

---

MARGIE MILAM:

Hello everyone. My name is Margie Milam. I'm the Senior Director of Strategic Initiative at ICANN, and it's a pleasure for me to welcome you to our webinar. The webinar is the answers to the top ten questions about the proposed Next Generation Registration Directory Services to replace WHOIS. Before we begin I'd like to remind all the participants of some housekeeping items. This webinar is being recorded, so if you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. At the end of the webinar you'll be given an opportunity to voice your comments and questions during the Q&A section.

The EWG will receive a copy of the chat transcript. Please note that the chat sessions are being archived and please follow the ICANN expected standards of behavior. Your lines are currently muted and they will be opened for the Q&A section. In the meantime you're more than welcome to submit your questions and/or comments via the Adobe Connect chat pod. If you do not wish to voice your comments or questions during the Q&A, please mute your line by pressing \*6. To unmute your line press \*7.

The slides, recording and transcript will be made available following the session on the announcement page. Today we will more deeply explore the key features of the proposed registry directory services, the foundation from which the community, through the gNSO, can develop a new global policy for gTLD registration data. This is to protect personal privacy and ensure greater accuracy, accountability and transparency for the ICANN ecosystem.

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

The goal of this webinar is to help you understand and ask any questions that you may have about how the proposed registration directory service, or the RDS, as we call it, tackles some of the difficult issues such as data privacy issues, as well as validation challenges that have long degraded data quality and accuracy, and also the RDS tries to strike a balance between access and accountability. With that, we'll turn to Michele Neylon, who will serve as a moderator today.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thanks Margie. I will be attempting to moderate the session. Margie's already given you the ground rules for how we're recording this. If there's anything that you wouldn't want to go on the record then please don't say it or put it in the chat, because it's all going to be archived forever. Our Agenda for this evening's webinar: basic introduction, then we're going to go through what have been highlighted as the top ten questions that have been received about the Final Report and our proposals. After going through those – there are some links to further reading and next steps, at which point we'll then have a Q&A session.

What exactly is the EWG? The EWG was formed at the beginning of last year, 2013. We were tasked with... As this slide says, you're breaking a decade-long impasse around WHOIS and the main registration records of how that entire thing is handled. The EWG was made up of a broad group of people from the four corners of the globe, with a lot of different expertise, a lot of different experiences. We met both face-to-face, over the phone and via email, over about 16 months. If you read the Report I think we had statistics on the number of meetings, the

---

number of phone calls, and a rough number of emails that were exchanged throughout our work.

The main thing that we were working on was the idea that we should be frank, honest and work together as a group trying to break the deadlock. The Report itself, and our proposals, some you may find quite drastic. You were asked not to simply stick to a bunch of existing issues, but to go back to basics and come up with a range of solutions to address them. The ultimate question we were trying to answer was the question posed by the ICANN Board: is there an alternative today to better serve the global Internet community?

In the Final Report we detailed a Next Generation Registration Directory Service – RDS. The idea, as Margie mentioned, is to strike the balance between accuracy, access, privacy and accountability. At a [key unclear 05:16] is the idea of permissible purposes, so that the data that's collected is validated and disclosed for permissible purposes only. Of course, if you're handing data over to anybody then you want that data to be safe, so it's the idea of a purpose-driven gated access. If you read through the full Report we go into this in much greater detail. Now we're going to go through the top ten questions that we received. I'll hand over to Susan.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:

Thanks Michele, and thank you all for joining us today. What makes the RDS different? The WHOIS provides a one-size-fits-all public access to anonymous users. Little accountability or abuse remedies. Limited individual privacy protection or the ability to conform to different laws.

---

Limited ability to ensure data integrity. Lack of security and auditing capabilities. Cumbersome contact management and inefficient communication. We looked at all of these points and tried to design and recommend a system that would address these issues.

With the RDS there would be limited anonymous access. You would have to tell the RDS who you are and why you need the data. We can also provide a jurisdictional rules engine so that we can comply with all the applicable laws around the globe. Validating of the data and accuracy of the data and auditing of the use of the data would be much easier in this system and also the contact management would be made easier for registrants. You could set up one set of data and use that universally. In general, we've addressed all these issues and provided a new system for the WHOIS. Onto slide two.

SCOTT HOLLENBECK:

The question here is that the EWG chose a centralized model for the RDS. The EWG shows a synchronized model; not necessarily a centralized model. The reason for that is for the EWG the term "centralized" was somewhat of a misnomer so it was renamed as "synchronized." "Centralized" implied storage of all of the data in one place, with one database, housing all the information. Based on the discussions and studies that were conducted by IBM it was clear that the data would be housed in multiple locations and it parks out into multiple databases.

