Adobe Connect: 4 members

Alex Deacon   Marc Anderson

Kurt Pritz   Sarah Wyld

on audio only: none

Apologies:

Alan Woods

Staff:

Caitlin Tubergen   Berry Cobb

Trang Nguyen   Terri Agnew

Daniel Haloran

Terri Agnew: (1/24/2019 11:02) Welcome to the EPDP - Data Elements Workbook on Thursday, 24 January 2019 at 17:30 UTC for 2 hours.

Terri Agnew: (11:02) wiki agenda page: https://community.icann.org/x/ZZkWBg

Sarah Wyld: (11:28) HI

Daniel Halloran: (11:29) Hello

Alex Deacon - IPC: (11:31) so many long calls............ :)

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (11:32) Alex - what doesn't kill us makes us stranger :)

Alex Deacon - IPC: (11:34) icann is far beyond strange

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (11:41) Lost audio - just me?

Alex Deacon - IPC: (11:41) also me

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (11:41) OK

Marc Anderson (RySG): (11:41) can't hear Berry

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (11:41) I hear Terri

Terri Agnew: (11:41) Berry's audio is back

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (11:41) Thanks!

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (11:49) If these terms (collection, transfer, disclosure) havent been defined clearly, should we work on defining them, so that we're all operating with the same understanding? OR we think we can discuss well enough without that?

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (11:51) Agree with Marc, what we do here should not prevent other data processing done separately/independently

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (11:53) Should we just jump in and talk through each row in the Purpose 2 chart, then?

Kurt Pritz: (11:53) Do we need to state that somewhere explicity in the report? what we do here should not prevent other data processing done separately/independently

Marc Anderson (RySG): (11:54) @Kurt - probably a good idea - similar to what was done for accuracy

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (11:55) Yes, would'nt hurt (@Kurt)

Berry Cobb: (11:57) Our four processing activities came orignially from Thomas XLS in LA.

Alex Deacon - IPC: (11:57) happy to do that.

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (11:58) ah, .xls :) Right! I think these 4 processing activities make sense

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (11:59) Very supportive! Yes.

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:01) so, the transfer of data from registrar to registry is covered in the 2nd row (COllection by Registry), I didnt follow that before but now I"m on board! OK.

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:02) then, the quesiton of if those 2 data are sent from registry to registrar is a technical quesiton, we should be able to look it up somewhere? Marc do you remember offhand?

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:02) Thanks for explaining that one Berry

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:03) Right - we don't process data simply in order to later disclose it.

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:04) so is "getting the data" transfer, disclosure or collection?

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:04) Alex - yeah - maybe we do need to go back to defining our terms. I have some ideas

Marc Anderson (RySG): (12:05) @ Alex - great question - I think the GDPR lawers see that as disclosure

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:05) My Idea: Collection = getting data from Data SubjectTransfer = moving data from one party to another when those parties are involved in the processing or controlling of those data Disclosure = moving data from one party to antoehr when one of those parties is not involved in the processing or controlling of the data

Marc Anderson (RySG): (12:05) but I'm not one

Berry Cobb: (12:06) And I could be going way into the weeds here....

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:06) Arent these things that woudl be worked out by the RDAP team? CL&D would be maintained by each R'ar or R'y displaying the data in the rquired format?

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:07) +1 Marc

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:09) Happy to see mods to those suggested definitions! But that's what makes snese to me

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:10) makes sense to me also.

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:12) Remember that at one point this purpose used to say "to data already collected"...(or something) That disapeared in Toronto.

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:13) Thanks Alan, good point!!

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:13) So we can accommodate that concept here by reducing the processing activites under purpose 2

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:14) yes as long as we all agree that this purpose can be realized based on data collected from other purposes.

Marc Anderson (RySG): (12:14) Yes, I agree with that Alex, at least I understand that to be the intent

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:22) Tech ID - goes with the quesiton about Registry DOmain ID, Registrant ID - do they get transferred from registry back to registrar? Or just displayed in registry whois? I think that's a technical quesiton that should be in some docs somewhere

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:23) right!

Marc Anderson (RySG): (12:27) agreed with what Alex and Berry both just said

Berry Cobb: (12:28) My feelings are hurt! ;-)

Marc Anderson (RySG): (12:31) sorry Berry, :(

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:33) ok - so we can clarify how this happens in those TBD fields.

