on what those requirements are. And then as we move into phase two having made that recommendation as to whether a next generation system is needed or those requirements can be met through Whois there will be a significant policy development effort. So in the three-phased approach that's referred to as designing or functional design of the policies themselves.

And then iteratively during that process would - there may also be opportunities for this working group to delve into phase three where we provide either implementation guidance or guidance on coexistence between systems should this group recommend that a next generation system is needed. What Greg Aaron observed was that some of the principals that we had pulled out of the EWG Report when Chuck put together his - the initial stab at the possible requirements list actually delved into that policy, specific policy design step and in some cases actually went further into implementation guidance as well.

And he had observed that the EWG kind of intermixed this in their report. And that is very true. What the EWG tried to do after establishing some baseline principles was then to actually test out those principles by envisioning what a new system would look like all the way down to recommending a system

model. But the - those very detailed principles in the EWG report are not necessarily what this group will deal with in phase 1.

So what Greg had suggested as a way of sort of triaging the difference between these three phases was to put all of our possible requirements into a grid like the one that's being displayed here. And we might do this at the end of gathering all the possible requirements together. So we don't necessarily have to decide on this today. This is simply, you know, presenting an idea for our next step. So taking all the possible requirements, putting them into a grid form and then adding the two columns that you see on the right here, one column being prerequisites or assumptions and then the right-most column being the phase in which that possible requirement probably falls.

Greg's thinking was that when we identify pre-requisites or assumptions that we will find that some of these possible requirements actually build on each other. So a possible requirement that's derived from a more basic possible requirement might not fall into phase one but in fact phase two or even phase three. And I'll show a few examples here as you look at the list. So just by way of example we've pulled a couple of possible requirements from draft two of the possible requirements list. Some of these come from the EWG report. Some of these come from the SAC 55 which Greg Aaron had submitted earlier I believe actually during our call last week.

Some of these possible requirements are very fundamental or foundational and don't have any pre-requisites or assumptions whereas others for example, the requirement Number 3 under users and purposes coming from the EWG report actually assumes that there have been some definition of permissible purposes and some definition of permissible users. So you might consider this a derived requirement or an expansion on a previous requirement.

And then other requirements just scrolling down a little bit I think you all have scroll control but you can see that some possible requirements might in fact

not be requirements at all but actually specific policies that are intended to fulfill a requirement. An example is given here of the requirement 20 from the EWG report.

And so I went through these in great detail. I'm just really trying to introduce the approach that Greg Aaron had suggested for helping us untangle once we get the whole possible requirements list together trying to untangle which of these really belong in phase one and then which are actually policies that would be intended to fulfill requirements that will defer to phase two. And I see question here from Holly Raiche what specifically do we need from the Greenleaf publication. So I think that's not about this triage approach.

Holly Raiche: Yes.

Lisa Phifer: But Holly Raiche, just to quickly answer that question, I actually don't know why the Privacy Group, Privacy Sub team flagged that as a very relevant document. But maybe somebody from the Privacy Team can take a look and see if they see possible requirements coming out of that work.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Lisa. This is Chuck again. Let me - I have a question. But before I ask my question does anybody have a question about anything that Lisa just talked about and about the issue that Greg raised? Kathy Kleiman go ahead.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay this is not well thought out but let me raise it. The last thing on the grid is law enforcement has a legitimate need to access the real identify of the responsible parties for domain name. And under the second box which I think is requirements or prerequisites is none. So one of the - what if we - we had the question of what is law enforcement and who is law enforcement. Where would that question go and how do we put that into the triage? Thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Lisa would you like to respond to that? This is Chuck. Go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Yes I'll take a stab at that. So that's a requirement that Greg had pulled out of SAC 55. So the quoted text there comes from SAC 55. If this working group should determine that that's a requirement that a directory service needs to fulfill then this group would probably go ahead in phase two and define policies around that, specific policies that way who is law enforcement, what does legitimate need mean? What is the real identify? What does it mean to be a responsible party?

So I would see that as personally I would see that as probably phase two and maybe even phase three depending on how detailed the recommendations became.

Chuck Gomes: So Lisa this is Chuck. Just to clarify what I think you just said you're not saying that this particular possible requirement is a phase two issue. What you're saying is the follow-up that would come from that would be phase two. Is that right?

Lisa Phifer: That's exactly correct. Thanks Chuck for clarifying.

Chuck Gomes: Okay good. Kathy Kleiman go ahead.

