ICANN Transcription
Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group
Tuesday 11 April 2017 at 1600 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Next-Gen RDS PDP WG call on the Tuesday, 11 April 2017 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. Attendance may be found at:
https://community.icann.org/x/CcPRAw
The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-nextgen-rds-pdp-11apr17-en.mp3

Coordinator: Recording has started.

Michelle DeSmyter: All right, great. Thank you so much, (Tory). Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening to all. Welcome to the Next Gen RDS PDP Working Group call on the 11th of April, 2017 at 1600 UTC. In the interest of time today there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants online, attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room so if you're only on the audio bridge today would you please let yourself be known now?

Beth Allegretti: Hi, it's Beth Allegretti, I'm online now but I'll be only audio shortly.

Michelle DeSmyter: All right thanks, Beth, we'll note that.

((Crosstalk))

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: This is Lawrence Olawale-Roberts. I'm on the audio bridge only.

Michelle DeSmyter: All right, thank you, Lawrence, we'll note that as well.

((Crosstalk))

Mike Hammer: Mike Hammer. I'm getting the visual part online but I'm on the audio bridge because it keeps on dropping out for the online for me.

Michelle DeSmyter: Okay. All right, thank you, Mike. All right, and as a reminder to all participants please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this, I will turn the call back over to Chuck Gomes.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Michelle. And welcome to everyone on our working group call today. Let me warn - give you a little bit of a warning, I'm in a recreational vehicle so there might be some - I'm not driving, okay, but it takes me a little bit longer to get on mute if I need to on my cell phone than if I'm in my office, so just a warning there.

Appreciate everyone joining the call today. We have a full agenda, as usual. Does anyone have a statement of interest update? And for those that aren't in Adobe yet, just speak up if you want to talk and let us know and we'll get you in as quickly as we can.

Lisa Phifer: Chuck, it appears that several people may be having some trouble with the AC audio.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Can you hear me okay, Lisa?

Lisa Phifer: Yes, I can, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Lisa? Oh okay, thank you.

Lisa Phifer: It looks like several people have audio and some people do not. Michelle is checking. Might want to give just a minute.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay, so I'll allow some time there. I didn't see any hands go up for statement of interest updates so hearing anyone so I'm assuming that's all in order. Let's take a look at the agenda while we're waiting here for more people to get audio. Andrew, go ahead.

Andrew Sullivan: Sorry about that. This is Andrew Sullivan. I should have probably I should have stated this last week and I didn't and I haven't managed to log into the site because for some reason my credentials don't seem to be working, but I'm officially an Oracle employee rather than a Dyn so that's a difference. I mentioned before that Dyn had been purchased by Oracle so in some sense there's no change in the statement of interest but of course it would be a material change - or a technical change so I want to mention it.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Andrew. Appreciate that. This is Chuck. Anyone else with a statement of interest update? Okay. Note the agenda, and again I'm kind of buying a little bit of time to see if we get some audio problems corrected. Looks like Kal got it. And…

Lisa Phifer: And note Maxim has an update to his SOI.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I see that. Maxim, would you like to - why don't you go ahead and share that with the group right now? Thank you for updating it.

Maxim Alzoba: Hello, everybody. Maxim Alzoba for the record. I have an updated by SOI because I'm member of Standing Selection Committee within GNSO. Yes, that's it basically.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Maxim, appreciate it. Anyone else? Okay, I'm going to assume that just about everyone has audio now. Let us know in Adobe if you don't if you're in Adobe, okay? And…

Lisa Phifer: Chuck, it appears that people who are in Adobe hear other people in Adobe but they're not hearing people on the phone on the audio bridge.

Chuck Gomes: Oh. That's not very good.

Michelle DeSmyter: Pardon me, Chuck. This is Michelle.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Michelle DeSmyter: I'm very sorry for the interruption. I just wanted to let you know this might be easier, I am going to let our IT department know what's going on. There is an Adobe Connect issue across the board, it's not just this call so I'm going to try and get that resolved as soon as possible.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Michelle. And so let me ask, those of you who are using the - have been trying unsuccessfully to use the Adobe audio, if you can dial in to audio please do so. I'm sorry for the inconvenience. But until they get the problem resolved, that's a work around. And the dial-in numbers were provided to everybody but let's put them in the chat as well so that if somebody doesn't have that handy they can find it. Andrew, is that an old hand? Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Lisa Phifer: …we can't hear you.

Chuck Gomes: All right, so again, just pausing a little bit. You can see - let me go back to the agenda and I'll talk about that a little while we try and allow some time for

people to dial in if they can. Can we get the - or did it already happen - the dial-in number put in the chat for people please?

Lisa Phifer: Chuck, the dial-ins are different for each country.

Chuck Gomes: Oh that's right. That's right. So please you can find it on the wiki or you can find it in the announcement or staff sends the announcements out several times before each meeting so please…

Lisa Phifer: And Michelle has indicated if you need a dial-out you can private chat her. That's…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yes, so if anyone - if anyone needs a dial-out please let Michelle know. And it looks like the issue is being addressed. Okay, let's get some updates while we're still letting some people get in. The - first of all the ICANN 58 data protection experts answers were sent to the working group list at the beginning of the weekend. And hopefully everybody got those and hopefully some of you have even reviewed them. I suspect not everyone has. But please do so.

We're going to allow at least until our meeting next week for everyone to review them thoroughly. In fact we're probably going to give you a little - a couple poll questions on the first two questions that we ask and the answers we receive just to get people warmed up and going on that this coming week. So those responses have been received.

Let me clarify that the answers are from the European Data Protection experts that were on the panel, not the - not from the people who were on the panel that weren't - that were part of the ICANN community and our community. So please understand that so they weren't from Becky or Greg or any of the others that were ICANN community participants in that. So or for

Jim, okay? Just make sure you understand that. We'll try and get an introduction on that added so that people can be clear on that.

Greg Shatan, you have your hand up. Go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Chuck. Greg Shatan for the record. You answered my first question already. I guess the - since the way it was presented it made it seem as if all the panelists were responding. So thank you for clarifying that. My question is whether those who were on the panel but who were not the European Data Protection Commissioners, will be given a chance to weigh in or respond in some fashion to that document or have they been dismissed with the thanks of a grateful populous and never to be heard from again?

Chuck Gomes: They have been dismissed. No, I'm just kidding. The - we will be going through the answers in quite a lot of detail in our working group. We're not going to do that today. And we may spread that over several weeks so absolutely, to the extent that they're participating in the working group, they will have an opportunity to share their views. That's - we need that in fact. So and not only those who were on the panel but everybody else in the working group. And this is Chuck speaking. So absolutely that will be it.

