

**ICANN Transcription  
GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP WG – Data Sub-team Session  
Tuesday 26 April 2016 at 1530 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP WG Data Sub-team Session call on the Tuesday 26 April 2016 at 15:30 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-data-26apr16-en.mp3>

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

Woman: . All right thank you (Zack). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the GNSO NexGen Registration Directory Services Policy Development Process Working Group call 26th of April 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 are on the audio bridge only please let yourself be known now.

Thank you. I'd also like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I'll hand it back over to you Michele.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Okay Michele for the transcript record and all that. So cut the usual questions beginning of any working group call. Are there any updates to people's statements of interest on conflicts of interest or anything in that – of that nature? Going once, going twice? Okay moving on.

Okay so for those of you who haven't been keeping track and just a recap instead of having our standard call with the entire working group we decided that today we would hold three calls as part of one call with each call - with each section dealing with one of the three sub teams.

So the first sub team is the Data Sub Team which is why you listen to my dulcet tones. The one following that at 1615 UTC will be the privacy sub team and then at 1700 UTC you will have the purpose sub team. So all these sub teams have been working our way diligently and there's been lots and lots of emails flying backwards and forwards. And so what we've been - what we're trying to do at this juncture is to try to and to bring all that work together so that we can then kind of feed that back into the main working group. Now for the Data Sub Team I sent an email around earlier today. Sorry about the delay in doing so but unfortunately I do have to sleep.

So the question I put to the - there are a couple of questions I put to the Sub Team Group. So first off did this input inventory produce any insights to inform the working group's plan? Next one is which inputs are most likely the most relevant during working group deliberations why? And under that one we have several documents that have already been highlighted from the previous call that we had plus also as well these are the ones which are being mentioned on multiplications and various email threads. Which inputs of any have generated the most discussion within the sub team? Which inputs may be considered obsolete or superseded by subsequent work? What input cut gaps if any may need to be addressed later and are there any other key takeaways from this input the team wishes to share with the main working group?

And as I added in my notes, you know, any and all inputs are considered at some point. We're not suggesting in any - at all that any documents are to be discounted or discarded unless of course they're completely superseded by something else. So that was where this came from. As previously discussed

by the various different emails we are not – everybody is welcome to be on all – on the entire call. However we're trying to do is have the sub groups working on this only. So those of you who were on the Data Sub Team if you could raise your hands in the Adobe Connect because I really don't feel like playing – doing a rollcall. So there's several of you there. Great, excellent, nice. Seeing lots of hands going up. That's wonderful.

Okay. Wow and this keeps on going. Okay so the idea here is to try to work through this as best we can. So since I hate doing things in illogical sequence I'm going to do things in a completely illogical sequence. So going to the third question that was posed which inputs of any generates the most discussion within the sub team? Any takers? (Vlad) go ahead. (Vlad) you may still be on mute. Either that or my audio's died, I'm not sure. Does anybody else want to go ahead whilst (Vlad) works out his technical difficulties?

No? Okay we can come back to that one. Are there any inputs that people might feel have been rendered obsolete or superseded by any subsequent work? Any takers? No? Okay so (Vlad) has put in the chat he thinks the 2003 Whois Task Force has been – was superseded by the 2007 report. Does anybody agree or disagree with (Vlad)? Anything else you want to add?

Okay. All right then the next question what input gaps if any may need to be addressed later? Does anybody have any thoughts on that one? Amr go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Michele, this is Amr. Just noting my own disclaimer in the chat I haven't been a very productive member of the sub team and I apologize for that. But I do have - it's just more of a question really in terms of input gaps here is internationalized registration data something that perhaps should have been done on this sub team and is this something we should address now or later? There's been a few pieces of work on this. There was the IRP Working Group. There was also an expert working group on internationalized registration data.