Kathy Kleiman: Thanks. So to follow-up and again just using this by ways of an example to kind of think about these boxes so in addition to the question of what is law enforcement to legitimate need, all of that is defined legitimate need or even legal need we're going to talk about in a phase two but not in phase one? I'm confused because some law enforcement may have legitimate needs and some may be - I mean there's always a question of what's a legitimate need, what's the legal need, what's within scope, what's within jurisdiction. So I'm still confused that we've kind of embrace all of this and then bring it to phase two or it somehow gets put in under permissible purposes, permissible users as questions we should be asking in phase one. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Yes and let me respond first and then I'll let Lisa respond. Good questions Kathy Kleiman. And I don't know if I identified myself but this is Chuck again. I'm sure all of you recognize the voice. But for somebody reading the transcript they might not be able to tell.

So we're going to continually confront the issue of whether it's a requirement, whether it's policy, whether it's implementation. As some of you know, I co-chaired the Policy and Implementation Working group that recommendations were made a year or so ago. And the boards have proved those and so forth. And that wasn't a PDP a concuss policy-type group but the GNSO is following those.

And we're going to confront that question all the time and we'll just have to make decisions. It's virtually impossible to always totally separate policy from requirements from implementation. They're going to overlap. And they're really in a continuum. So all I can suggest is let's not get - let's talk about that and see if it's better for example to leave something to phase two, some part of for example this particular requirement we're looking at right now or if it would be better if we refine the requirement in what we're doing.

I don't think there's a simple answer in any case but we'll talk about that. And I just ask everyone to realize that we're going to continually have this friction of that and that's okay. That's part of it because you can't totally separate implementation from policy. And when we're defining requirements we're going to run into that friction as well and we won't just ignore it. We'll try and deal with it and we'll make decisions together as how maybe best to handle that. So I hope that helps a little bit Kathy Kleiman. But there's not an easy answer on that. We'll have to look at it on a case by case basis. Does that help any?

Kathy Kleiman: Kind of. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: I didn't expect it to be a totally satisfactory answer, Chuck speaking again. So
                 we'll deal with that. And that's part of the complexity of what we're dealing
                 with. And some of these are really - just looking at this one requirement
                 there's some real tough questions that we're going to have to grapple with.
                 And that whether we do it in phase one just in defining the requirements or
                 phase two. My prediction we'll probably end up doing some in both but that's
                 just a personal prediction.

                 Now that was not a hand up but I guess that's not needed any more so okay.
                 All right, let me ask the question that I mentioned I had going through my
                 head and I've actually been thinking about this over this last week. And the
                 question is this. What would - I mean - sorry for fumbling a little bit. I'm trying
                 to formulate it in my head. But it seems to me that this triage that we're
                 talking about here could maybe be at least in part a first step when we're
                 looking at each of the requirements under deliberation.

                 In other words, the first thing we do maybe is to decide is this indeed in the a
                 possible requirement for phase one or should this be something that's moved
                 to phase two in policy development or phase three in implementation. And let
                 me let Lisa respond to that because she's been thinking through it with Greg.
                 And I'm going to have to put myself on mute just a minute. So go ahead Lisa
                 if you could pick that up. And if any of the - anybody in the working group or
                 anybody in the leaders group want to comment please feel free to raise your
                 hand.

Lisa Phifer: And thanks Chuck. This is Lisa Phifer again for the record. I do think that
                 what Greg has suggested is really a way for us to organize the initial list of
                 possible requirements once we get everything on paper. And of course noting
                 that list of possible requirements will never be completely done. But once we
                 get to the point where we feel that we've covered enough of the documents
                 and thoughts, drawn possible requirements from a broad enough set of
                 sources that we can move ahead. What Greg's approach really does is let -

and I've just - I thought that you all had synchronized control of the screen but if you don't now let me know again. L

What the - Greg's approach allows us to do I think is just get the - organize the possible requirements and really focus in on the possible requirements that seem to be clearly the underlying or most basic of the possible requirements then let the working group focus on deliberating on those really starting point possible requirements as its first order of business.

And then as the working group looks at those possible requirements and sort of massages them into what the group may ultimately choose to recommend as a requirement for a directly service or for registration data that you - the working group might then take a look at those items that sort of fell on the borderline weren't really sure if they were phase one or phase two. The working group might then take a look at those and see just how far to take phase one.

Now the idea being that phase one established the foundation upon which all policies should be based. So without agreeing on some of the fundamentals like what is the purpose or registration data, what is the purpose of (unintelligible) service, who are we trying to serve and why, what data do they need, unless the working group establishes some of those basics and then it's really hard to go through to the next step and actually define very detailed policies that indicate more clearly who falls in each of those categories, how will those purposes be defined in the future, how will they be communicated to registrants, et cetera, so just giving you just a few examples of what might fall into phase two. But again the working group decides that.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Lisa. This is Chuck. Now I missed the first part of that. Was my assessment somewhat on target in that we could do this triage as we we're going through deliberation?