So we're not going to just accept the answers as-is, we're going to go through them and see what kind of agreement we can get in terms of things that we can learn from the answers. In some cases we'll probably have some clarifying questions. In my review of the answers, I had a few clarifying questions that I know I want to ask. But also I saw a lot of things that were encouraging. They didn't just nix everything but actually said some things in there that provide suggestions for ways forward as well. So we'll get into all of that.

Mike, Michael Hammer, go ahead.

Mike Hammer: Thank you. So, yes, I actually did read the document, have some real concerns. How do we - because I'm still not clear on the process, how do we put forward a suggestion or approach that might solve the privacy concerns but still allow us to move forward in a way that allows anti-abuse folks like myself to fight the bad guys?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michael. Well, that will happen in the next few weeks and months as we first of all finalize our key concepts, as some of those relate to privacy and data protection, but some of the key concepts will relate to needs of law enforcement and intellectual property, things like that. So there will be lots of opportunity for input. And our ultimate goal is what you have asked about, and that is to find solutions that meet the competing needs that we will encounter and are encountering already.

So bear with us. We can only accomplish so much especially with a group this size and with competing interests involved, but we will have full opportunity to come up with solutions, okay? Greg Shatan, your hand's up again.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Chuck. A brief follow up on my first question, and a brief follow up to Mike's remarks. First, what about panelists who are not participating in the working group? Will they be given an opportunity to review the document and to either contribute to it and respond in some fashion?

And the second point, I also have some concerns about the document, which appears to me to be at least as much an advocacy document as a document coming from those in a position of advocating or at least managing data protection initiatives. So it concerns me that we have kind of one side of the coin perhaps being represented here and not how private companies such as ICANN and many of us would deal with this as a practical purpose. So I don't know that we have that expertise. I unfortunately don't have that level of expertise in this area so I'm wondering how we will deal with kind of evening out the scale. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. This is Chuck again. I'm sure it's a one-sided document. And our task is to recognize that and to get out of that what we can that's helpful but at the same time make sure that we do look at other sides, and we will. So going in I figured it would be one-sided, even the, you know, the data protection experts, they were presenting their point of view. I wanted to understand their point of view, and I still do. But that's - but it's our task now to see all sides. And we will do that.

As far as people that aren't a part of this working group, anybody can contribute to this working group as long as they're identified and want to do so, communicate to the leadership team that someone who wants to do that, that will be fine. Of course they're welcome to join the working group as well. So there's no restrictions on somebody that wants to make a contribution in doing so whether they're a part of the working group or not, they just need to work with us so that we can arrange for that.

And you're welcome, as working group members, to share the document. It's a public document. So you're welcome to share that with any of those panelists or somebody else, for that matter, who has good expertise so that they can contribute either through you or directly if they'd like their viewpoints.

Keep in mind that we, as a working group, didn't sponsor that session. It was sponsored by the GNSO and the GAC, so we had limited control over that. But that doesn't prevent us from doing our due diligence and we will. Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. This is Lisa from staff. Just to maybe reiterate especially since we have some new working group members that weren't part of the process prior to Copenhagen, this working group had developed the list of questions in an effort to, you know, further our education on privacy laws - privacy and data protection laws and concepts. And so as such really this - the answers are really part of our education. And this should be maybe

viewed as a mutual education process because the experts that did provide answers, of course, aren't experts in registration data and directory services.

So some of what we can do as a working group is facilitate that mutual education by asking some clarifying questions perhaps to help them understand how those principles apply, or we think they might apply to registration data and get further feedback. So it can be, I think, a two way street, not just a one way document.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Lisa. This is Chuck again. I think that's enough on that document. We'll probably - quite likely as part of our agenda next week in the working group, we'll start looking at some of those answers. As you know, we asked 19 questions so we're not going to try and bite them all off at once, but please if you haven't reviewed it, review it before our meeting next week. And as I indicated, we'll probably have a couple poll questions.

They're going to be a little bit - there will be a different nature to the poll questions we're going to ask related to this document, because we're not going to be making - trying to get rough consensus on some decisions yet; it's way too early for that on those. But we want to make sure we have good understanding and that we find out the issues that we've got to address and confirm with - from all points of view. So please review that before next time.

Agenda Item 2B are questions for ccTLD operators. And Susan Kawaguchi is going to give us a little update in terms of what's happening there.

Susan Kawaguchi: Hi, a small team has been working on those questions. And we continue to - I've actually sort of dropped the ball last week and didn't keep the thread going so hopefully we'll get more work done this week or the beginning of next. And so far we have about four or five questions and hope to develop and sort of center in on a few more key points. So hopefully next week we'll have some questions to provide to the broader working group.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Susan. Chuck again. The next item is - and of course as we're going through these things if anybody has a question just raise your hand if you're not in Adobe speak up and we'll give you opportunity to do so. Let's go then to the next agenda item which is the definition of authoritative. And I think we have three people who volunteered last week to work on that. And David Cake's going to give us an update. And certainly either of the others on that small group are welcome to speak up if they'd like as well. David.

David Cake: Can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, we can. You're coming across loud and clear.

David Cake: Oh terrific. Just wanted to say the - that group has started its work but we don't yet have an answer for you. What we have done is looked in detail at the use of the term "authoritative" within the RFC documents. And unfortunately determined that the - while it is well defined in those documents, it's really well defined only for the DNS and not in a way that is even particularly well done for that purpose but certainly not useful for ours. We've also - Palage has filled us in on the issues with the confusion with the legal definition of authoritative and I would avoid those.

                 We think we're beginning to capture the idea that we are after. But that - we have not yet done so.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, David. This is Chuck.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Much appreciated. And let us know, give us a little - once you have agreed on a draft definition the plan of course is to share it with the whole working group and discuss it as a whole working group and hopefully come to reasonably strong agreement in terms of definition because one of the conclusion from last week was we really need that definition now, not later. And so thanks to

the three of you, Andrew, Mike Palage, and David Cake for working on that. We look forward to a great definition that we'll all readily accept. So and just to make your task even more challenging I'll throw that out. So thanks, guys, for the help there.

And then the fourth item under Agenda Item 2 is planning for the meeting in Johannesburg in June. And that is well under way. And the leadership team has made a request, and I'll let Amr update everybody on the request and what's going on there. Amr, go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Chuck. This is Amr from staff. Apart from the regular working group face to face meeting, the leadership team and staff are submitting a request for a three-hour cross community session to discuss this working group's progress and to solicit input from the broader community especially considering that ICANN 59 in Johannesburg is going to be a policy forum where the focus of the public meeting is to discuss ongoing policy development work.