[unclear 08:30] information pools from all the disparate sources would be synchronized with the information from the RDS – hence the term

---

“synchronized”. When you’re looking at this slide and when you read the Report, the EWG analyzed a number of models, and each of the models differs in how the data was queried or copied into the RDS. We looked at the current WHOIS, we looked at separated models, synchronized, regional, opt-out, and bypassed all of those that are here, and they’re all fleshed out more in the Report.

Many of these models came from the community itself and the key for the EWG in analyzing all of this was that the RDS had to remain the authoritative source that provided authenticated, dated and logged assets to access all the information. We also looked at a set of criteria that included a number of factors as we were looking at each of the different models – for example, what were the security implications for each of the models.

We looked at jurisdictional privacy concerns, implementation, operations issues, accreditation requirements and obviously there were a couple of different models to that; the synchronized, and that’s where the IBM came into play. We felt that we definitely needed to look at some of the costs that were attended to those two models, which is what IBM did. They released their Report, the Implementation Model Cost Analysis Report, I believe. Based on that study and the conclusion that we arrived at from our analysis we recommended the synchronized model. Next slide.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

The next question is, does the RDS eliminate free public access to data? The short answer is no, it doesn’t. Some registration data would remain

---

public to unauthenticated requestors – everybody – to promote Internet stability and meet basic DNS needs. It would be available for any permissible purposes without authentication. What is available would depend on what data protection regime would be in place, what you as a domain name holder have chosen to release, and various other factors.

It's a bit more complicated than it is now, but it doesn't get rid of the fundamental data that everybody needs to find out what's going on and to solve technical issues. I think we're onto the next slide.

SCOTT HOLLENBECK:

Hi. My name is Scott Hollenbeck and the question I'm going to address on this slide is: what would I need to do to access gated RDS data? Now, the concept of gated data is new. It doesn't exist in WHOIS, but it addresses our needs to protect privacy and ensure that data is collected and disclosed only for permissible purposes. If you look at this slide you'll see where we talk about gated queries: "A requestor must be accredited and obtain a requestor ID." That's a new concept.

In addition to the data that's freely available to unauthenticated, sometimes thought of as anonymous users, in the RDS we introduce a concept of authenticated users who actually have credentials that can be presented to gain access to gated data. Requestors must first work with an accreditor to document who they are and what their permissible purposes are, and assuming certain metrics are met they will be given credentials.

---

They send a query to the RDS, where they are presenting their credentials and their purposes, and if everything checks out they'll be given access to the public data plus the gated data for which their purpose has been validated. Next slide.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:

Hi. This is Susan again. What new data will the RDS collect? Not much new data. As you can see in the first chart, that's the existing WHOIS record: your admin, tech, contact data, the registrant data, and then all of the data supplied by the registrar and registry. We will be collecting purpose-based contact data so you can designate a technical contact or a legal contact, an abuse contact, and we will be collecting all of that data associated with this domain registration. But most of the data is gated. For general working of the DNS the registry and the registrar data will still be available anonymously.

You can look that up. The only thing available anonymously, without telling the RDS who you are or why you need the data will be the registrant ID associated with the domain name registration and their email address. You would not receive the actual name of the registrant unless the registrant wanted to make that available anonymously. All of the rest of the data; the registrant contact data, any new optional data elements such as SMS or your LinkedIn profile, your Twitter handle, Facebook page, those would all be gated along with the designated PBCs, which could be yourself or a third party.

---

All of that will be gated, as you can see by the little gray hash-mark there, and it will require the validated and credentialed access. We are onto the next slide with Lanre.

LANRE AJAYI:

This is Lanre. Thank you Susan. This slide is addressing contacts and contact IDs. What are contacts, and what are contact IDs? Contacts are simple [laptop 15:50] contact data. They are [visible 15:53] and they are matched to the contact ID. The contact IDs are public. They are available for general access, but the contact data are largely gated. Most of it is gated. The contact IDs are available to everyone. That basically is the difference between the contacts and the contact IDs.

Into that, accountability and stability [unclear 16:30] registrant's contact mandate [unclear] for every domain. Every domain must have registrant contacts, if not have [unclear] contact. It must have [unclear 16:44] contacts, abuse contacts and [admin] contacts. The business contact is optional. Privacy and proxies provide a contact, which only is visible when a registrant [unclear 17:02] provider. That's basically about the contact and contact ID. Next slide please.