Lisa Phifer: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Lisa Phifer: In fact I think it's a way of organizing the list of possible requirements as the starting point of deliberation. We'll have a very long list of possible requirements. We're already at 38 pages just having covered eight documents. So it's really just a way of beginning that deliberation process maybe.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Okay this is Chuck again. So now a second - a follow-up question to that is that whether or not then is there anything that you and Greg thought would be beneficial before we actually get into the deliberation and apply the triage?

Lisa Phifer: I'm sorry Chuck, could you ask that question again?

Chuck Gomes: Sure, Chuck speaking. Are there any action steps between now and when we start deliberation with regard to this particular triage task?

Lisa Phifer: I think the only action step at this point would be to think about this process and think about what the - how the working group might fill in that prerequisites column because the purpose of the prerequisites column is to try to understand the interrelationship between possible requirements and then figure out what falls into phases one, two and three. But right now I would say this is a concept and not necessarily something we could just sit down and fill out that prerequisites column. So the action to me, the action for all working group members would be to think about what would be useful to identify in that pre-requisites column or in fact if there's another aspect of possible requirements that would be useful to identify as part of this triage and organizing our thoughts to begin deliberation.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Chuck speaking again. So okay. If anybody has any questions or comments on this please feel free to jump in now. Okay and I'm

glad to see the volunteers keep coming. That's much appreciated. All right then we go to agenda Item 4 which is just confirming our next meeting. And that's scheduled for next Tuesday same time. And that will be our first meeting in June. So we of course will send out an agenda beforehand. And the action item that the Leadership Team has between now and then is to give - maybe take a first crack at an outreach message number two that we'll send to the working group list before that meeting.

And the action item for everybody else if you haven't volunteered for a, one of our source documents please do so. And hopefully we'll have a minimum all of the eight relevant, particularly relevant documents covered. And if somebody thinks there's another one that's really relevant in addition to the eight please identify it and if possible volunteer for it.

So we'll hopefully by next Tuesday then have a good draft two of the possible requirements. And ultimately then draft two would what would be - would be what we would send out to the SOs, ACs, Cs and SGs for them to take a look at and see if they think we missed anything and suggest it. Any questions or comments on that? Lisa are there any other actions items that we should highlight? Go ahead. Oh hand went down. I guess not.

Lisa Phifer: No sorry. I was confused on taking myself off mute. This is Lisa Phifer again…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I understand. Most of us have done that.

Lisa Phifer: The - I - the only other action I would raise is in respect to our Helsinki meeting. And that is that the session description that we published for the cross community session for Helsinki involves working group members suggesting possible requirements, the kick-off discussion and solicit input from session attendees on what they see as possible requirements. So we all

might be thinking a little bit about anyone who might want to volunteer to suggest a possible requirement in that session. We probably at our next call should come back and actually start organizing our participation for that cross community session.

Chuck Gomes: Yes let's make that - thanks Lisa. This is Chuck. Let's make that an action item following-up of this meeting and then of course to include it on the agenda next week because you're absolutely right. We should start doing that. And let me make sure that everyone on the call understands what Lisa's suggesting there. So and I think it's on Monday, late Monday afternoon is when we have a cross-community RDS session in Helsinki.

And the way that that is going to be handled is to ask for a few volunteers from the working group to very briefly -- I think we're just talking a minute or so -- share a requirement to kind of get discussion going. And that particularly session will be a good follow-up to our second outreach to the community and asking them to identify requirements. So be thinking about that. And some of you hopefully will participate in that to get discussion going in that cross community session.

We're going to really emphasize trying to get people that aren't part of the working group in that to participate in that session. But that said we want participation across the working group as well. We just don't want the working group to monopolize it so we can take advantage of people that aren't normally a part of our process in that session.

Now the working group session I believe then is on Tuesday morning. I think we have up till lunch time. Maybe - well I don't have it in front of me. I should have it in front of me and I don't. But so Tuesday morning in Helsinki will be our working group meeting. And it'll be broken up with a break or two in there, at least one break. And we'll make it an actual working group session. But we will allow participation from non-working group members in that particular session to take advantage of the in-person nature against understanding that

some of you and others will be participating remotely which is fine as well. Thanks Lisa for bringing that up on the Helsinki meeting.

For those of you that I haven't met in person that are going to be in Helsinki I always look forward to meeting people I'm working with in person for the first time and of course seeing those of you that I already know again will be great when we're there in Helsinki. Anything else before we adjourn this call? Okay well thanks everybody.

Woman: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: We're plugging away and look forward to the work that's going to happen between now and next Tuesday and we'll talk again then. Meeting adjourned.

Woman: Thank you.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you. Again today's meeting has been adjourned. Operator please stop the recordings and disconnect all remaining lines and have a good day.

                        END