So predicting the progress of this working group by June we're planning on providing a brief overview of the questions that the working group is addressing and some of the answers that the working group has come up with. And but the main bulk of the cross community session what we're hoping is that we're going to be soliciting this input from the broader community on the working group's initial key concepts for users and purposes, data elements, and the related privacy and data protection law requirements.

So we're, like I said, we're going to be requesting a three-hour session and doing this with the thought in mind that the session with the privacy experts in Copenhagen, which was 90 minutes, was not long enough, so we're going to be asking for two blocks of 90 minute sessions which comes to three hours.

Be happy to answer any questions on this. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Amr. This is Chuck again. And just to clarify, and Amr indicated this at the beginning, and that is this is separate from our face to face working group meeting. So early in the four days of meetings in Johannesburg, the plan is to have a three-hour working group session, okay, like we've had at each of the sessions since we've been operating. In addition to that, we're requesting a three hour cross community session, they used to call them high interest sessions, where the whole community is invited and there are minimal conflicts, conflicting meetings going on, where we then would seek community input. So we would hope that the majority of the session, like Amr said, is interactive with the guests that are there between the working group members and member from the community are not part of our working group so that we can test where we're at with them.

Now one of the things that, as you know, we've been doing for quite a while now, is developing some key concepts and even eventually some purposes of things and trying to reach at least rough consensus on those things. The main intent would be to communicate those areas of at least rough consensus agreement that we have reached so far and see what kind of feedback we can get from the broader community and take advantage of the face to face meeting to do that. Any questions on that?

Okay, very good. And I'll glance at the chat because I - when I'm managing a meeting I'm not always good at that so if somebody sees something in the chat that I missed, please bring it up.

The - so let's go then to Agenda Item 3, which is the bulk of our meeting today and start deliberating on Charter Question - Sub Question 3.1, "What are the purposes of each existing gTLD thin registration data element?" As you'll recall, a couple weeks ago I think now, maybe a little bit more than that, Andrew Sullivan suggested an approach for moving forward in what we were doing and Rod suggested that a good connection for that was - Rod

Rasmussen - suggested that the Expert Working Group report had some good information that we could use and maybe facilitate that effort.

So what's happened now - there's been an integration of Andrew's suggested approach with the information from the EWG report. And hopefully that document is being brought up now so that we can start going through that. And we're going to start with the first data element from thin data, which is the domain name.

So here is the merged document, or it's in front of you here, so we're not going to go through that. But just for those who need a refresher in terms of what the thin data elements are, Andrew included that in it his document and you can see them there, the domain name, the registrar, etcetera. And so our goal today in our meeting is to start going through those in using the method that Andrew suggested.

And there's a table and you have scrolling rights if you're in Adobe. For those of you who are not in Adobe, hope you have the document in front of you. Any time anybody's not able to get in Adobe it's really helpful if you can have the documents available for your own use so you can stay with us.

And so in the table that follows there, if you scroll down I think it's to about Page 3, you'll see that there is a column for the thin data element, the first one being domain name, the EWG purposes there in the next column. Now so that everyone understands because some of them weren't involved certainly when the EWG report was done, but some of them are even - have joined us in the last few weeks.

Rod, I'm going to ask you, if you would please, to just kind of explain what the EWG purposes are at a high level at least so when it says "all" what does that mean? I obviously know what it means but some people may not. And if you could talk a little bit about that I would appreciate it.

Rod Rasmussen: Okay, Chuck. This is Rod Rasmussen. Thanks for putting me on the spot.

Chuck Gomes: You're welcome.

Rod Rasmussen: So, you know, so the purposes - so when we crafted this work, obviously didn't all come together in holistically all at once. And what we did in kind of the initial stages of what we were working on as the EWG was looking at what purposes people were putting or using or applying this information that's collected into Whois and what those were and trying to gather up a comprehensive universe of those.

Those are explained in detail in one of the earlier sections of that, I think the first or second section of the report after the executive summary. And those are related to each other and describe in some detail through that section.

Then what we did was apply - take the actual data elements that are involved in the, you know, generally in an RDS whether they existed, you know, today today's world or potentially could exist in a going-forward scenario and related those back to those original purposes so that we could actually create this matrix.

So there's a shorthand within that document that relates a general concept that was - describe in more depth elsewhere in the document to that particular data element. And that exercise led to kind of this mapping of different data elements to purposes for which they're collected and displayed and used an all those things.

The exercise also allowed us to go through and see if there were - excuse me, data elements that had no real purpose at least that would - we would consider a legitimate purpose. We identified a few illegitimate purposes, expand harvesting and abuse and some other things. But the considerations we were given for inclusion included the ones that we had determined as a group that were some sort of legitimate purposes that we agreed to.

So that is what that matrix was. And so there's a general concept area that's mapped here and then we have to actually go into the guts of the document to understand the details of each of these shorthand items. Is that what you were looking for, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. I did. Now does anybody have any questions on that? This is Chuck. So the - when it says "all" it basically means all purposes that were identified in the EWG report. And keep in mind, those are - those were uses that they identified. They were not developing policy. It's going to be up to us to develop policy and right now we're looking at requirements for policy. So but they felt like the domain name went across all of the purposes that they - that they identified.

And so it's going to be up to us to decide okay, are the purposes - can we adopt the purposes that they suggested, that they found in their research and in their work? Or can - will we add to them? Will we change them? I mean, that's our task, okay? But this makes for a real good starting point for us.

I'll let you read the collection rationale and the publication rationale on your own and while you're doing that, let's let a couple people jump in. Alan Greenberg, you're first.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Just a quick note. There's only one use of the word "all" the others actually itemize the specific applicable purposes. I would suggest to make this document accessible to more people, replace "all" with whatever the list is.

Chuck Gomes: That's fine. I think we can - staff can take that on as a task. I think that's real doable. Thank you, Alan. Chuck speaking again. Theo, your turn.

Theo Geurts: Thanks, Chuck. This is Theo for the record. So I was not in the RDS - or in the EWG but I'm wondering if I'm looking at all these purposes, from what I'm

hearing the reasoning is either a technical point of view or a very nice to have so to speak.

I'm not hearing what I'm missing in the EWG report is the exploration like could the information that our people are seeking for being achieved by other means by perhaps going through a registrar or other technical means? It sounds to me it has a very technical side so to speak and not really been looking through a lens like is this really, really required? Could we have achieved this by other means? Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Theo. This is Chuck. Well, what you're saying is really important. First of all, we need to understand, all of us, that it wasn't the - that was not the task of the EWG, okay? That's our task as a working group to do what you're talking about. And in fact, for those of you who have reviewed that answers to the - from the data protection experts, that's one of the things - one of the questions they asked. Could something be accomplished in an easier way or a less intrusive way and so forth? So what you're getting at, Theo, is exactly what we're going to have to do, okay?