And there was some recommendations that came out of the translation transliteration of contact information PDP that are probably also relevant to internationalized registration data that it was so I'm just wondering if this is something that it's timely to bring this up now, should of been brought up sooner or is this something we should look at in the future? And I believe all of these, the work of all these three groups are within scope of this PDP so would appreciate some insight on that. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Amr. I just as I said previously I don't think anything is out of scope unless it's very obviously out of scope. And I think, you know, just personally I think, you know, you're raising a valid point. I - the internationalized aspects are something that definitely need to be looked at. I think in good terms of the EWG I think what we discussed there was rather than getting into kind of lots of gory detail around it we just basically said it should be fully you UTF8 et cetera. It should be fully UTF8 capable or worse that affect so that we didn't have to get it – be too concerned about it.

There was – yes. So that's another one that I've spent with the EW – the main EWG as opposed to the – an expert one on international registrations specifically. Okay so (Lisa)'s saying in the chat that the IRD report should also probably be added to list of inputs. Okay (Alex) is saying in the chat that the current focus needs to be more on data currently displayed on Whois and the subsequent data reflected by (unintelligible) registration. Do we need to account for data collect but not made available?

Did you mean by data that's collected but can't be displayed or could be displayed in a future version of something if you wouldn't mind clarifying? Okay (Alex)? And Amar's suggesting he'd be able to do some more work on IRD at some point.

Okay then are there any other inputs, input gaps that people have spotted? No? Okay. We can come back to that. So let's go back up to the top then.

First question did this infantry produce any insights to inform the working groups work plan? Any thoughts on that one? Nothing?

Okay next one, which inputs are likely to be the most relevant during working group deliberations and why? So the ones that would - the first few documents we have listed there we have the Whois Task Force final reports. We have SAC Zero 54. We have the EWG recommendations including tutorials and FAQs. And we have RA Spec 4. Are there any other inputs are documents that people feel are the most relevant or are those ones the main ones?

Okay then we need to provide a rationale behind each one of those. So starting with the first one the Whois task force final report, why? Why is that important? Anybody? Okay. SAC 054? Amar the question was in relation to the Whois Task Force Final Report why is it important? So (Vlad) has responded that the WTF final report is a good foundation for what was required in the past and mostly what is still required.

(Jeff Acas) is saying it may not be important but could be relevant to discussions. And (Vlad)'s saying that SAC 54 and the RA give us what is currently required. (Elise) is also mentioning that in RFC 7485 should be added to the list. (Vlad) do you have a working phone yet because I'm kind of getting – I was hoping to hear somebody else's voice other than mine. Ah, ha, I hear sound okay never mind. Maybe...

Stephanie Perrin: Hello?

Michele Neylon: Hello yes. Go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Just Stephanie testing her sound. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you for the sound check. So I'm trying to read these things off the screen. (Vlad) the EWG report gives insight into what might be required in the

future and might also - it also gives an insight into where data elements might be moving towards. I'm not sure I understand that bit but okay. Any other thoughts? And (Norma) agrees with RC7485. (Elaine) RDAP advisory, which RDAP advisory?

Okay so (Vlad) said the last bit is to deal with proposed additional contact types that are not currently in the Whois such as the legal contact. Okay. So you're talking about extra contact types that might end up in some form of directory in the future, okay. And (Elaine) has clarified that the RDAP advisory is the most recent one. Okay, fine.

So (Elaine) are you suggesting that that is one of the more important inputs or are you just asking if that has been reviewed? So (Elisa)'s point we have in the chat. The EWG report also provides principles regarding why data elements should or should not be collected or displayed or made mandatory – sorry, or optional as well as the concept of purpose based contact data. Okay so (Elaine)'s point being about the RDAP thing is that it could influence what has to be collected and published in some version of Whois. Okay then all right we're doing pretty well here I think in some of these.

So moving back there to the third question which inputs if any generates the most discussion within the small team? Is there any particular documents that people felt was more dramatic, more interesting, more controversial than any other? Nothing? Okay (Lisa)'s saying that the SAC 54 did get a little bit more – did generate a bit more interest than most of the others. (Alex) thinks that we were pretty much in data collection mode. Okay just where – just be – from my own experience I think looking as I'm on all the lists I think ours was the least controversial of the lists. I'm sure the other groups will have much more to say on this topic than we did. Okay then good.