Next slide is, how would RDS improve data quality? The RDS [unclear 17:42] registrants and [contact areas] a lot of control over their personal data. This implies the registrant to keep accurate data, because they know they have control over their data. They can choose what aspects of their data is public, which are gated, or gated [unclear 18:03]. Because they know they have control of their data they are not inclined



---

to [give up] their data, thereby improving data quality. Also, in the RDS there is this concept of gated access.

Because you know most of your protected data is gated, the registrants are often not inclined to supply [accurate 18:28] data in the system, thereby improving data quality. More importantly, every piece of data submitted is subjected to some kind of validation. Contact validation is applicable to all data. Identify validation is optional. I'd like to direct you to the diagram here to see the validation flow. [unclear 19:02] particular [unclear], which is [unclear], and the [unclear] in this particular case is a review of [RSD 19:13].

Some particular data elements that are submitted to validation, the system will check if that data element, if that [field 19:27] is [exactly] valid. If it's valid, that [field] – like an email address – is sent to [unclear 19:38] separate validation. If it's not, an error message is transferred to the registrant. The system goes through an operational validation and is tracked and an email can actually be sent to that particular email address. If that [unclear 20:03] data element passes operational validation then it goes to the next stage, and the next stage is to determine whether the registrant requires identify validation.

If the registrant does not want identify validation then [unclear 20:26] registrant is assigned a contact ID and issued a credential, and that info is stored in that database. That's the process. The [unclear 20:42] is that every data element is subjected to validation processes, and that [broadly] enhances the data quality of the RDS. Thank you.

---

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

It's Stephanie again. Basically, just to explain the trade-offs that are made here, in terms of privacy and data quality, the criticism over the last umpteen years has been that everything's wide open but the data quality is not there. As you can tell from what Lanre said, we are seriously ratcheting up the reliability of the data by doing data verification. More or less, the price for that is stronger fences around personal data and more choice in terms of releasing personal data.

Basically, this concept of a rules engine, which would enforce the RDS policy, harmonize it with existing data protection and privacy laws, and you'll notice there's also a recommendation in our Report that ICANN look at a privacy policy to cover the whole RDS system, so that basically this engine would enforce the protection of personal data that ought to be available only with appropriate documentation and identification of the requestor. That's a little word about that system and how the gate will be enforced.

It also supports accredited privacy proxy services so that if you still wish to protect all of your data, you can purchase an accredited privacy proxy service that will then put its data into the RDS. Finally, just a note that we did make a recommendation for providing greater protection for persons at risk, for persons in certain categories who are possibly going to be hurt if their name and address are associated with the domain that they've registered – we're talking about journalists and political speech and that sort of thing.

We have proposed a system for obtaining domain names anonymously. That's the secure protected credentials system. That's just a word on that. Onto the next slide.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

This is Carlton Samuels. We want to talk about how the RDS makes life simpler for individual registrants. You'll be pleased to know we did not ignore the [unclear 24:07] of the registrant. As the rule in the RDS, registrants will have more visibility into what their data is used for, based on the fact that we will record the uses of the data and it has to be qualified for you to get access to it. They will have the ability to enter and update their data more easily, and they certainly will have more flexibility and control over what data is public.

Certainly there's information here about the balancing act the EWG went into to ensure that they did the quality, privacy, availability and access – all these are managed in such a way that there's some control by the registrant of what actually gets public. It's important to have options [to record 25:11] fraudulent use of their data, and this feeds nicely into the purpose of requirement for access to RDS. It's also easier to track because you have one place to see what RDS users can learn about them. You have a picture of not only what you have put up, but to see who's using what you've put up.

All in all, there's greater assurance that the privacy, data protection, security and auditing policies that we are contemplating in this new [unclear 25:52] will be uniformly applied. We have access to data that will be limited to those who have a need to know, and we have some accountability frameworks for requestors who are making access to RDS data. All in all, it comes out as a simpler life for individual registrants. Now to the next slide.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thanks Carlton. Michele again. Another question we've been asked is, what are the impacts on both registrar and registry costs? This is something that we discussed at length and there have been quite a few questions about. The first thing that we discussed was that the RDS needs to be run on a purely cost-recovery basis. In other words, it shouldn't be used in some way to generate revenue. It should be run in such a way that it covers its own costs and nothing more. Since the introduction of the 2013 RAA, there has been a greater burden placed on registrars and in some cases on registries, around the validation of WHOIS contact data.