And so you're right on but it was not their task, it was very clear from the very beginning, and I was not on that group either, but I did track it pretty closely and provided comments and so forth. And it was very clear from the beginning and at the end that they were not developing policy for - and so what some of - what you're talking about is going to feed right into our development of policy as we proceed forward. Rod, go ahead.

Rod Rasmussen: Thanks, Chuck. Rod Rasmussen again. Yes, and thank you for making that point. We were trying very diligently to not make policy in the EWG and trying to do a couple things. One is to get through the issue sand make sure they were thoroughly explored, and then come up with ways forward. We presented several different kind of models to do that.

I would say, though, that we did actually look at alternative ways of doing things. So for example, the entire system we came up with validators as a new concept. The high - I can't remember - highly sensitively credentialing system was another new concept.

So there are several new concepts in there, we didn't come up with every idea under the sun; we'd still be at it I would imagine coming up with ways of dealing with different - dealing with getting information or doing processes, not just about information, it's about processes for accomplishing goals, right, so information is needed in order to accomplish goals, typically, it's not - information is not needed into and of itself.

So we did take a look at a lot of these things and proposed several different options for doing things better than the current system or even some of the other systems that had been proposed. So there's a lot in there that is not what I would call kind of standard thinking or kind of the old way of doing things. So it's worth exploring there.

But yes, there's a lot of different ways that were discussed that weren't put to paper as well as far as, you know, how do you accomplish this goal or provide this information etcetera, etcetera, so there's a - it represents quite a bit. But it is up to this group really to take that information and all the other information and go, okay, well here are the things that we've decided are legitimate purposes and how do we accomplish those, what are the models we can look at for accomplishing those - the goals that those purposes represent? Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Rod, very much. And just - this is Chuck again. And one of the things that strikes me a lot when you look at the EWG report the concept of purpose is a really key element. And of course that's why they were talking about - that's why we have a column here that says EWG Purposes. And the interesting thing about that in terms of where we've been focusing the last few weeks is, is that in the European data protection requirements that we've

been looking at, purpose is also a really key element. So there's a really nice connection and there in that work. So that's a good connection.

So now, my question as we're looking at the data element domain name, can we - can we accept that as kind of the basic - that data element really is needed for whatever list of purposes we use, in other words, all, like it says here, that's referring to all of the EWG purposes. But can we set - it seems to me that the domain name is an essential data element for whatever purposes we come up with. If you don't have a domain name and some of the explanation and rationale says this, you know, we have nothing.

So is there anybody opposed to the conclusion that whatever purposes we come up with, the domain name will be - will support those purposes. Any disagreement with that or any questions about that or do we need to spend more time on that?

((Crosstalk))

Okay. I don't see any hands. Rod, is that an old hand?

Rod Rasmussen: Sorry, it's an old hand.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. All right, then let's then - so that - for staff and the leadership team, so that'll be a polling question just to confirm, that those on the call today there were no objections to the domain name relating to whatever purposes we come up with. And in the case of the EWG, all purposes. So we're about the - the wording on that.

The next one is the registrar, the name of the registrar is the next data element. And again, we won't take time to read on the call unless somebody needs us to. But the registrar - and notice the EWG purposes that are listed there, for that, so you've got domain name control, business domain name purchase or sale, academic public interest, DNS research and so on, you can

look through those on your own. And that was - those are all uses that happen today with regard.

Now whether we decide that those are purposes that we will recommend for example, displaying the registrar name, that's up to us. But let's talk about this one. First of all, let me ask the question whether or not you support all of those EWG purposes as being legitimate for displaying the registrar, is there any disagreement that for those uses, and let's use the word "use" for that, for those uses, anybody disagree with any of those that those are reasons for having - collecting the registrar name and possibly even displaying it? Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks, Chuck. Can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Stephanie Perrin: Maybe not. Okay, good. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I'm not sure this is the right place to - not sure this is the right place to interject this discussion. But I'm wondering if while we discuss the registrar, should we not also talk about the reseller?

Chuck Gomes: Well, first of all, Stephanie, this is Chuck. Keep in mind just for the reason to make managing our process easier, we're focusing right now on thin data elements, okay? It so happens that - and next we're going to focus on thick data elements. Now as you know, reseller is not in either group so we're probably going to have to add - okay, what else do we need to look at besides what we know today as thin and thick data? So now wouldn't be the time to talk about reseller, but let's not forget that going forward. Okay? Once we get past the known thick data elements, should we add some new thick elements? We'll have to come to that later, okay?

Any other comments on registrar? Marc Anderson, go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. This is Marc Anderson for the record. So I think you're asking us if we agree with registrar as a data element but also if we agree that all the EWG purposes apply. Is that correct?

Chuck Gomes: Well, I haven't gotten to that second question yet, but you're right on target. We need to get there.

Marc Anderson: Okay, then I'll hold my comment until we get there. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: No, it's a great comment because - and I've been kind of grappling in my own head, okay, where do we get to that? Do we need to pause and go through those purposes before we even proceed too much further on this? And we may need to do that. So let's go to Andrew and then we'll go to Lisa.

Andrew Sullivan: Hi, thanks. This is Andrew Sullivan. So I just want to point out, because it isn't totally clear from this chart, and I appreciate the chart so I'm not - please don't understand this as a critique of this method. But I sent the message to the list, I grouped this together with some of the other - some of the other data elements because actually there's this - of them here - that are all tightly related to one another.

And so the part of the point that I was trying to make in that message is that even if you object to this - to this registrar field, you still need to have something to say about like the entire set of them because in some sense you're going to need to have the identity of this registrar. And then the question becomes only whether that data is already available somewhere else. And if it is, and it turns out it is, it's in a public registry, in an existing IANA registry, then of course the objection to including the rest of it in the Whois really comes down to a - or in the RDS, becomes a sort of style preference rather than anything else.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Andrew. And I'm going to have a follow up for you. For the sake of those who may benefit from the whole set of elements that you're talking

about from the thin data, why don't you go ahead and name those other elements that are in the category you're talking about and why?

Andrew Sullivan: So what I said was that we have this registrar ID and that's the identity of the entity that created the entry in the registry or we (unintelligible) repository, but whatever. And then we've got the Whois server and the referral URL, and those are meta data that are necessary literally to be able to do the distributed database that the RDS makes. So you sort of have to have that.