So the - going back to Question 4 which inputs may be obsolete or superseded by subsequent work? So the one with the Whois task force? Are there any other inputs that people feel might be rendered obsolete or sorry,

have been rendered obsolete? No? Okay. Okay then so moving on again input gaps. So we've got international registration data, anything else? Sorry (unintelligible) data, subset of data – the registrars doing – (unintelligible) is doing registrations. Do need to account for data collected but not made available in the current Whois. Okay so are there any other gaps?

(Norm) is asking is (Who Was) data captured in any reports? (Norm) in which report documents could you be a little bit more specific please? In any of the documents. Okay I think well Who Was it was something that we definitely did discuss within the EWG. I'm not sure about any other of the other documents offhand. (Lisa) is that something that was picked up anywhere else?

(Lisa Phifer): (Michele) no, I think not. This is (Lisa Phifer) for the record. You're right we did touch on it in the EWG report but I don't recall seeing it in any other input document that was reviewed.

Michele Neylon: Okay thanks. Stephanie is saying when and how (unintelligible) so what are you referring to? Go ahead Stephanie please speak up because I'm...

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks. I remember mentioning the - this is Stephanie Perrin for the record, mentioning the Who Was but for those of us who are not familiar can you explain exactly what the justification for Who Was is, who does it, how it's - what the mandate is, you know, what the authority for collection is?

Michele Neylon: Okay Michele. I'm not going to give you a rationale about why - about or a justification for it. I can speak to what the concept behind Who – what the concept is – sorry, my choice of verbs here when we're talking about Who Was because of the - anyway I can describe what it is. I'm not going to get into why it should or shouldn't exist.

So essentially the idea okay Whois tells you what who or to whom a domain name is registered at the present moment in time. The concept behind Who

Was is to tell you who a domain name was registered to in the past. In some parts of Who Was data could just be related to which name servers a domain name used at a point in time or maybe which part of a specific data element might have changed over time.

So for example if you were to look at a lot of my personal domain names they were all using my mobile phone number at one point. Then I switched it to the office phone number. That would probably be picked up at some point. And Who Was is used - can be used for a multitude of different reasons. I'm not going to kind of rational - I can rationalize it for you if you really want but there are a number of reasons why it can be useful for a multitude of different people or different players, not always just pure kind of value-added service type thing. Does that help Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: Well who produces it? I mean, where does it come from. You do not provide the service you being you registrars right? Somebody gathers the historical data.

Michele Neylon: They'll be registrars.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, no no I thought this was if I may quote you, a dirty filthy reseller that was harvesting the data and then republishing. It's a question I...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: All right this - okay so a couple of the registries I believe VeriSign was one were offering or proposing to offer a some form of Who Was service at some point in the past. Now I can't further off the top of my head remember whether VeriSign actually went ahead with it or not. Somebody might - from VeriSign might be on this call that might be able to correct me. Actually Chuck works for VeriSign so maybe he'll remember.



I can't remember whether that actually happened. I suspect it didn't. So the registry – a registry operator would have a record of all the name servers that were used by a particular domain and which registrar the domain was with at various points throughout its domains history. As a registrar we would probably have records covering various other bits of data related to the domain name, when it was with us. But as you say yes, no registrars themselves don't generally offer that service at the moment.

And as (Norm) put in the chat nobody at the moment offers a full view of all gTLD data in terms of who I'm sorry - all that information at any given time. (Jody Coker) has said in the chat that VeriSign did offer the who was service but discontinued it. Okay. And it didn't contain contact information and the reason it didn't contain contact information. And the reason it didn't contact information is because VeriSign doesn't have the contact information so it couldn't have done it. (Alex) is saying it - you could describe it as being industry innovation to fill a market need. So I'm not sure which – which subsection do you want to put this in Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: I don't suppose you have a section for illegal reuse of information. It wouldn't be a popular section but, you know, there's two ways of viewing this. There have been complaints to data protection commissioners regarding the inability for individuals to get their phone numbers out of the...

