ICANN
Transcription
Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group
Tuesday, 01 August 2017 at 16:00 UTC

Note: 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-pdp-01aug17-en.mp3 Adobe Connect recording: **https://participate.icann.org/p9iru2t8yn8/**
Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/VWfwAw
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

Julie Bisland: Okay, thank you. Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening, everyone. And welcome to the Next Generation RDS PDP Working Group call on the 1st of August 2017. In the interest of time there will be no roll call; attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. If you are only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourself be known now?

Okay thank you. Hearing no names, I would like to remind all 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. And with this I'll turn it back over to our chair, Chuck Gomes.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Julie, and welcome everyone. Let me start by asking if there are any updates to statement of interest. Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Just to let the group know I'm a member of the RDS Whois Review Team and interim chair.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much. And congratulations, Alan, for the chair position. So…

Alan Greenberg: One could question whether it's congratulations…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Maybe condolences, whatever, but I'm - I appreciate you taking the responsibility. Okay, anyone else? All right, thank you very much. Let's go ahead and move right into our agenda, get our work moving here. So the first item on our agenda is to continue our deliberation beyond the minimum public data set. And the main charter question is what data should be collected, stored and disclosed, although really all we're looking at is collection right now.

And so the first thing we're going to do is to take a look at our poll results from last week's poll. And we had about - I think about 22 people respond to the poll. Thanks to those of you who did. And provided quite a lot of good information.

You can see that - see who responded on the page in front of you. And in a moment we should have scrolling - we should all have scrolling capability. So in the meantime - there we go, okay, if you go down to Question 2, we'll start there. And if you look at the results for Question 2 we had a pretty strong support, 82% agreed with the key concept, "RDS policy must include a definition of every gTLD registration data element including both a semantic definition and by reference to appropriate standards a syntax definition."

Now we had quite a bit of talk on the list and in our meeting last week on the syntax. Hopefully the parenthetical covers that enough at least for now. So and I certainly understand why a few people weren't sure because it was a fairly involved discussion on the syntax and so forth so that's okay.

So unless anyone wants to comment, and you can see the comments and the proposed alternatives there, my suggestion on this one is that we accept it as a tentative key concept with at least rough consensus at this point in time understanding that we can always come back to it. And so I'll pause, see if anybody wants to comment. If any of you want to push for your proposed alternatives a little bit further you're welcome to do that, otherwise we'll just accept this one and move on to Question Number 3.

I do like the word "(crandelolences)" although I have trouble saying it.

Okay let's go on to Question 3 then if you'll scroll down to the results for that. And the key concept here is, "At least one element identifying the domain name registrant, i.e. registered name holder, must be collected and included in the RDS." Again, we had about 82% people in agreement with that. We had one person disagree. And that person's not on the call so I can't turn to that person.

One thing I would like to suggest for everybody especially if you disagree it would be very helpful if you provide your thinking on that, your rationale, so that rather than just disagreeing and so I would like to encourage that of everybody. If you disagree and you're of course welcome to do that, and you should do that if you disagree, but please put a comment to explain why because the group is doing a lot of time talking about these things and so forth and if you disagree with everybody in the group it'd be nice to know why you do that. And so please follow that suggestion when you disagree.

And again, I don't want to discourage anybody from disagreeing, but help us understand where you're coming from and don't just rely on things (unintelligible). Could you please remember to mute your phones? Sounds like somebody just did so thank you.

Now Marc, go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Hey, Chuck, thanks. It's Marc Anderson for the record. On this one I would say, you know, I do agree with this statement; I think it's actually a very important key concept. But, you know, I do want to just sort of point out or raise that, you know, in some cases the identifying information will be of a privacy or proxy provider. You know, and I think that's still within, you know, the framework of what, you know, Question 3 intends. But at least that's, you know, sort of how I'm interpreting it. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: And thanks, Marc. And that's not only your interpretation, we've said that I think the last two meetings that the domain name registrant may be a proxy provider. So that doesn't mean you're getting the actual user of the domain name when you see that. And we've accepted that as a working group and so but thanks for reminding everybody of that. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, thank you. I just wanted to go further on that. My understanding is when someone registries a domain name on your behalf and identifies themselves as the registrant, whether it's a privacy proxy provider or your lawyer, they're taking full responsibility for the domain. They may choose to reveal who the true registrant of you know, of interest is, should things come to pass. But regardless, they're taking responsibility to respond on behalf of whatever happens with that domain name.

                 And I don't think that alters the fact that they are effectively the de facto registrant. So yes it might be a privacy service, it might be your lawyer, it might be your mother in law, but they're nevertheless the registrant of record and assume all the responsibilities. So I don't think we really need to differentiate, but we may want to define that clearly as we go forward. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, and of course the previous question we said that all of these data elements need to be defined. But what you said is correct, Alan. And of course as I think everyone knows, there's a recent consensus policy involving privacy and proxy providers that is being implemented or will be

implemented. So, some of those things will be dealt with. But what you said and what Marc said are absolutely correct.

Any other comments on this key concept? Or does anybody want to talk about their proposed alternative? I think we have strong enough support here to declare a rough consensus, tentative key concept here. Marc, go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Hey, Chuck. It's Marc again. I'm not sure I agree with what Alan just said. I think there's a differentiation between a privacy registration and a proxy registration. And I think in a proxy registration I agree with Alan's statement, but I think in a privacy registration that's not meant to be the case.