And then the mapping of registrar IDs to names is actually in an IANA registry. So to have the distributed system we have two of these elements that are the referral URLs and the web server. The ID is literally a functional question because it - you need to know what identity created the entry in the registry so that you can go and follow up with the registrar or with the entity that created that thing somehow. So to have a distributed system you need to know where to go in the next step.

And then I guess maybe the one that is - has got the strongest claim to being some kind of information that maybe needs some privacy is literally the field we're talking about right now which is the registrar and that's the name that maps to this ID number that shows up in the next field, which we haven't started talking about yet. And so if you want to make an argument that this is data that ought not to appear in the RDS, you're going to need a further argument that the IANA registry that exists for this actually ought to be taken down. And I guess that was the reason that I intervened now.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Andrew. This is Chuck again. Lisa, your turn.

Lisa Phifer: I had actually put my hand up to address a different point, and you may want to take any responses to Andrew's question or comments first.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Anybody have a question for Andrew or a comment? Okay. Thanks,
                 Andrew. I want to make sure everybody had a little broader context, and I
                 think that was helpful. Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: I just wanted to respond to the previous question about do all of the listed -
                 are we being asked to say that all of the listed purposes are legitimate. And I
                 just want to remind you that the - or everyone - that the purposes that are
                 listed here we actually already deliberated on those as purposes for thin data
                 collection. And they're captured as some of our rough consensus points in
                 Section 2.2.2 of our working document. So we have actually already begun to
                 talk about many of these purposes that are listed in the EWG purpose
                 column. We didn't get through that entire list and we did only look at them as
                 purposes for thin data collection, but we have actually started that.

Chuck Gomes: And which ones have we - this is Chuck, Lisa, which ones have we covered -
                 come to rough consensus on as purposes?

Lisa Phifer: As I'm looking at the document and looking at the ones that are listed for
                 registrar and the sponsoring registrar IANA ID, all of those we have
                 discussed as potential purposes for thin data collection - or I should say
                 legitimate purposes for thin data collection, thin data only.

Chuck Gomes: And how does that relate to the EWG purposes here?

Lisa Phifer: They are the same. When we went through our deliberation we started with a
                 very brief description of each purpose that you'll find in the EWG executive
                 summary, I believe. I should point out, though, as we were going through
                 those purposes, many people provided full comments that said eventually we
                 have to get to actually defining these purposes in detail. So I think it would be
                 a stretch to say that we've fully agreed with the EWG's in depth definitions
                 but we certainly started from the same list.

Chuck Gomes: And this is Chuck. Lisa, another question, do you, in your experience and expertise, think that we can accept the EWG purposes for now before maybe looking at the definitions more thoroughly or would it be beneficial to refine those definitions first?

Lisa Phifer: Well as this is an iterative process and it will always be a chicken and egg situation, if we can make progress on identifying the data element - purposes for each data element, just based on the top level list, that would get us one step further and then we could go back to actually defining the purposes in detail, keeping in mind that that means then we'd have to look at the data element agreements and say does that now match the purpose definition in depth?

Chuck Gomes: Right. Thank you. Stephanie, your turn.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks, Chuck. I'd just like to - Stephanie Perrin for the record. I'd like to echo what Lisa just said. I've done a lot of thinking about this because I was on the EWG. I was frustrated by the fact that we really - we looked at privacy, in my view, in kind of a privacy play pen way. We did not look at it holistically, although I did my best to pester everybody nonstop about looking at it the way commissioners do. We just couldn't and get the work done.

So the question now is, short of writing an annotated privacy guide to the EWG report, which so far has escaped me, how the heck do you bring up, well this purpose isn't legitimate if you look at it from a proportionality and data limitation use? We did not, as the EWG, look at things from the data limitation which is kind of Step 1 in data protection.

So I really think we need to get going forward and if something is really out of bounds I think that's the time to bring it up or if a nuance needs to be added, bring it up there. There's enough people and we've got enough education going on data protection that I think there's much less risk that we're going to

wind up at the end of this and go, oh gee, we actually couldn't collect any of that stuff in the first place. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: I hope that was clear.

Chuck Gomes: I think it was. If anybody has a question they're welcome to ask it but I thought it was clear. But again, it's up to all of you on the call to determine that for yourselves; if it's not please ask. Marc Anderson.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. Marc Anderson. I guess I'm reflecting back on the points that Andrew just made about IANA being sort of, you know, and I hesitate to use this word, but authoritative for the registrar that maps to, you know, the name that maps to the IANA ID. And I think he makes some really good points there that we should consider, you know, and, you know, and again I think, you know, I feel like maybe I'm jumping ahead. Maybe, you know, we really need the authoritative definition before we, you know, before we jump into this too far.

But, you know, I think you could make the argument that the registry, you know, isn't authoritative for what the registrar name is and that the IANA ID is the - is the information that the registry will have and that the registrar name really needs to come from IANA especially if you're considering, you know, RDS data as sort of, you know, in a distributed model. So, I mean, I think that's, you know, some really interesting points that Andrew made and it's, you know, it's something we should consider.

But that also got me thinking about another aspect of RDS, and, you know, and just sort of maybe a reminder for everybody that in Whois today there are actually - there are three types of look-ups. There's a domain look-up, a name server look-up and a registrar look-up. And in our focus, and, you know, quite understandably so has been on the domain look-up, but there's

also, you know, a registrar look-up where you do a Whois search for a registrar and you get information about that registrar.

And, you know, looking at this list of data, you know, sometimes I think that, you know, the domain look-up is a little overloaded and some of the information that's displayed in the domain look-up really belongs in the registrar look-up. So just I guess some food for thought for everybody as we roll through the collection discussion and consider the publication of data as well. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. Chuck again. Roger, your turn.

Roger Carney: Thanks, Chuck. This is Roger. I guess I'm a little confused on the level of agreement on purpose. And maybe I'm ahead of myself, not sure, but I wanted to ask this. I think that generally when we talked about this before, there was agreement that that is, you know, these are - seem like valid legitimate purposes, but I don't remember the discussion on are they purposes that an ICANN RDS needs to be concerned with. And I think those are two different things.

But I'm not sure that we've - I don't remember, anyway, balancing these purposes to ICANN's remit and these actually being, you know, valid purposes. And to me those are two different things.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Roger. This is Chuck. So if you look at the EWG purposes listed for registrar, do you think any of those are outside of ICANN's mission?