With this new model that we're proposing, gTLD registrars would no longer be obligated to collect or validate the WHOIS contact data. The idea would be that you would shift all of that over to validators so that they would deal with the contact validation, they would deal with the compliance, and they would have to deal with any and all data protection issues around that data. This would mean that on the registrar side the focus would be more firmly based on the DNS-related bit – the more technical aspect of it.

With respect to registries, the same kind of thing applies, because they no longer have to receive or disclose the WHOIS contact data, and the storage and the processing would all move over to the validators, as previously mentioned. The Port 43 and Port 80 WHOIS obligation would then shift to the synchronized RDS and registries would use EPP to supply updates to the SRDS. Obviously, the same could be said for registrars. Now I'll pass you over to Faisal.

FAISAL SHAH:

Hello, this is Faisal Shah. The next question is, how would the RDS [unclear 28:58] reverse WHOIS needs? There were a number of physical cases that we discussed in the EWG that called for the provision of a reverse WHOIS and WhoWas data services. Based on these discussions the EWG recommended that the RDS allow for reverse WHOIS and WhoWas queries, and ultimately work with third parties to provide this type of information.

In essence, in addition to the ordinary queries that you would see from the RDS, you would also be able to run WHOIS queries from the public and the gated elements across all the gTLDs, and the WhoWas queries [unclear 29:41] information to the system itself, so long as you abide by the strict RDS policy guidelines. You've got to abide by the accreditation and authentication, etcetera. Then you could also get the information from certain groups or parties. I think we thought that every third party could also come up with innovative ways of presenting this information, which would be welcome.

The caveat of course is that even information from third parties would also need to meet the policy that would be set out by RDS for accessing the information. In other words, users would still need to be authenticated and accredited and whatever information provided would still need to be [unclear 30:23]. Onto the next slide. Michele?

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thank you Faisal. Okay, so if you want to learn more about the RDS and EWG Report, here are a load of URLs that you're not going to remember.

---

---

Don't worry. All these links and everything else will be made available afterwards. We've got the full Report, which is a big piece of work. If you're into the environment, don't print it. It's very long. The FAQs and of course there are several videos where some of us have answered some of these questions for you.

Next steps. The ICANN Board is currently considering how they want to handle things. The nature of the EWG's work is probably a little bit different within the ICANN ecosystem. The Mandate came from the ICANN Board and CEO, so anything that comes out of this would have to be channeled back into the gNSO and the normal PDP. The ICANN Board are currently considering that.

On the Monday, at ICANN 51 in LA, there's a session in the afternoon, I believe it's around three o'clock. Margie or someone can confirm the time. It will be related to all things WHOIS, which obviously will encompass our work. Of course, if you're interested in providing any feedback and contributing ideas please do come along to the session in LA, either in-person or remotely. At this juncture we will open things up to the floor, if anybody has questions. I've just been told that the time for the Monday session hasn't been finalized, but it is on Monday, as far as I know.

I have one question on the chat from CK: "Would registrants be able to know who's requesting to view their data contact details, and what process would be followed to obtain that information?" I'll hand that one over to Stephanie.

---

STEPHANIE PERRIN: You can hand it over Michele, but I'm not entirely certain that I have the answer. In the case of law enforcement, for instance, they may have an ability to request, under their legal system, that the investigated person not be aware that their data has been distributed. All of that is dealt with under data protection law in the different regimes. The point of actually having a harmonized policy is to make sure that there's a certain amount of fairness that crosses across the entire ecosystem to simplify matters.

There would have to be procedures developed in terms of when an individual gets to know that their data is being accessed, and when they don't. I hope that answers the question.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks Stephanie. Does anybody else want to speak to this one?

CARLTON SAMUELS: The contemplation is that the RDS would love all requests for that data, and presumably the policy [unclear 34:33] the registrant to look at all those requests, eventually.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thank you Carlton. I've got two more questions in the chat – one from Elaine [Priest 34:50]: "Are you planning on A/B testing during the registration path [unclear] interruption of validation affects completion?" Thoughts? Somebody might like to take that?

---

SCOTT HOLLENBECK: Sure. Scott Hollenbeck here. I think the long and short is that it's a little too early to say for sure what plans we have for development and deployment, because the EWG isn't doing development and deployment. That will ultimately be something that has to be addressed during the policy development process, in terms of whatever types of statement of work is prepared for the contractors and folks who actually do the implementation. However, having said that, what you described is absolutely best engineering practice and someone would have to make sure such testing takes place.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thank you. I also have another question in the chat from [Leanne Kenny]: "Are you able to explain how you define "permissible processes" and give an indication of what they are?" I'll give this one over to Faisal.