Chuck Gomes: That is correct, Marc. And I don't think Alan was trying to be that fine-tuned on it. In the case of a privacy registration, the privacy provider is not the registrant typically. So there is a difference there, but thanks for pointing that out. Any objections to accepting this key concept as a rough consensus conclusion at this stage of the game or any additional comments?

Okay, let's go on then to Question 4. And the key concept there, if you scroll down to Question 4, is "Data enabling at least one way to contact the registrant must be collected and included in the RDS." We had one less person in this case agree; one person disagree. And we have several unsure. And that's okay because a lot of these things involve a lot of factors so we certainly understand that.

And it's even harder if you weren't on the call where we discussed some of these things so that's the advantage of listening to the recording and looking at the transcript.

So on this one, does anyone want to comment on any of the proposed alternatives or just share a comment on this one? Again, I think we have strong enough support at this stage of the game to accept it as a tentative conclusion. And if anybody objects to that please let us know.

Okay, let's go ahead and go to Question 5. And the - here we have a couple alternatives at least. And here we don't have as strong a conclusion on either one of the alternatives. So the first one in green on your screen is "At minimum the registrant's email address must be collected and included in the RDS." And then the one in blue and the bars are color coded to match. "At a minimum one or more email addresses must be collected for every domain name included in the RDS for contact roles that require an email address for contactability."

We talked about this one quite a bit last week. And you can see that there were 12 people who supported A and 9 people supported B. And then two people disagree with this key concept. And Klaus, I'm going to pick on you, apologize but I'm going to do it. Could you explain why you disagree with this key concept?

Klaus Stoll: Hi, can you hear me? Yes, this is Klaus for the record.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Klaus Stoll: Quite simply because I think there are much better or other ways to contact people and for example, what happened to me quite recently that the email provider just simply packed it in and I had to stop using a certain email. And I can't even go back into certain email settings to delete the old email. So I think there should be quite simply other alternatives available for registrations than email, that's all. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Klaus. And that's very helpful, that's why it's good when you disagree to put your rationale in here. And that's perfect, what you said I readily understand. Now, I would propose that even if we require email - an email address or more than - or possibly more than one email address, that doesn't prevent us from allowing for other means of contact and we have

another key concept that's coming up that deals with that. But thanks, Klaus, that's very helpful certainly to me.

Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. The wording of the proposal is at minimum "at a minimum" so we're not saying in this that other contact methods aren't going to be collected or available or used. So in the case of email, yes, emails go stale. One of the largest providers of free email in the Irish market decided a few years to just stop offering service. So overnight thousands and thousands of domains and other services that were using email addresses at that provider ceased operating.

As a registrar, we have people's phone numbers and other methods of contacting them so, you know, you can still ring people, you can still send them text messages, you can still contact them using other means which is why I have no issue with the idea of - the idea expressed here that it's at minimum. We're not saying it's the only method of contact.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. Marc, go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. Marc Anderson for the record. You know, I like email, that's my favorite form of communication. And, you know, on last week's call I think a lot of people made points on why email is certainly the - is at this time the most practical method. But I kind of - I kind of - I'm concerned that we're basically making the requirement here that says you can't have a domain name unless you have an email address.

And, you know, and that makes me slightly uncomfortable. I feel like there are other perfectly legitimate methods of contacting people. And so I'm not entirely convinced that email must be a prerequisite to buying a domain name. And that's sort of why I'm a little - I'm a little hesitant on this one. I'm not convinced that email should be mandatory for a registration. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. Rod, you're up.

Rod Rasmussen: Thanks, Rod Rasmussen. And I'd actually like to respond directly to what
                Marc was just saying there. I think that in this light, you know, I was the one
                who proposed the alternative language there. And that is you personally don't
                necessarily have to have an email as a registrant, that's why the wording was
                chosen somewhat carefully I hope, to say the roles that require an email,
                because we have a lot of automated processes and policy today. And I'm not
                sure that practicalities are changing all of that policy and practice what those
                would be in order to do things like domain transfers, you know, other sorts of
                update processes, etcetera, that are baked into a lot of different things.

                So I think that if you have an issue with not having email yourself you may be
                able to designate other contacts that do have email to be able to handle
                those processes. And we don't know the - what the - that's another reason for
                the wording the way it is, we may come up with going through this process,
                may go through this and find that we don't have to necessarily require it at all.

                But if we are going to have email of the processes that exist and we think are
                going to continue to exist in order to make this whole domain ecosystem
                work, then at least some role has to have it, not necessarily the registrant.
                Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Rod. This is Chuck. With that understanding, Marc, I'm going to
                come back to you just briefly. Your point is well taken that - especially the
                wording in A kind of requires an email address to do a domain registration.
                And, B still does in the sense that one may be provided. But Rod's right, the
                way this is worded, and he helped us word it, it doesn't necessarily mean that
                the person has to - the registrant themselves has to have an email address,
                but they would have to provide one that would work if a communication came
                via email. Does that make you any more comfortable, Marc?

Marc Anderson: Hey, Chuck. Marc again. Yes, I typed in chat that, you know, it does. I mean, you know, I think people made very good points last week, things like domain transfers, email is just sort of baked into that process. And, you know, I don't think we should take on trying to change those processes; I think that's beyond our scope. So there's some very practical reasons why email should be involved and, you know, you know, just listening to Rod talk, you know, sort of you know, addressed my hesitation I guess.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. I'm going to have to disagree because one of the problems for us when we are trying to sell digital services, you know, email, Website hosting, office, you know, business collaboration services, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera, is at this stage you're reaching more and more towards the small businesses that may not have active email at present. So for in some cases you might end up taking signups using some other method other than email.