Roger Carney: That's a good question, Chuck. This is Roger. That's a good question. I think that - I mean, obviously I think there's possibility in that. I mean, I'm not sure what criminal investigation means, how wide that is. You know, is it ICANN's concern - is it in their remit that they have to support look-ups by law enforcement? And I'm not saying yes or no, I'm just saying I'm not sure we've discussed those things in accordance with ICANN's remit. You know, is

academic an issue for ICANN? Maybe that's a nice thing to do. But is that required by their remit?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, that's well said and those are really good questions. I'm sure we're going to have to dig into those a lot deeper as we go forward. Marc Anderson, you're up again.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. Marc Anderson again. Yes, I mean, I just want to, you know, say I agree with what Roger is saying. I mean, those - when I raised my hand initially to ask if we were delving into, you know, do we agree with all the EWG purposes, you know, Roger said exactly what I was thinking. You know, I think especially having heard from the data commissioners and read through their comments, you know, I'll pick on academic, you know, as one of the EWG purposes.

You know, having read through what the data commissioners provided us, and, you know, I'm not sure, you know, that that's, you know, that's one of ICANN's purposes. And, you know, again nothing against academic research, you know, I personally, you know, am supportive of that, but is that really, you know, ICANN's purpose for collecting and displaying of the data? You know, it sounds like from what we've learned so far that it's not. So I, you know, I definitely agree with Roger's points, I think that's something we have to consider carefully. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Marc. Chuck again. Any other comments or discussion on the registrar data element? Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. This is Greg Shatan for the record. And following up on the last couple of remarks. I think we have to avoid narrow or crabbed or reductive interpretations of purpose or ICANN's remit. You know, clearly it's not an invitation to go dashing around willy-nilly and expanding it to meaninglessness. But, you know, for instance, academic research can relate directly or indirectly to security, stability, resiliency. It's not just sociology

research, there are apparently STEM courses in academia. So they might be doing research as well.

You know, the groves of academe are not unconnected to the commercial world and the legal world. So I think that some idea that academic research is, you know, broadly speaking, somehow not ICANN's purpose I think is to not actually engage in any analysis of ICANN's purpose or remit or the purpose of academic research and how it relates to any kinds of advancements in technology or in understanding how technology influences people's lives or the like.

So I think we have to watch out for kind of trying to draw bright lines that exist without actual thought about what - where those bright lines lead us and what they divide us from. Just I just have a great deal of concern about the conversation that just took place. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. Chuck again. And I'm going to go back to some of you on the EWG when I finish what I'm going to say. So listen closely and be ready if you can. So, Greg, I think what you're saying is, is that at least in part, is that when we're looking at the purpose for the collection of a data element, whether it be registrar or one of the others, it doesn't necessarily have to be one of ICANN's purposes, as long as it's not inconsistent with ICANN's mission. And I don't know if that's right or not.

But what I'd like - and I'll go to Theo next - but what I'd like, those of you that were on the EWG - any of you who'd like to talk - how did you deal with the issue of ICANN's mission versus uses or purposes of Whois data? I'm curious whether you grappled with that or not and if so how you did that. So - and I see Michele's got his hand up, and he was on the EWG. But if others want to speak go ahead and put your hand up on that to answer that question. Theo, it's your turn.

Theo Geurts: Thanks, Chuck. So I think what Marc just pointed out is very critical here because it just ties back into what Greg just said, when we talk about academic purposes. Is that actually something that needs to be supported through the RDS? I mean, if you look within Europe, there are countless of companies doing all kinds of things. And there is academic research, there is just not an RDS where you can look up all that data, but definitely all those universities that are engaged in academic purposes, they go out, consult with all these companies, request for information, and that's how they build their academic paper, so to speak.

But it's not done through an RDS, so that begs the question, is it within ICANN's remit to support it through the RDS? Well, there are countless examples how you can go about this. And I think that is basically what we - what Stephanie mentioned earlier on, is there another purpose to achieve this? And are we not going to end up building something and then come to the conclusion like, okay, we should have done this another way and we should totally scrap this. There's a real danger there. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Theo. And before I go to Michele, I think there's another way to ask that question, it's one thing to ask if something is in ICANN's remit; another way to ask it would be is something contradictory to ICANN's remit? A little bit different way of looking at it. Something may not be explicitly in their remit, we define, but maybe it's not contrary to it either. So anyway, I throw that out for thought.

And by the way, I will do my best, I'm sure I will fail miserably, most of the time, but to try and help us to look at things from different directions, just like you guys will too. So I hope you recognize that so far. I do not have a particular agenda and I hope to - as long as I'm chair of the group to never have a particular agenda. But I will raise points not to take a side, but rather to help us think through issues fully. Michele, your turn.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Chuck. Michele for the record. So during the EWG's work, a lot of what we were trying to do was to ascertain what people were actually doing with domain registration data. We weren't - whether that was legitimate, illegitimate, legal, illegal or not, was more a case of, you know, people are doing this, this is possibly why they're doing it, and then trying to kind of categorize that into, okay that seems legitimate, that over there definitely is not legitimate.

So for example, somebody mining data in order to be able to break the law is obviously not legitimate. I mean, so a lot of the time we were talking about legitimate and illegitimate purposes, I note that Lisa is now going to probably have a much better memory and give much more detailed response than I can ever give because she's got a much better memory than I do. But the - we didn't kind of look at this every single time like immediately, you know, does this fall within ICANN's remit I mean, on that specific question, if you ask it that particular way.

I think we were more looking at what falls within ICANN's remit at a much higher level, if that makes sense. I'll hand over to Lisa because I know she's going to contradict me. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. Lisa, your turn.

Lisa Phifer: Oh, Michele. This is Lisa Phifer for the record. I'm definitely not going to contradict you; that was spot on. I actually raised my hand to call Chuck's attention to some comments in the chat about being careful to separate the purposes of collection from the purposes of publication or access.

And maybe just to build on what Michele said, I completely agree, the EWG's purpose statement referred directly back to ICANN's mission, but looked at consistency with ICANN's mission from a very high level. I don't think we went purpose by purpose at least in my recollection, and tried to think about whether each purpose was within that remit individually. But what we

probably did do is focus more on purposes for access because I'm thinking about it, we started with use cases, which is of course people having access to data and then putting it to some use.

We didn't spend a whole lot of time thinking about purposes for collection, although we did have principles about collection itself, and, you know, when would collection be mandatory or optional and so forth. We didn't necessarily think about purposes as whether they were the purpose for collection in the first place. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa. This is Chuck. And of course the distinction between collection and access is very important. Thanks for those of you who emphasized that. And another comment, Stephanie, go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, it's Stephanie Perrin for the record. I just want to thoroughly endorse what Lisa just said. The reason why some of us objected to starting with use cases is the use cases kind of slid over when the data should have been collected in the first place. Once you've got your - we're analyzing the use cases, you're pretty far down the road from a data protection perspective unless you are permitted to stop and say, hold it, how does this match ICANN's remit?