Michele Neylon: Okay. Just I'll...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: ...okay I'll just stop you right there. Just one thing to bear in mind here, Who Was does not have to include contact information or personally identifiable information. So for example if you're if StephaniePerrin.com was hijacked Who Was would be able to tell us which registrars it bounced through and which name servers it used over the – over a period of time.

Was what you're talking about I think has more to do with personally identifiable information being sold and resold. So I mean this, you know, there's two parts to that. But okay so we could – where could we slot the Who Was thing in as being something to discuss further? Could we put that in which one was this, blah, blah, blah? I'm trying to see where this would put this, input gaps maybe? Okay I recognize (Vlad) and then (Lisa). (Vlad) do you have...

Vlad Dinculescu: (Unintelligible) can you hear me?

Michele Neylon: Oh I can hear you. Go ahead (Vlad).

Vlad Dinculescu: Oh fun times okay but yes it's (unintelligible) was very, nice. For the record. This Who Was service that'd be something that more of the Privacy Team should be looking at considering that we're not so much looking at the data elements because maybe a Who Was servers from one provider maybe listen to a Who Was service to another provider perhaps. But the legal aspect around the privacy around the information and release of that information of the historical information shouldn't that be more on the Privacy Team side, not so much as to data element side? Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Fair point, thank you (Vlad). (Lisa) over to you.

(Lisa Phifer): Thanks Michele. I was actually just starting to type in chat but I think it's already been noted that the EWG report covers a number of items that might be future additions to consider or enhancements to consider. Who Was is one of those. Reverse Whois is also covered there. So you could just note that Who Was is one of the many possible enhancements that's considered as part of the EWG report and looking at possible needs for data elements as opposed to restrictions upon providing them which of course is the domain of the privacy area.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you. Okay so this is one of the things I think just to, you know, highlight something that we had touched on previously. And, you know, none of these sub teams exist in isolation. There's always going to be crossover between the various sub teams since we're all going to be dealing with data and elements and things that all kind of cross over multiple areas.

Okay so info gaps we've got some sections there. Key takeaways from this – key takeaways we want to share with the main working group. Anybody, Chuck and (Vlad)?

Chuck Gomes: Why don't you let (Vlad) go first and then I'll jump in.

Michele Neylon: Okay go ahead (Vlad).

Vlad Dinculescu: Hi. Vlad Dinculescu for the record. I suppose if you're looking at key takeaways in terms of the documents I'm not so sure if we need to look in the past particularly with the Whois Task Force Report. But the RA specification for of what kind he is is very, very important from our point of view and the EWG recommendations also going into the future in terms of what's might look like in the future and what it might incorporate, what we need to address in terms of data elements in the future. In my opinion I believe those are the most two key documents that (unintelligible). Thanks.

Michele Neylon: All right thank you. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Okay thanks, great activity going on. I've really been pleased with what's going on. And hopefully this will generate more follow-up on the - your list, your team list over the coming week and that's great. But I wanted to go back to Question Number 1 at the top of the Adobe screen and suggest some area for discussion. It's been quite a while now but when we were talking about the work plan and the order of the questions when we get to deliberation on the questions from the charter okay there was quite a bit of discussion on the order of what should be talked about especially with regard to Question

Number 1 which was users and who should have access and why, the users and the purposes question.

And Question Number 3, or excuse me, Question Number 4 was on what data should be collected, stored and disclosed which of course is what your team is all about. And then Question Number 5 which had to do what steps are needed to protect data and privacy. And the debate on in our group, the full group was okay maybe we should switch the order of those. Maybe the data elements should be covered first and privacy second and then users and purposes and some people got a little different order.