Now having email further down the road when the domain is active or within a couple of a weeks of the domain being active, sure, which would address all the things around transfers, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. But I'm not 100% convinced that forcing people to have an email address at the time that they're registering a domain name should be a prerequisite.

Chuck Gomes: So, Michele, would you not accept either A or B the way they're worded?

Michele Neylon: Well, you see, it's all around timing, Chuck. So the thing is, the way it's worded at the moment we're talking about collecting and storing the data, we're not saying when.

Chuck Gomes: So back to my question, are you okay with A or B the way they're worded?

Michele Neylon: Oh yes, no, I am. I mean, and my position on that isn't going to change. But the…

Chuck Gomes: okay.

Michele Neylon: …the thing is, I mean, look, we did a project a couple of years ago and the market we were targeting were, you know, these kind of small businesses who are disconnected. And, you know, they all will have mobile phones. Now if you go into say the, you know, into developing markets, people will have mobiles, they'll have other things.

I mean, you might be physically actually interacting and taking signups from people in person. The assumption they're going to have email something that, you know, they might have it further down the line, and realistically in terms of managing domain names when they move from using their freebie Hotmail or whatever it is email address to using their @theirbusinessname.whatever, a lot of the time they don't maintain the old Hotmail thing so you end up with a contactability issue.

So realistically speaking having them actually using an email address that they're actually using actively is probably better in the long run. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Michele, that answered my question. Appreciate that. Alan, you're up.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I sympathize with what Michele is saying that there markets where email may not be something that is - that they can claim they have at the time of registration. I wonder - I don't know if it fits here or not, but I wonder if we should at some point consider whether we wish to allow the email contacts that we use to be the domain that is being registered. That's done in an awful lot of cases but it's really problematic if the domain stops working and there's no contact information available at that point that actually

functions. So I just perhaps put it on a checklist of things to look at as we go forward. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Alan, this is Chuck. I need you to explain what you're suggesting because I don't understand…

Alan Greenberg: Sure. If I register alangreenberg.com and I use me@alangreenberg.com as my contact, if that domain for some technical reason stops working, the contact information also stops working.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay, got it. Okay. Thanks. And were you making a suggestion - a specific suggestion for another action on our part or just pointing that out?

Alan Greenberg: I'm suggesting that we should consider whether we want to allow that or not. Allowing it is clearly a good thing when we're looking at the small businesses that Michele is talking about and they will ultimately only have one electronic persona and that's the domain they're registering. On the other hand, it does cause potential problems in using that contact information when there are issues.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again. To use a personal example, if you don't allow it, my two emails don't work. So but - and I think there might be a lot of people like that.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I'm just giving the two sides and simply saying we should make a conscious decision. It may well be a bad idea to disallow it but I think we should make a conscious decision, just not think about what the implications are.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. I mean, I understand exactly where Alan's coming from. So to put what Alan's talking about into clear - into clear kind of terms, I suppose, what he's concerned about is if you have - we'll pick on

Alan, so we'll use Alan.ca, so Alan has god@alan.com, daddy@alan.ca, whatever he has a dotCA, and he's using that forever thing. If the domain name expires or there's an issue with the domain name, then everything associated with it, including the contacts and everything else, that the registrar and everybody else would have, all die with it.

But of course then you've got the scenario where for example, in a more corporate environment, you're not going to use a, you know, a free whatever email address, at some point you're going to end up having to use your corporate email address for various things. I mean, I have no issue with pointing out the risks with using I think Andrew used the very correct term, in bailiwick email, there are risks associated with that, and having an alternative contact email address somewhere be that in RDS, Whois, the registrar, whatever, makes perfect sense.

But forbidding people from using their own domain name to provide the email address that the contacts for their domain would cause all sorts of crazy problems, I mean, I just don't see that flying. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. And Alan, thanks for bringing up this point. What I'm going to suggest so that we don't try to do it on this call is that Alan, if you would propose a new key concept with regard to this issue and we can work on it on the list and then possibly add it to our discussions in the meeting next week, so but thanks for bringing that up.

The - so and again, take a look at the comments in the chat as well. I'm going to ask a question, if I look at A and B, it seems to me - and I'm going to ask especially for those who supported A, and not B, it seems to me if we accepted B as a rough consensus key concept at this point in time, for the most part it really covers A.

But I want to give opportunity for those who chose A instead of B, and there were actually more of you that did that. Does - would that - would you be opposed to that and why? So, Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I didn't participate in this poll, I was on vacation and didn't get around to it. But I strongly support B because if you think of the case of a large corporation, having the corporation's email address must be collected does not make nearly as much sense as saying you must collect an address for contact related to the use of - related to the domain name. So I think it applies in the case like that where the first wording just doesn't apply at all. Having IBM's generic email address is not the same as being able to contact someone for the domain. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. So is there - would there be anybody opposed to accepting B as our tentative conclusion at this point in time? And if so, could you explain why? Okay. No objections then to doing that. All right, let's use B at this stage and we will move on from there to the next question.

Question 6, and again there are a couple alternatives on 6 so the first one in green is, "In addition to email addresses, data enabling one alternative method of contact must be collected and included in the RDS." And then an alternative to that was "Data enabling one or more alternative or preferred methods of contact may also be optionally collected and included in the RDS." Now there are several differences in those two key statements that I'm sure I don't need to explain to you.