So we were looking at a high level, is this a defensible practice as opposed to an indefensible practice. So for instance, you will hear me further down the road objecting to the whole idea of pre-clearing use of a domain name for children because that's not within ICANN's remit to speculate on whether a domain is going to be used for child abuse or not.

So it doesn't mean that fighting child abuse on the Internet is not a defensible practice, of course it is, it's just not within ICANN's remit. I use that rather glaring example because it happens to be in the media these days. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stephanie. Chuck again. So let me turn it around like I did earlier is - so is using RDS information to fight child abuse contradictory to ICANN's mission? I know it's not their mission, I totally agree with you on that. But is using it - that information, assuming the right people are using it and so forth, is that against ICANN's mission? That's for you, Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin for the record. No, it's not - if you have it and it's usable, and you are accessing it according to law, then that's all fine. So to go back to the - to go back to the academic example, as Theo pointed out, academics study stuff all the time but they're used to having to do research protocols, they're used to having to sign confidentiality agreements, you know, like that's a question of method not of legitimacy of purpose.

So the question with respect to for instance, the child abuse issue, is do you ask somebody to do a criminal records check before they get to register a domain name? I don't think so. That's outside the bounds of a data collection that ICANN can authorize according to its remit. And so this is one of the problems with these things is you do - and I'm not arguing for going back to analyzing (unintelligible) I think the only way we're going to get forward is to raise the issues that are completely out of bounds as they come up.

But you have to look at the purpose for collection with every data element, and that's something we maybe haven't done. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stephanie. Appreciate you responding to my question. And of course as we move further along I think we all begin to see that, okay, it's one thing to collect the data and then when we start getting into access and how it's accessed and so forth like the question I asked with regard to child abuse and how do we control that, we get ahead of our game and we will get there, to things like gated access and then some of the other ideas that came out of the EWG report, certification and so forth. So anyway we'll get to those things. But thank you, Stephanie, I appreciate your answer on that. It was helpful for me at least.

So let me ask a question, is there anybody on the call that thinks the registrar - the name of the registrar should not be collected? Okay. Marc.

Marc Anderson: This is Marc. For the record, I let out a huge sigh when you asked this question. I guess, you know, if we were to take a minimalist approach to say, you know, we're only going to capture the data that's necessary for, you know, the operation of, you know, the processing of domain names and operation of it, you know, if we as a group were to decide that we want to take a minimalist approach and capture the minimum amount of data, then I would say we do not capture the registrar name.

You know, and jumping ahead, you know, the registrar IANA ID, the next one, the sponsoring registrar IANA ID, I would say that's sufficient to meet the minimum purposes. You know, and I'm not necessarily advocating for that but I think, you know, if we - we as a group want to take that minimalist approach to capturing just that data necessary, then, you know, the registrar name is not necessary. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. And I guess we could argue other, we could collect the registrar name and not the ID would work too. But okay, thank you. Andrew, you're up.

Andrew Sullivan: First of all…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: There you go, good.

Andrew Sullivan: …actually capturing the - is this better?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

Andrew Sullivan: Just a nit, capturing the registrar name actually would not help because the ID is the only one that you can use because some IDs bind to more than one - bind to the same name. But I think more importantly, we have to be careful here about this term "capture" because the practical way this works in registries is that a registrar is connected with an identifier of some kind, which binds to the IANA ID of the registrar and then the identity - the name as it were, the friendly name, of the registrar is captured from some other source, probably the IANA registry.

So the question is really whether that data should be in the repository in some sense, but that doesn't mean that you're collecting it in any kind of active sense and maybe this is one of the difficulties that we're having because of the way these things are being captured.

I just see in the chat somebody saying the IANA ID is unique to each registrar, it's true that the IANA ID is unique to each registrar, but some registrars merge with one another and then what happens is their friendly name actually binds to more than one ID for a period even though it's the same name, and then eventually it collapses.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Andrew. This is Chuck. Scott, go ahead.

Scott Hollenbeck: Yes, unfortunately - this is Scott Hollenbeck. I think Andrew kind of mentioned a bit what I was going to say because the way this works with a domain is registered, via EPP, the name of the registrar is not part of the information that is pushed from registrar to registry when that process takes place.

You know, there is an association made when a registrar establishes a TCP connection to the registry and issues EPP commands. And so, you know, the registry knows who it's dealing with when registrars, you know, push information to the registry. But this name is derived, you know, based on the

output of a particular transaction. And as Andrew said, you know, the friendly name or whatever you want to call it, is something that is ultimately pulled from some other place. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Scott. Alan Greenberg, you're next.

Alan Greenberg: Again, most of what I was going to say has already said. The registrar ID is, as Scott said, derived. I suspect although I don't know for sure, that the registrar name is not even in the actual Whois data that's kept because I presume if a registrar changes its name it changes it once and the new name gets reflected when someone does a Whois. I'm guessing that, I don't know for sure but I suspect that is the case. So the use of the word "collected" is not appropriate here either. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. And maybe - this is Chuck - maybe we ought to be careful about that because maybe the question should be instead of collected we should ask should the registrar name be in the RDS, however it gets there.

Alan Greenberg: Chuck…

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: …the point is I'm not sure it is even today in the Whois. It's displayed but I'm not sure it's actually a data element.

Chuck Gomes: The registrar name?

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: I think it is. Am I wrong on that?

Alan Greenberg: I don't…

Chuck Gomes: Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. The registrar name is definitely - it is definitely an element, a data element. There's a couple of elements that are collected in various different places and this entire thing around the IANA ID is giving me a massive headache. Each IANA ID is unique, people, each one is unique. Go have a look at the list. The IANA IDs, not 100% sequential, there are a couple of them were issued out of sequence. I have no idea why. I'm sure somebody does know but it's not important.

But mostly are sequential. And if you actually look at the sequence you can even see whether IANA ID listed for registrars who have lost their accreditation or have gone out of business or have voluntarily removed themselves from the party as it were. But they are all there. So our IANA ID is 1448. Network Solutions is ID 1 or 2. Go Daddy's is a fairly low number, etcetera, etcetera. So you can see by the number of the IANA ID roughly when the registrar got accredited by ICANN.

Now a single company can own multiple accreditations, each accreditation will have an IANA ID. And the companies can trade under lots and lots and lots of different names. There's the entire thing about friendly names and everything else is just completely ridiculous because you have a legal name for a company. Our company is Blacknight Internet Solutions Limited, but if you ever meet me a conference or have a look at my business cards, I don't advertise us as that because it's too much of a mouthful.