FAISAL SHAH: I think with "permissible purposes" we've defined it in the Report itself. I think there's a link of 11 different purposes that we actually set out. I don't have it in front of me but I think a quick reading of the Report will provide that to you.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thank you Faisal. Chuck Gomes, go ahead.

CHUCK GOMES: Thanks Michele and everyone else. I have a couple of questions. I'll probably ask them at different times because they're quite different.



---

First of all, with regards of the next steps, you talk about the session in LA on Monday. Will the EWG provide some suggested breakouts of how PDPs might be broken out for realistic work? I know in discussions with you earlier you have expressed the willingness to help the gNSO do that. Is the work in LA going to be from scratch, or is the Working Group going to provide some guidelines in that regard, going into that session?

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thanks Chuck. I'm going to pick Margie for this one.

MARGIE MILAM:

Sure, this is Margie Milam on staff. The Monday session is meant to be more high-level. I don't think it's going to go into how to break out this subject. It's more about how the EWG's Report and recommendations fit into the future of the whole RDS and how to structure it within the gNSO. It won't go that deep, and I know that the EWG hasn't really explored that, as to how you would break it up into a PDP.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:

This is Susan. I just want to add on. Personally, as a Member of the EWG I would welcome the opportunity to give some guidance. If the Board or the gNSO comes back to us and asks for some input, we'd be happy to do that.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Can I just say plus one to Susan? I would also want to point people to what's happening in the PPSAI Working Group, where we're looking at

---

the privacy proxy framework, and suggest that maybe that is a way for us to break up the work and treat it in a fashion that will probably make sense to the user, in what [unclear 39:21] gNSO.

CHUCK GOMES: Can I do a follow up on that?

MICHELE NEYLON: I'll allow you, Chuck.

CHUCK GOMES: Thanks Michele. I appreciate it. It seems to me that we're doing things in a serial manner that's going to slow down what's already going to be a very huge task in terms of policy development. Maybe it's hung up with the Board. I don't know what the case is, but we know that the gNSO's going to need some help from the Working Group in terms of designing probably multiple PDPs on this.

I know this isn't your responsibility, but I guess I'm just communicating a point here that maybe staff can nudge the Board and see if we can't get the Working Group – who I'm hearing you all say you're willing – to start working on that, rather than waiting until the Board makes some decision and then having you do it, and then going to the gNSO and working with the gNSO. We've got a lot of work in front of us and it seems like some of these things could be speeded up, if we weren't too hung up in terms of successive steps.

---

You can respond if you want. That's just a suggestion on my part, and it may be one for the Board more so than you guys, but I thought it would be important to make it.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks Chuck. Denise has something to add and then I'll go with Stephanie.

DENISE [?]: [41:16] Just a quick follow up. Thanks Chuck for your insightful contributions. Similar conversations have been occurring at the Board level. The Board in fact, just recently agreed that it would be great to have some more in-depth discussion with gNSO reps on this very subject, to make sure that there's a clear understanding and collaboration on the best way to move forward with this PDP – so certainly look to LA. Additional information will be showing up on emails shortly, I'm sure, regarding getting people together to discuss this further and provide more ideas for further gNSO and gNSO Council discussions.

MICHELE NEYLON: Stephanie, and then I'm going back to the queue.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Just briefly, I thin Chuck's question is an excellent question. We did discuss this a lot over the year and a half. We were working on the EWG Report because, as I'm sure you're aware, this is a whole lot of [nasty

---

42:37] policy development, and you don't want it running serially. On the other hand, coordination will be challenging because you can't move in on getting very accurate data – in my opinion of course being the privacy advocate here – without making sure the privacy is moving at the same pace. How to coordinate that is a real problem – even worse than the regular ICANN columns for coordination issues. Just throwing that in.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thank you Stephanie. Elaine had a follow up question: "Is it the plan to [cause 43:13] foundation during the purchase plan, or must a registrant have that validation before they try to register? Or have we not thought of that yet?" Scott, I'll give this one to you.

SCOTT HOLLENBECK:

Sure. Hi, Scott Hollenbeck again. Yes, we've definitely thought about this, because the whole topic of validation is new and we know that it's been a very significant issue for many, many years. To answer the question in a nutshell though, the idea is that details will be validated outside of and prior to the purchase path, and it's largely because there are some data elements that will be very difficult to validate in real-time. For example, if you're trying to determine that a postal address is valid, one way you could validate it would be to try to send a message and see if it gets bounced back or not.