One of them is there's a must in the green one. And there's not a - it's optional in the blue. And in the blue it talks about one or more, a couple of differences there. So let me, first of all, and you can see the results, pretty good support for B. But I've also heard some people say that, you know, in our discussion so far, not just on this question, that, you know, it might be a good idea to require an alternative method. We just talked about that when we were talking about the previous question.

So let me open it up for discussion on this and hear what members have to say. Michele, start it off please.

Michele Neylon: Yes, thanks. Michele for the record. I'm not 100% sure whether requiring an alternative contact method is really within our purview. I mean, you know, it's I mean, like it addresses a particular need and requirement in another realm. I'm just 100% sure whether it really deals with what we're dealing with, if that makes sense. I mean, in terms of, you know, a SSAC recommendation on good domain name management, it would make perfect sense to me. But in terms of discussing the policy around a replacement for Whois, I'm not sure that it really does. Now I can be convinced otherwise but I'm just not 100% convinced.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. Chuck again. Greg, you're up - Greg Shatan.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. Sorry I did not participate in the poll. The weekend was a mess for good reasons. But in any case, I think neither of these alternatives are really ones that I would line up behind. What I would have liked to have seen is one that said that in addition to email address, data enabling two alternative methods of contact must be collected and included in the RDS.

So we have the at least - we have one or more and the second we only have the optional, so we did not get kind of the third combination which is to have two alternative methods which is also the status quo as noted by the other Greg, when I'm not the other Greg, in the notes. And so - and I think that I would disagree with Michele, I'm not sure I can be persuasive right off the top of my head but I do think that contactability is part of Whois and thus should be part of RDS.

And as we've noted so far in our conversation, email can fail and it's good to have other modes of communication so that you can get there somehow. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. Would you do us a favor and write your third alternative in the chat so that we have it in writing there? And we'll continue pursuing this further, but it'd be nice to see it in writing. Stephanie, your turn.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. My initial urge to put my hand up was we can't manage every possible risk in terms of contacting the registrant, you know, umpteen emails could fail, the phone could be out, who knows. I'm just wondering exactly what risks are we undertaking to manage? It seems to me they should be tightly wound up with the security and stability of the Internet. So obviously if the domain is acting up as in the example cited, a phone number or an address would help us track that person down.

Secondly, we are not talking about publishing this data, we're talking about the data that has to be collected and in the RDS somewhere so in a tiered access system it's not necessarily reachable. What we have not talked about is the differentiation between data that we insist on being in the RDS, and data that we could, separately, insist that registrars through their contract, collect.

And I'm just wondering if that isn't one way of handling some of these risks, if at the end of the day the email isn't working and nobody's answering the phone, if I know the registrar I'm going to contact the registrar, and if the registrar had to have an alternative method of contacting, and Michele says they obviously already do, but you might want to mandate that for the registrars that are not as good as Michele is, that don't show up at ICANN meetings, you could handle it that way. But it all gets tied down to just exactly how much of the risk management of this entire system are we willing to take on? Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: So thanks, Stephanie. This is Chuck. So a follow up question. So if I hear at least part of what you're saying, you're suggesting that alternative means of communications could be required in policy for registrars to obtain and not necessarily put it in the RDS, did I get that right?

Stephanie Perrin: Exactly. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Oh no, you're welcome. Thanks for the input. Alan, you're next.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. We cannot address every possible risk. As Stephanie points out, the phone system can go down, all sorts of things can happen in disaster situations or even in semi-normal situations. But email is a rather special case, we know people change emails on a regular basis, you know, we know email fails just in terms of reliability. You know, sometimes the messages from ICANN's mailing list get to me, occasionally they don't.

So email is a special case that has a particularly high risk associated with it working. And I think mandating that a valid email address be collected is something that we do want to augment with an additional method of communication.

The concept - I haven't thought about it very much, because I hadn't thought of it until Stephanie just mentioned, but the concept of requiring a registrar to keep specific information but that is not placed in the RDS, doesn't sound right to me. That sounds like talking about their business practices as opposed to something that ICANN should have control over. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Alan. Chuck again. Andrew.

Andrew Sullivan: Hi. Thanks. I - twice in this discussion people have said once in the chat and something just now, that, you know, there's this idea of requiring the registrars to collect something but it's not in the RDS. And I guess I'm a little mystified what people mean by that because it seems to me that if what we're

doing is we're requiring that registrars collect some piece of data, then in some sense it is in the RDS, that's what this thing is, it's a distributed database that includes the things that are collected about registrars.

And so there's a distinction here that people are making that I think I don't understand. Maybe I've overlooked something in our documentation, but I - maybe somebody could explain to me what the distinction is that they've got in mind. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Before I respond let's see if others can respond to that. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Chuck. That's actually why I put up my hand. Okay, I think I can understand why there might be a little bit of confusion around this. If you go through the policies and the contracts, there's a lot - for example there's stuff around payments, and if a registrar is asked - is subject to audit certain things around payments may be requested by ICANN but at no time would we ever transmit or share that kind of information with an RDS. It doesn't go into Whois, but it is information that we collect.

There's also various things about IP addresses to do with various transactions, etcetera, etcetera. Again, as the registrar, we have the data, but we're not putting that into RDS or any replacement of it. I mean, there's a ton of information that we would have about our clients that have nothing to do with Whois or its replacement. Now if there is an issue, be that something which is - some potential breach of a contractual condition, that, you know, it might be covered in some part of the contract, but it doesn't mean that we're going to put that into an RDS. I don't know, does that help?

