Terri Agnew: (1/31/2019 11:07) Welcome to the The EPDP - Data Elements Workbook on Thursday, 31 January 2019 at 17:30 UTC for 2 hours.

 Terri Agnew: (11:07) agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/uJsWBg

 Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (11:27) Hi

 Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (11:29) Berry's mic is quiet for me eh

 Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (11:29) Thanks

 Alan Woods (RYSG): (11:29) for me too!

 Alan Woods (RYSG): (11:31) Thank you ... and sorry again!

 Marc Anderson (RySG): (11:32) Stephanie said she will be late, but I think she is planning on joining

 Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (11:32) Yes Berry your sound is better thanks

 Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (11:34) FYI I won't be on next Tuesday's plenary meeting

 Alan Woods (RYSG): (11:34) (achieved)

 Terri Agnew: (11:34) @Sarah, noted for 05 Feb meeting (apologies)

 Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (11:35) Thanks Terri. I'm not alt-ing for anyone that day so not sure if it needs to be noted but you know best :)

 Alan Woods (RYSG): (11:38) will do!

 Alan Woods (RYSG): (11:39) I think we can take out the controller / joint controller given the move on! :)

 Alan Woods (RYSG): (11:39) much simpler!

 Marc Anderson (RySG): (11:40) given all the full group discussion around rec #11, agree best to remove and move on

 Alan Woods (RYSG): (11:41) I agree. Retention should be a separate process of considerations. Not necessary at the moment.

 Marc Anderson (RySG): (11:41) no objection

 Alex Deacon - IPC: (11:42) id like to better understand the disclosure/publication definition at some point (whenever it makes sense)

 Alex Deacon - IPC: (11:43) cool

 Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (11:45) Thanks Berry, I'm suitably frightened

 Berry Cobb: (11:49) Not that I'm an expert, but whether its public or not, to me its still being disclosed.

Alan Woods (RYSG): (11:51) +1 Sarah

Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (11:51) Yes, backwards, thanks

Alex Deacon - IPC: (11:52) ok - that seems fine - lets just make sure if we use different terms we know what they mean and we use them consistantly through out the document.

Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (11:52) +1 Alex - defined terms is key

Marc Anderson (RySG): (11:56) yes

Alan Woods (RYSG): (11:56) agreed! hahaha ... again proviso ... i'm a layer... imay have (read definately did) mangle that!

Alan Woods (RYSG): (11:57) *lawyer

Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (11:57) From my medium-technical-level perspective,it was a great explanation. I could'nt now explain it to smeone else, but it all made sense when you said it.

Marc Anderson (RySG): (11:57) also correct, for 1a, we aren't talking RDS, this is done via DNS - still disclosure (publication)

Alex Deacon - IPC: (11:59) If they were not "out there" the DNS wouldn't beable to do what it was designed to do.

Alex Deacon - IPC: (11:59) they = IP addresses and name servers.

Alan Woods (RYSG): (12:00) exactly! :) Perfect! It's a necessary disclosure that most closely resembles a 'publication'. I'm in! :)

Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:01) Yes, those should be optional

Alan Woods (RYSG): (12:02) ok both makes sense ... less artictic licence more - well grounded & educated assumption!

Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:02) +1 Alan

Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:02) Can we scroll back up to the Registrant section please

Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:03) I just want to look through that a bit more

Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:03) thaks

Alan Woods (RYSG): (12:03) OK guys ... I can stay on the line, but dropping from the AC room! :)

Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:03) Bye Alan!

Alan Woods (RYSG): (12:03) (i'll be listening for about another 20 minutes) thank you and sorry again for going!

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:06) I'll note that "DNSSEC" is actually multiple fields: "DNSSEC" and "DNSSEC DS Data"

Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:07) But is the DNSSEC key being published required to fulfill this purpose (activate & allocate the domain to the RNH)? If the DNSSEC key is not published can the domain still be activated? like just with broken DNSSEC?

Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:07) (I dont know that much about DNSSEC, sorry)

Marc Anderson (RySG): (12:07) oh, good questions.... raising my hand to answer

Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:07) thanks Marc

Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:10) :D I can live with sorta

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:11) its not, but if the RNH wants it one could argue that the domain name is not fully activated.

Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:11) @Berry - would it be possible when you do the next version of these workbooks to take the Purpose statement and put it into the header box on the "data elements matrix" page for each one, please? That would mean a lot less scrolling up and down to ensure I keep the right purpose in mind when looking through these matrices

Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:12) So would DNSSEC fit better under purpose 2 (security stability resliency of the DNS)?

Berry Cobb: (12:12) I'll see what I can do. You should have them memorized by now right? ;-)

Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:12) Thanks Berry :) I'm honestly surprised that I don't.