So just to generate just a little bit of discussion and hopefully more discussion on your list, your team list I'm curious if this team, the data team came up with any opinions in terms of the order of how we should cover those or whether they should be synced up in some way? And I'll leave it at that. So the three elements that a lot of discussion occurred on the whole list were data elements privacy and users and purposes. And when we get to deliberation in the working group and of course develop our work plan in that regard did this team - does this team have after the work that you've done you have any opinions, any input on that that you would like to share?

Michele Neylon: Thanks Chuck. So any thoughts from anybody? (Nick) is that in relation to Chuck's - to Chuck or in relation to (Fabrizio)? Okay so it's to Chuck's comments. So (Nick) has put in the chat at this point what data, which users, what privacy would be my suggestion for order of approach. And (Luke) I assume that's in response to (Nick) is it? What about the rectification and raiser of rights? That's more to do with privacy though. Stephanie is that an old hand or a new hand?

Stephanie Perrin: It's actually a new hand Michele if I may. And I'm not really a part of this group so of course you can tell me to go away.

Michele Neylon: Have I ever told you to go away? Have I ever done that to you?

Stephanie Perrin: I don't think so but, you know, there's always a first time and I'm sure there'll be votes to send me away in a moment. But in response to (Nick)'s order and we've made the point before we being those on the privacy side it does seem as if we are asking people to imagine all the possible uses for this wonderful data and following with that all the possible elements that we might also want to collect for those purposes and those users and then tagging privacy at the end. And as I've said a zillion times already the first question is what is the purpose of the collection use and disclosure of information at ICANN under its mandate to be the official purveyor of registrations? And that ought to be limited in specific under data protection...

Michele Neylon: Okay. Okay so we're moving back into a privacy discussion here but I disagree with you entirely.

Stephanie Perrin: You disagree or you agree?

Michele Neylon: I'm Irish so I can't even plead the fifth because we don't have a fifth. Well we probably do but it wouldn't mean the same thing. I'm not going to answer that there. What I will say is okay so you disagree with the order that (Nick) is suggesting so you're suggesting instead that the privacy should look - come first and then data and users. (Lisa) put in the chat that the charter recommends agreeing upon purposes and users before data so the data needs can be put into context which doesn't quite address your point. So okay then what - so what we can probably take away from this is that some people may feel that privacy should be - that which privacy should be applied and all that so it goes back over to the privacy team. I'm not sure exactly where this fits into the Data Sub Team.

So maybe what we can say then is that the data team, the data is subject to other elements subject - is going to be subject to privacy and purpose. Is that helpful or not? Somebody other than Stephanie agree or disagree with me please. (Vlad) go ahead.

Vlad Dinculescu: Thanks Michele, Vlad Dinculescu for the record. From my point of view when I look at data I mean if I don't have a purpose behind it then why am I collecting it in a sense? So for me purpose always (unintelligible) to find what I need well, to find why I would need something. From there I would look at current data to say does current data elements that are currently provided be it through the Whois, be it some sort of contractual requirement can that actually meet my purpose?

And if it does okay, do I need to restrict some sort of access to this data because is it (unintelligible) to some of the nature? So to me a purpose, an underlying need would then be served by a data element and then covered up with privacy if need be. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Okay thanks (Vlad). All right then. Okay I'm just conscious of the time. We've got a couple of minutes left until the next group starts. So I think we've done some – we've got some good input here. So between now and next week I think there's a couple of the questions here we may need to flesh out a little bit further but I think overall we're in a pretty good place. So how about we try to finalize responses to a couple of – there's a couple of outstanding pieces by close of business on Friday of this week so that we can be able to hand that back over to the main group at the next meeting next week? Does that seem reasonable to those of you who are on this call? I'll assume that your silence is agreement. Okay in that case I will hand over now to - I will hand over to the Privacy Team which is being led by David Cake who may not actually be on the call.

((Crosstalk))

Is David on the call? Oh he is on the call. Sorry go ahead David.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. We need to do about a one minute break just to switch the recording. It may actually be less than one minute. And again like Michele

said we can - others are welcome to stay on as long as you like but let's take no more than a minute to switch recordings. Thanks.

END OF Data Sub-team Session