Chuck Gomes: Andrew, you're welcome to respond to Michele's question.

Andrew Sullivan: Okay, so that's why I put my hand up. Thanks. It's Andrew again. It does help but I guess the thing that's troubling me a little bit is that we decided to talk not just about things that we publish in the Whois, you know, in the traditional

way, but once we had this idea that we were also going to talk about all this stuff that's collected and whether we're going to collect it, quote, in the RDS, I - my view is that what that essentially means is anything you collect is in some sense in the RDS and now it's just a question of who is allowed to view it and who isn't.

And so in the case of stuff about payments, for instance, you know, nobody outside of the parties involved in the payment are allowed to see that information except under cases of audit, and in that case the auditors are allowed to, and of course under court under and so on.

But it's part of the RDS just as surely as name server information is since we've decided to include all of the stuff that we're collecting in the RDS, at least that's the way I view it. So I guess I'm just trying to - maybe what we're trying to say and the distinction that you're trying to make if I understood you correctly is stuff that could conceivably be a candidate for somebody aside from the registrar and the registrant to see versus everything else, is that the distinction you're making?

Chuck Gomes: Michele.

Michele Neylon: Yes, okay, I think I can understand where you're coming from and I understand how you got there. But okay there's two parts to this. One part is that - is that although information may be collected and processed in relation to the management of a domain, be that the registration, transfer, update, etcetera, etcetera, under the current system there's a ton of information that is made publicly available with no kind of checks or anything, I mean, anybody can access it pretty much.

Within the paradigm of an RDS, that there would be some level of gating, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. So for example, I don't know, if you fit into a particular category, you would get access to more information, I mean, details of that we haven't fully discussed. But that's where some of that came from.

When it comes to things like payment information and all that, I think that's where there's a bit of confusion. And I'm not sure whether that's being caused by us or by - I don't know, something else. It's, you know, as the - if you think about it terms of your day to day dealings with anybody, I mean, you're exchanging the emails with somebody but if you know somebody in person and you've actually hung out with them, you know that while that person may have very strong feelings about X, Y and Z, they also happen to have a penchant for scotch whiskey. And the only reason you know that is because you were hanging out with them.

And the same with a registrar and hosting provider, we have a ton of information related to our clients that falls well outside the purview of Whois or its replacement. Some of it might fall under the purview of a contractual obligation or some kind of policy obligation that exists within ICANN's purview, but outside of the Whois accuracy RDS stuff. I don't know if that helps you at all.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, so this is Chuck. I'm going to jump in now. We're going to - we're not going to resolve this question in this meeting, okay? Those that have the hands up, I'm going to give you a chance to talk so you don't need to take your hands down, I'm just going to ask you to keep it within a minute or so, so that we can move on to Question 7, and then I want to have enough time for another important item on the agenda. So let's - let me make clear, we're not done with this one yet, and I don't know - I've been busy listening and not watching the chat. So, Greg, I don't know if you ever put your third alternative in there, but if you haven't, please do that.

And then we will - let me let Alan, Michael and Stephanie and Tim, thanks for jumping back in, Tim, because you hadn't said anything yet, that would be great for you to do it. Try and keep it within a minute or so, so that we can move onto another topic understanding that we're going to have to spend

more time on this one in the list and in the - and then in future meeting or two. So Alan, you're up.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. Alan Greenberg speaking. I think Andrew is suggesting that we define the RDS as anything that is collected and that's a rats nest that is even larger than the one we're already in. And I would avoid that like the plague for all the reasons that Michele gave and other people on the - in the chat. You know, among other things, registrars may keep historic information of what it was last week even though it's changed now. That's not necessarily something that we want to put in the RDS in any particular case it might be and we may want to deliberate on that. But there's a huge amount of information that is associated with domain names that might be discoverable on a court order but certainly I don't think belong in the RDS. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. Michael.

Michael Hammer: Thank you. Michael Hammer for the record. So really I think it's somewhat easy to divide this into clear buckets. So there is information collected for the RDS whether or not it's published. We keep on getting hung up on the published part. There are things that are collected under RAA which is a contractual agreement between ICANN, the registries and the registrars. And then there is additional things that a registrar may choose to collect as part of their agreement with their customer that is beyond either RDS or RAA unless it's specifically precluded by RAA.

And if we think about it that way, I think it makes it easier to deal with questions like what was on the survey. That's all I got.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michael. Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks. Stephanie Perrin for the record. Predictably enough I'm going to remind everybody that the purpose of collection, from a data protection

perspective, goes back to who the controller is. And there's a very strict limit, ICANN can set itself up as a controller insisting be collected and put into a directory service, an RDS, that could be available to a global population. That's pretty limited, it has to follow the rules. And I'll repeat some of the arguments that I made back in the EWG days, there's no way that I can see that the financial information, the payment information, which of course is essential if you're investigating a crime, should be under the control of ICANN, i.e. under this - in this system.

So that bright line between the what the - what the registrar has and what ICANN controls through its contracts, has to be maintained or we're going to be in one heck of a mess. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Stephanie. And this is Chuck. And I'm just going to insert one comment. You recall that the data protection experts in their responses to our questions, pointed out that there could be joint controllers, okay, so a registrar and ICANN, for example, could be joint controllers. And it's my understanding that their purposes might be different for particular data elements, so just wanted to point that out from information we received from the data protection. Tim, you're up.