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:33) I dont think disclosure is necessary in order to fulfill this purpose? The registrar has the data and can thus communicate with the registrant, without disclosing the data

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:34) Data needs to be collected for specified purposes, so I do agree that the registrar should collect data in order to fulfill this purpose of contacting the domain owner. But that doesn't mean disclosure, as Marc just said

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:35) but what about entities that are not registrars?

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:35) Do they collect data? We should talk about it :)

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:35) Remember this is an ICANN purpose - not a registrar purpose.

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:36) Right - but ICANN purposes includes things that the Registrar must do in order to fulifll our contractual obligations

Marc Anderson (RySG): (12:36) yup, good points Sarah

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:36) And you, Marc

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:37) Retention doesn't seem like a purpose here , agreed Berry

Marc Anderson (RySG): (12:37) I can see retention as the life of the domain registration

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:38) Does a registry need to communicate with a registrant? Would'nt they typically go through the registrar?

Marc Anderson (RySG): (12:39) I think we have to take into account optional disclosure as from our discussions we know some people will opt in to publish their contact details.

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:41) OK - so the url to a web form the anonymized email address would be available to any one who has the need to contact the RNH.

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:41) OK - so it could in theory be both a registrar and registry purpose

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:41) Alex - right, the URL woudl be avialable to all

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:41) ok - i misunderstood your earlier point. thanks.

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:42) NP!

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:42) This is super complicated, I'm impressed if I make sense at all.

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:42) overly complicated

Marc Anderson (RySG): (12:43) Pending Alan's input, I think it would be optional transfer to registry (based on their polices) for this purpose

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:43) +1 Marc

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:43) Right, maybe we can define that better

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:44) but the anonymized email or webURL are not personal data, so they're not what we're defninig here?

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:45) do we need another term for access to public information.

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:45) I dont think so, becuase its' public already?

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:49) I think we need to define what the Minimum Public Data Set is and state up front that it is public and no disclosure is necessary.   i.e. a url to a web form or a anonymous email address is part of that public data set.

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:50) Alex - yeah I wondered if that's also something we'll do in this small group. But it's fairly controversial as to which data elements must be published, so...

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:50) Agree with Marc

Marc Anderson (RySG): (12:50) yeah, a minium public data set concept would be useful

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:51) Wouldn't it just be wha'ts redacted vs not redacted?

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:52) it may be

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:54) Agreed

Marc Anderson (RySG): (12:57) I think we generally agree on purpose 3, understanding that the disclosure row doesn't map great.

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:58) Yes

Marc Anderson (RySG): (12:58) yes

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:58) I'm ok to continue

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:59) (And fix the typos in the definitions maybe :))

Marc Anderson (RySG): (12:59) good points from Alex, I'm ok to continue though... 4 is escrow right?

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:59) Yes, 4 is escrow

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (13:00) I'm still a bit confused about minimum public data, why would it include redacted data? Redacted = not public? (what am I misunderstanding?) - we can discuss that in the email thread

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (13:01) Right, so if there's a specific EPDP rec. for redaction, we can't change that here (much as I would like to!)

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (13:02) THanks for trying, Marc! I'm OK to continue this idea via email

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (13:02) so that we can get into Escrow here

Marc Anderson (RySG): (13:02) :)

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (13:05) Agree that we are not collecting data for this purpose, we will escrow data that is collected for other purposes. So it's a *transfer* of data that needs to be in this purpose

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (13:06) Would we need to cross-reference it to other purposes, find all data that are collected, and then mark those as needing transfer in this purpose 4?

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (13:09) based on our definitions, that sending of data from EBERO to gaining registry seems like transer, rather than disclosure.

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (13:10) Yup I lost track of why it's one disclosure for R'ar but two for R'y

Marc Anderson (RySG): (13:13) ah, right, transfer, then disclosure.... I'm good with that

Berry Cobb: (13:13) Let's circle back on retention

Marc Anderson (RySG): (13:16) do we have an action item to go back to the full group on minimum public data set?

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (13:17) Oh right - what about using letters? R=requird, o=optional, N/A= not applicable

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (13:17) like, why do we have to use numbers?

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (13:17) :)

Marc Anderson (RySG): (13:18) ok, thanks!

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (13:18) Great teamwork!

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (13:18) Thanks for leading us through it Berry

Marc Anderson (RySG): (13:18) thanks all