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:13) @sarah - purpose 2 is only about 3rd party accesss so i don't think so.
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:13) Oh right - thanks Alex. I keep forgetting to read to the end of that one
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:13) Thanks Marc! that sounds good
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:13) Oh right! Good point Alan
Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:14) i'm picturing alan standing on the cliffs of moher.
Marc Anderson (RySG): (12:14) agreed, doesn't fit under purpose 2
Marc Anderson (RySG): (12:14) still really a part of the service that the registry is providing
Marc Anderson (RySG): (12:14) and agree with Alan's point, we don't need to loose sleep over DNSSEC key as it's not PII
Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:16) here is my key - happy to share :)   DNSSEC: signedDelegation   DNSSEC DS Data: 19156 8 2 881CDB63BA01BF1160454D9CC499C9AE0D6E8D296AFE786664C32C05BB31427C
Marc Anderson (RySG): (12:16) @Alex - lol
Marc Anderson (RySG): (12:16) +1 Berry
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:16) Yep sounds good thanks
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:19) So, the Org field - is not collected at all (either required or optionally) but it is optionally transmitted to the registry?
Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:19) only if collected I assume
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:20) But so far it hasn't been collected at all? So if we collect it under a purpose later, we could disclose it under this purpose? I thought each disclosure has to be iwthin the same purpose as the colleciton
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:21) Agree that transmission should be Optional
Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:22) i wonder if the german language has different words for all of the flavors of the word "optional' we seem to need....
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:22) I would expect there are several :)
Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:24) +1 Berry - agree there should be an O in the Org collection field.
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:26) What he said.
Berry Cobb: (12:27) Optional for Registrant to fill in, but if supplied it must be processed
Berry Cobb: (12:27) Optional for Registrar to provide, but if supplied it must be processed
Berry Cobb: (12:27) Optional for contracted party subject to terms and conditions
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:28) Sorry,waht does provide mean in that second one
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:28) maybe that's a discussion for an email thread
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:29) Thanks!
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:29) O-RNH, O-Rr, O-CP
Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:30) that could work
Marc Anderson (RySG): (12:31) can you say that again Berry, I'm not sure I followed
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:31) Yeah or give a specific example
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:33) Is the quesiton if O makes sense in column 1B?
Berry Cobb: (12:33) yes.
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:33) OK
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:34) Right - what Marc is saying is where i would've gone with this
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:34) The registry would need to have a contractual requirement to the registrar to provide the data
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:34) so then its not optional
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:34) Maybe this is O-CP (Optional for contracted party subject to terms and conditions_
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:37) +1 Marc!
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:37) I keep making that exact mistake because I dont read the whole sentence to the end ...

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:37) +1 Marc
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:39) wait
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:40) i had more to ask re 1b
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:40) sorry
Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:41) I guess it depends on who the data is being disclosed to
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:41) Alex, valid point
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:42) (not sure I agree with it, but should be considered)
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:42) if anything, they should be optional
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:43) "registrant details" is vague but seems to mean the registrant contact set... Let's see if we can make it O please
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:45) Super, thaks
Marc Anderson (RySG): (12:45) makes sense
Marc Anderson (RySG): (12:45) +1 Alex
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:47) Thanks for coming back to that
Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:47) sounds good . FWIW I'm a big fan of the data flow maps. understand it is a lot of work to update them and ensure they are current.
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:49) Makes sense to me
Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:52) I think that is understood under 61f
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:52) True - not sure it's somehting we can/should define here
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:52) I just don't want to somehow suggest that ALL these data MUST be disclosed
Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:53) its understood that under 61f there is a possibility that zero data will be disclosed.
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:54) Thanks Alex. I just worry that not everyone understands the same thing...
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:54) ALso, those blank ones (phone ext, fax, fax ext) - should be some sort of optional right?
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:55) Thanks Berry
Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:56) Agree marc in a GDPR compliant manner.
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (12:58) Yeah - i'm not sure that disclosure under purpose 2 for data that's collected under purpose-not-2 works
Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:59) lets just be careful to not undo agreements (important agreements)
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (13:00) Alex - indeed
Berry Cobb: (13:01) Thus our principle that we should ID what data needs to be collected, so that it can be disclosed later.
Berry Cobb: (13:01) looking at it in isolation.
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (13:06) Yeah - I'd like to see some kind of indication that there is a possibility that zero data (or a subset of the data) will be disclosed.
Marc Anderson (RySG): (13:06) yup, agree with Alex, not trying to undo anything agreed to earlier, just noting that its not a automatic disclosure, or maybe I should say publication, but rather a disclosure request
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (13:08) Yes, that
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (13:11) It's hard to put everyting in tables
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (13:11) We appreciate your efforts
Berry Cobb: (13:13) correct - and to me a direct connection to SSR
Alex Deacon - IPC: (13:14) though 3 goes beyond SSR
Berry Cobb: (13:14) I may have mis-spoke.
Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (13:15) Agree with Marc -and the worksheet does show data being collected for this purpose

Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (13:16) +1 Marc

Marc Anderson (RySG): (13:19) I'm interested in drilling down more on the URS/UDRP ones as well. I haven't looked at them recently, but I recall having some concerns with that one.

Alex Deacon - IPC: (13:19) I have some data berry and will send it to you today (for Purpose 5)

Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (13:20) Where are we with the definitions - do we have updated versions beyond Alan's redline? I was going to look through them again

Marc Anderson (RySG): (13:20) No worries, probably just as well, I spoke to much today

Marc Anderson (RySG): (13:20) but happy to give an update next week.

Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (13:22) Thnks Berry - scrolled back up and I see them there

Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (13:22) Thanks Berry, appreciate your work

Marc Anderson (RySG): (13:22) thanks Berry!

Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (13:22) And thanks to Marc, ALex, and Alan

Sarah Wyld - RrSG: (13:22) It's good to work through this with you