Tim O'Brien: Good morning, everyone. Tim O'Brien for the record. It looks like we'll be beating these dead horses for a while, and I can appreciate that. Let me also highlight that in third world countries, in certain rural areas here in the United States, there potentially could be problems with communication or that organization may not even exist anymore.

And for independent malware researchers, independent security researchers trying to get in touch with organizations to let them know that their old Website hasn't been taken down and is spewing malware or is being used for command and control, that can get a little frustrating to say the least, when even though you've reached out to the registrar or the hosting provider and they won't talk to you, it's still compromising systems in the organization.

And I had one situation just a couple months ago of an old brewery Website out in the Carolinas here in the United States where the only way I was able to get - we were able to get in touch with them was finding the guy's LinkedIn profile and reaching out. So…

Chuck Gomes: Thanks.

Tim O'Brien: We can't come up with, you know, every outlier situation but we need to come up with some way that here's the information and it's for legitimate purposes and we're helping protect the sanctity and the ability to communicate over the Internet.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Tim. And I want to cut this item off. Marc, are you still wanting to talk about this same item?

Marc Anderson: I was going to make a comment sort of on Question 5 and 6 combined.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Marc Anderson: I don't know if fits into where you're going.

Chuck Gomes: Keep it brief please.

Marc Anderson: Sure. And I think that, you know, I've mentioned this in previous calls, I think contactability is important and looking at Question 5 and 6, you know, on the whole, you know, my opinion is that, you know, it's important to have one primary method of contactability and for all the reasons people have mentioned, there should be at least one alternative method of contact. You know, which may or may not be email but sort of looking at 5 and 6 on the

whole, you know, that's sort of, you know, my opinion on where we should go with that. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. And what I'm going to suggest, and this will be an action item for the leadership team to take is that we try and come up with a question or two on this particular item that deals with some of the things that have been brought up and put it into a poll so that we can kind of motivate some ongoing thinking and follow up with that next week. So that'll be an action item for us as a leadership team on that.

And very quickly, let's go to Question 7. If you want to scroll down there? This one's an easier one I think. So the key concept is, "At least one element enabling contact must be based on an open standard and not a proprietary communication method." And those that were on the call last week or listened to the recording, you'll recall that this came out of that meeting and Andrew made some good points on this one.

Again, we have pretty strong support here, no disagreement. So I'm going to suggest that we accept that as a tentative conclusion with at least rough consensus at this point in the game, and add it to our list of such things. And are there any objections to that? Stephanie, is that an old hand? Okay, thanks. All right, if not, then we will accept that as a tentative conclusion.

And I then want to go to the next item on the agenda which is Item 2c, which is deliberate on key concepts for registrant email address and other contact methods. I'm sorry, it's 2d, I'm on the wrong one. Deliberate on roles that were broadly supported in our - a poll what three weeks ago or so. Admin, tech, abuse, privacy proxy, and we're going to add to that the other two that were suggested in the EWG report.

And what we're going to do now is I'm going to turn it over to Rod Rasmussen. He's made a presentation at the leadership team request to - on the contact approach suggested in the EWG report. And it's pretty involved

so I encourage you to not only pay attention on this but be prepared to ask questions.

Now just one little alert, okay, and why I wanted to have as much time as possible for this one today, my understanding is Rod's not going to be with us the next couple weeks, next couple meetings, so if you have questions note them and we'll try and fit them in today if we have time. Now there are other people on the EWG - who were on the EWG that are part of our team, and we're not going to just rely on Rod for responses. But to the extent possible let's take advantage of the fact that he is with us this week.

Rod, it's over to you. Thanks.

Rod Rasmussen: Thanks, Chuck. Rod Rasmussen here. So I pulled together some - from various sources and slide decks that we put together - I should say we - Lisa and the staff put together mainly during the EWG process a few years ago and from those presentations tried to cull down to this core concept that I've been talking about here for the last few calls around what these purpose-based contacts look like. And really this idea of separating contact objects or the idea of the data around contacts from the domain registration itself and making that a linked type of thing.

And so there were a lot of presentations that were given during the various ICANN meetings and then information pulled together as part of support for FAQs and other things that we did to try and explain some of these things. So I've taken - I don't know probably about 30 or 40 slides and condensed it down to into I think 7 or 8. And if we could move to Slide 2, I'll get into what I'm talking about.

But the idea here is just to try and get people on the same page as far as how we treat these things from a conceptual basis because I think it solves a lot of problems both from a policy perspective and a design perspective as far as being able to support this - these kinds of things.

Could I - I don't know who's driving the slides. Could I have Slide 2 please? Thank you. There we go, now it's showing up properly on mine. So we already talked about the different types of contacts and that's what this topic area is. I don't want to get too far into this but the idea is that, you know, you have these different roles and those roles have different responsibilities attached to them. And they may have different requirements attached to them as far as the information that may be published publicly versus various gates, versus being required for somebody to collect and maintain. Right?

And we don't have to make decisions about those immediately but the idea here is as really around the framework for how we do this so that we can in fact say that for - if we define what a abuse contact is or a business contact is, whatever, you know, pick your favorite type of contact, then roles and responsibilities can be debated around that and then how that is collected and displayed are also tied to those roles and responsibilities rather than just kind of carte blanche, everything is the same perspective that the current Whois system has.

Next slide please? Okay, and this diagram here kind of gives you the idea of what we're talking about here. So you have a domain name that's going to have a registrant at the very least, and that registrant may designate multiple contacts to provide their - the required or necessary fulfillment of the roles, that those different types of contacts have.