There are plenty of other companies that are - I mean, take Google for example, Google is not the actual corporate entity these days, it's Alphabet. There are tons of other ones like that. The IANA ID is bound to a corporate entity of some kind or a name or a trading name or something, but one company could have lots and lots and lots of IANA IDs associated with it. I mean, an example, Enom (unintelligible) well over 250.

Now the data elements that are collected by the registries, when you're being onboarded as a registrar include things like the URL or host name of your Whois server and also the other bit which is on that slide there, the quote unquote, referral URL, that's collected from the registrar during the onboarding processing with the registries. The IANA ID and the registrar name, that will display whatever is in the IANA system.

So if you look at a domain name that's registered through ourselves it'll come back sponsoring registrar IANA ID, 1448, Blacknight Internet Solutions Limited, the full legal name. We changed the company name to the Michele's Widgets Limited and updated it everywhere, then it would end up being reflected there. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. And we're just about out of time so I'm going to wrap up on a couple things here. First of all, I want to call your attention to what Lisa said in the chat, I do sometimes see the chat. But I like the way Lisa said it with regard to what we're talking about here, if I can find - there it is, okay.

What we're really asking is should registrar name be a registration data element? I think that seems like a pretty clean way to ask it and gets around some of the little technical issues that we're talking about that are accurate but we can spend all day - but that's probably a good way to look at it and I'll use that terminology myself.

I want to come back to something that Marc Anderson said because he was talking about this minimalist approach. And when you look at the answers to the data protection - from the data protection experts, they certainly talked about that a little bit, I don't think they used the word "minimalist." But, I mean, do we - and this isn't a question we can answer right now but we'll probably, I mean, does it make sense to try and do a minimalist approach and go with the least amount of data there assuming that the data that's there - it comports with laws and so forth?

I think that's something we can talk about later. If it's convenient to have a registrar name - just for convenience as long as it doesn't make it - violate any laws or any policies or so forth, that maybe okay. There's nothing wrong with that as long as that - so think about that in terms of a minimalist approach.

What I want to do to close things off, and using Lisa's wording, okay, the suggested wording and if somebody has a better suggestion of course we can talk about that later, should domain name be a registration data element? I think there's agreement on that, that it should be.

Should registrar name be a registration data element? Is anybody opposed to that being a registration data element? Okay. See a green checkmark in there. The - and is - and, Jim, go ahead and speak.

Jim Galvin: So, yes, I just wanted to say yes I'm opposed to it being a registration data element.

Chuck Gomes: And why is that, Jim?

Jim Galvin: You don't need the name because you have the registrar ID. You know, the name is a separate database and you look it up there. I don't know why it would be part of the actual registration data. Thank you. And Jim Galvin for the record.

Chuck Gomes: And, Jim, this is Chuck again. I'm going to pursue that a little bit. So you definitely support a minimalist approach obviously. If it's not absolutely needed, don't put it in there. So if it's convenient, so that somebody doesn't have to look up a registrar's ID to find the name of the registrar, don't put it in there even though it's convenient?

Jim Galvin: Okay, so and I'm sorry to take a little bit of time here. But let's separate collection from publication. For collection purposes, no, you don't have to

collect the registrar name, you only need the registrar ID and as has been explained here multiple times, you know, that's sort derived data, if you want to call it that, but it's known by the registry, it's just kind of a given because of the TCP connection that's coming into the registry. So there really aren't any concerns there.

Now, as far as a minimalist approach on collection, you know, yes, I'm sort of for that. As far as an approach on publication, I think that's a separate question. Whether or not…

Chuck Gomes: It is.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Galvin: …display registrar name is a separate question. Maybe on behalf of convenience a registry might do that. But I'm not speaking to that question at the moment. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, Jim, I'm not done yet so hang in there and I'll try and rush here. But notice I rephrased the question. I got rid of the word "collect." The question is, "Should registrar name be a registration data element?" I agree with you, you don't have to collect it, you can figure that out. But forget the word "collect." "Should the registrar name be a registration data element?"

Jim Galvin: So I'll say no because I have the ID and thus the name can always be inferred. And has been mentioned here in this discussion, you know, the name can change. But, you know, the ID doesn't unless there's a transfer and so there's an explicit event to make that happen. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: So if you're a user, sorry about this, but if so if you're a new user that isn't so familiar with the system, and doesn't know how to look up the registrar ID and get the name, you wouldn't want it in there just to help that person?

Jim Galvin: Now that's a different question. Maybe. But I think that's a beyond the policy that we're worried about right now.

Chuck Gomes: I know, but I'm playing devil's advocate for a reason, okay? But anyway…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …I've got to go quickly to Marc and Alan and then we've got to wrap up. Okay, Marc, go ahead. Please be brief.

Marc Anderson: Chuck, just noting that we're over our time limit. I just, you know, would say I agree with the points Jim was making and I'll end it there. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, again to be very quick, I think there's a very big difference between what someone may display in result to a query and - or display or send and what is in the registry, what is actually stored. So let's keep those separate. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thank you. Okay, so we don't - I don't think we have rough consensus on whether the registrar name should be in the RDS or not so let's not put a poll question on that but I think there is agreement on the domain name so we'll do a poll question on that.

Our - we're over time as several of us have noted. Sorry about that. The - so let's - we'll have - we will have a poll. It'll probably come out later today or early tomorrow and it'll be due by the end of the day on Saturday. And please respond to that. Like I said, there will probably be a couple questions on the data protection experts answers, very general high level, not of the same nature of the kind of questions we're going to - we've been asking and what we'll ask about - the domain name element, so please be aware of that.

Our meeting next week is at the alternate time, please note that, hope you can still participate. And give those who are in - who generally do this meeting at very terrible times for them, have a little more desirable time next week. And as far as action items, Lisa, do you want to quickly go over those?

Lisa Phifer: Sure, Chuck. We have the one proposed agreement on domain name being necessary for every legitimate purpose. We have an action for working group members to participate in a poll covering that as well as providing some input on a couple of the privacy expert answers that we received. And I believe that is it. I don't think we have any other action items. Of course we have the two small teams working on their tasks to look at ccTLD questions and the definition of authoritative so that's an outstanding action from last week.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, and just to add to that, Lisa, this is Chuck. We - obviously if you haven't reviewed the whole set of answers to the 19 questions please do that. We will poll on the Questions 1 and 2 probably but please review that before next week's meeting. So that said, is there anything else need to cover before we move on? Okay, thanks, everybody. Have a good rest of the week. And we'll do exchanges on the list and again in our meeting a week from now. Meeting adjourned. The recording can stop.

END