I realize that's probably a bad example but hopefully it gives you the idea. Long and short, validation happens before the purchase path is

---

entered, and the registrants would be able to reference and use data that's been pre-validated.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thank you Scott. The next question we have is from Jim Prendergast: "The accrediting agency for access to gated data – do you have an estimate on the cost associated with that? Who pays for it, and how long is the accreditation valid for?" That one I think I'll go to Faisal.

FAISAL SHAH:

I think IBM looked at all the different costings around this. I don't recall whether or not they had an estimate associated with a cost for the access to the gated data... At the end of the day, I think one of the things that we're really trying to encourage is that all these costs are pushed back to the registrant. I think our whole goal was that if there are ways of doing it, we're going to try and make this so that it's cost recovery and zero cost back to the registrant. At the end of the day, if the RDS can actually take on the burden, that's what we are looking for the RDS to do.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thanks Faisal. The next question is from Cintra: "There is a gap between this system and the ccTLD WHOIS. Are there any plans to transition or to encourage transition of ccTLD WHOIS to the RDS?" This one's for Scott.

---

SCOTT HOLLENBECK: Hi. While I can't talk to plans to transition or encourage transition, I can certainly talk to how RDAP – the Registration Data Access Protocol – as described in the Final Report works, and how it could work in a model where either ccTLD data is included in the RDS or if it's not. If we assume that the RDS and the ccTLDs both eventually implement and employ RDAP, RDAP includes the ability to do referrals via HTTP.

If the data in a ccTLD registry happens to reside outside the RDS it would be perfectly feasible for the RDS to recognize when it receives a query for a ccTLD data element, issue an HTTP redirect to the ccTLD registry operator, and from the client's perspective it would all look well and good.

FAISAL SHAH: This is Faisal. I'd like to add to that Scott. It would also seem from an implementation standpoint that we'd focus first on getting the structure set up with the gTLDs and then have that implemented with the ccTLDs and maybe at some point throw it out to some of the smaller ccTLDs and go from there. I think initially we almost have to take this in steps, rather than take over the whole thing.

CARLTON SAMUELS: The point of [unclear 47:35] is that there's no technical disability to include ccTLDs in WHOIS data, under the umbrella of the RDS.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thank you Carlton. Just also my own – taking my hat of moderator off – to Cintra's question, this entire project is focused on gTLDs, and ICANN

---

has no remit over how ccTLDs handle WHOIS data or how they publish it or don't publish it. While it might make sense at one level that ccTLDs do something similar with WHOIS data, there's zero obligation for them to do so, nor would we be in a position to force them into doing anything. Thanks. Any further questions? Have I missed one? Chuck?

CHUCK GOMES:

following up the questions by Elaine and Jim on the registration process – and you answered part of the question in the sense that it's anticipated that a registrant would first have their data validated through the validator – you talked early on about the cost of that, and that those costs would not be dealt with by registries and registrars but they'd be handled through the validation process. This may be a policy question that has to still be developed, but I'll ask it anyway.

Are you envisaging the registrant then paying a fee to the validator to have their data validated? Or is the thinking more that that would be a subsidized cost through the ICANN budget? You may not even be able to answer that, but it's a follow up to the other things that have been said about the registration process, the validation process, the validator and so forth. Any response or thoughts you have there would be appreciated.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thank you Chuck.

FAISAL SHAH:

This is Faisal. From my perspective I think it would be something we'd at least envision not... I guess it would all depend... I think we have to still

---

go through the whole analysis of how this would all work, but certainly I would like to see it more on the subsidized side of pushing all that back down to the registrant.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thank you Faisal. Anyone else want to jump in on this one? Just as a note on the point, Chuck, in the case of, say .xxx that had a validation system – and there's a few of the currently launching TLDs with extra validation built in, you can even look at some of the existing ones such as .travel, the cost of the validation are built into the registration fees. There are all sorts of different options to be explored here, but I don't think we ever envisioned any scenario in which a registrant would end up having to pay an extra fee on top of whatever they'd be paying for the domain registration [list 51:51].

CHUCK GOMES: Right. Thanks.

MICHELE NEYLON: Further questions? Any further questions for us, or shall I give you all back half an hour?

MARGIE MILAM: If there are no further questions this will conclude the webinar. I wanted to remind you that we will have the recording, the slides and the transcript. They will be made available so that you can refer back to it if you'd like. Thank you all for participating and for joining us at this time.



MICHELE NEYLON:            Thanks everybody.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**