There's no requirement for there to be anything but one contact for a domain necessarily because the registrant themselves can handle all those roles if they so choose. Right? That's - it's not that we have to fill out 10 different pieces of contact information, full sets of data for 10 different contacts or 20 different contacts or whatever it is, the idea is if you have responsibilities that you want to divvy up to other people to have them handle things for you, for example, your ISP or web hosting firm to handle all technical issues for you, you can so designate them.

And the - that is linked from the domain name to the ID, the - if you are old-timer NIC handle, or come up with whatever, you know, kind of key you want to as far as the connector goes, doesn't really matter. The idea is that you have this basically pointer to another contact object which is going to be maintained by the contact themselves. I'll go into that in just a second. But the idea being that as a name is designated, modified, etcetera, you do not necessarily have to update contact information associated with a particular domain name.

And my apologies if you're hearing some background noise, I've got a contractor working on my house today and just fired up a saw so hopefully it won't be too loud.

The - just saying the idea here is that domain information can be changed things like name server, things like that, or even registrant data can be changed but you don't have to change everything necessarily. And that's across all the domain names you may be associated with.

Can I have the next slide please? So this one is an interesting comparison of where we are today which everything is - at the top is the current system, everything is green because it's all public. All that information has to be collected and maintained for every single domain name there is. Some registrars have gotten clever about doing that and still have their backend systems, if you enter it once you can just reuse it again.

I will point out ironically, that back in the day, prior to ICANN, when Network Solutions was running everything, they had this concept called a NIC handle and you'd fill in your information once, and you would get your NIC handle and that information could be used for any domain that Network Solutions happened to be responsible for which used to be all gTLDs.

So you could in fact make a modification to say the address if you moved, I know I did this at least once, and that would be reflected across all the domain names that I happened to have, whether it was Com, Net, Org, I think that was it at the time, if - I couldn't get an Edu, for example, but Com, Net and Org were the big three.

And so those you could, you know, because they had a system where the ostensibly, I wasn't at Network Solutions so I'm not sure what their database actually looked like, but from the outside it looked like they collected and created an object and they tied it to the domain name so that it was actually designated for and in the various roles because you had the four classic roles of registrant, admin, tech and billing were the four classic roles.

So this is what I'm talking about is a little bit of back to the future in a way of how we were doing things. So you know, Network Solutions was the registry for everything and they were the registrar for everything so it made it a little bit easier. But the idea was pretty straightforward.

That's the top. The bottom is kind of how the EWG was doing this going forward which is you would have data around domain names, the things we've already talked about like the registration date and the name servers and stuff like that as the existing kind of domain name data that's domain specific. And then you would have a registrant ID with, you know, depending on where your policy different information being publicly available or not and then other information behind a gate. Those are all decisions that have to be made, you know, from a policy perspective. But again, you have that information collected there.

And then you'd have these purpose-based contacts which are optional but would then again different information could be displayed in different situations for different use cases and for different purposes and in either publicly and/or via gate or some other methodology. So the idea there is that you have this connector between the domain and those contacts.

And those contact - the people who have those contacts manage their own data. Again, you as a domain holder have - you can manage your registry identification, but if you designate a purpose-based contact to somebody else, some other entity, say it's your web hosting provider, say it's your proxy provider, say it's some legal representative you want to have handling various things for you, whatever it is, right, those entities, individuals or organizations manage their data, right. And then you provide the connector between them.

That raises some questions around - that we talked about on the list last week around getting permission to be - or from those contacts to handle those roles and we actually talked about that at length. But the system allows you to do some kind of back and forth validation or verification around the concept that as an ISP I do know I am responsible for the technical - as a technical contact for this domain name, for example, things like that can be automated and they can also - this allows you to as a contact say, I'm not interested in being that role anymore, I'm going to say I do not provide that permission and then the domain registrant would have to find somebody else to handle that role for them.

So for example, if you were to change your hosting provider you couldn't list your old hosting provider as your technical contact if they do not wish to be it anymore, for example. Okay, next slide please. And now it's getting really loud in here.

Okay, yes, so this is - these are a couple of examples of what the data looks like. These are various fields. And again, this is what we proposed in the EWG, we may come up with different proposals here. But each one of these is a contact and for the role that it is assumed, you may disclose different information publicly versus behind a gate versus some other method.

So if I'm taking on a proxy provider role as one of these, and another one is a business one, I could have the same contact information but different things

may be displayed or publicly displayed or available via a certain purpose based on the role I happen to be playing for that particular domain name. And that's an important concept to remember.

This basically takes the information you provide, you submit that once and then it's - the way and it's collected once but then it's displayed based on the purpose and the role that you're actually playing rather than it's just displayed or not displayed. Right, so this allows you a lot of flexibility in how you do this.

Next slide please. We want to make sure we get through this if we have any questions. So here's what this ends up kind of looking like for different use cases here, and we've got three different ones. One you have a person who signed up for their own domain name, and they don't have any of these other special things. They're just going to list themselves for all their contacts. So basically the registrant contact fills all the roles. So if you need to get a hold of somebody for abuse, well you get the information from the registrant that would be published for abuse. If you need to get a hold of somebody for - well you wouldn't have a proxy provider or a business contact in this particular case because you have an individual person.

The middle one has that same person but they decide to use a proxy provider, right, and they decide to use their ISP as their technical contact because they, you know, any, you know, anything that comes up that is of a technical nature, you know, things are broken, things are spewing spam, whatever, but the - well actually that's abuse contact, but, you know, for technical issues get a hold of my ISP then they'll take care of it for you. Other than that go through the proxy provider so that's the kind of that middle case.

And then the third case on the right is a business that is - wants to provide a full suite of different contacts for different issues. And again, you have the different roles there. And those roles would likely, in a business, be handled by somebody within that organization but not necessarily, I mean, for example, you know, I may have - I may have my - still have an ISP handle

things that are - because I'm hosting, I don't know, an Amazon cloud services or something like that and I want to, you know, any issues to go bug them about it. Or I may have outside legal counsel or something like that where I want to designate a different contact.

Okay, so those are kind of how that ends up being practice is what it looks like. How do we get there? That's the next slide please. Yes, no, one back, there we go, registrant contact creation. So there's two parts to contacts. One is you got to create them in the first place, or actually there's three parts, there's the creation of contacts, there's the - and then there's the creation of a domain name, or the designation of a contact for the domain name and then there's modification and we'll talk about modification in a minute.

But basically the idea here is that you would, as a person entity, organization, that is going to have information associated with domain names, you would create a contact. And the EWG report we talked about validators, which may or may not be registrars, but they would be some organization you would work with that you would provide your information to and they would enter it into the system.

We'd envisioned that registrars would be validators but there could be other local like law firms or other entities that might provide these services especially when you have data protection differences amongst different countries, etcetera, you may go to a local place to enter this information.

Remember, that the information in the RDS is a pointer from a domain is a pointer to a contact, so while we were talking about centralized database for the RDS - the EWG, there - this paradigm and framework allows you to actually store data locally and then retrieve it based on clarity. And so keep that in mind.

But anyways, you would use a validator or a registrar - I can even imagine some of the registries wanting to be validators because that's part of their

business model - that would provide this service for you. And you can - there's a whole bunch of stuff we haven't gotten to around validation, authentication and all that good stuff that this supports really nicely, which I'll put to the side and we can come back to that later.

When you create a domain name, you then designate the contacts you want for the various roles if you want to put different contact in other than yourself as a registrant. You can either - the process for doing that there's lots of different ways you can do that, you can, you know, if you're a registrar, you may automate the whole process because you know you're going to be the contacts for technical issues and things like that. Kind of what happens today at some registrars or hosting companies that are resellers for registrars, I see that happening a lot.

Another thing you can do is provide, if you purchase services from a registrar or from that ISP or something like that you can get an authorization code from them to designate them as a contact. Or you could have a notification process where if I say hey, I want contact XYZ 123 to be my business contact or pick whatever contact you feel like, then they would get a notification saying hey, you know, domain X is requesting you as the - as this contact, do you accept that? So there's lots of different processes you can do to actually validate the fact that this contact is the one that's supposed to be handling that role and then allow them to opt out later.

And that gets to the last slide here which is - I think this is the last slide, which is - move to the next one - there we go. No, no, I'm sorry, that slide right there. So you use these - you can use these validators, registrars, right now or however you want to think about it, but they're the organizations and the websites you go into and say hey, I want to modify my information, then if I need to change my phone number or my email address or my LinkedIn account name or whatever I'm using as contact information, I do that once.

And for every domain with every role that I'm associated with, that information is, in theory, automatically updated so I don't have to do that for the 10,00 domain names I happen to host as a ISP or web hosting company. This problem has come up and it's been mentioned to me actually several times over just the last couple of months. There's a lot of interest in this, but it's a long-standing problem.

Back in the day, as I said, when it was just Network Solutions, this was really easy because I did this more than once myself, I just update it and it all worked. I believe, and I know there's some, you know, there will be an interesting discussion to talk about how we can do this on an inter-registry, inter-registrar basis. But it is technically possible, it is the question is whether is - and whether there's a will to do it.

But it solves a lot of these issues. And again, it gets back to I can now control who gets to use my information and what roles they use it which my policy means that depending on the roles I agree to, that information may or may not be available publicly or via gates and things like that depending on how I define the policy. So it fairly elegantly solves a lot of the issues right now because everything is domain-centric rather than contact - domain and contact-centric, we run into because we keep saying oh, we're going to define this per domain and that means all that information gets entered in for that domain name and is kind of sitting there. And the person who - or organization who it's representing may or may not be happy about that.

So the next slide was a bonus slide. I know we've only got like 12 minutes left and this is kind of - there's - you can look at this - this is kind of our set of what the minimum public data might look like which is the set of domain information, some registrant information and then contact IDs is basically the concept there.

So that is the seven or eight slides that I boiled that down to and I have not been able to follow all the questions so I will shut up now and let Chuck run the queue of however people want to…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Thanks a lot, Rod, not only for giving this presentation but for preparing it. And thanks to the EWG for all the work they did on this because it's something I think we might be able to take advantage of in part or maybe in full. Let's - so let's leave the last slide up there for a little bit, Number 9, just because it has a lot of detail and people can kind of look at that, if somebody wants to go back to another slide when they ask they question we can do that.

So if - well everybody has scroll control again. So if you'd like to look at the data on Slide 9, just what the minimum public data might look like under this model, I said "might" okay, then take a look at that slide.

I'm going to open it up for Q&A, now we've only got about 10 minutes so let's be as concise as we can both in questions and in responses. I'm sure we're going to have to spend a lot more time on this but let's take advantage of Rod's presence here. And if others in the EWG want to jump in too, that's certainly welcome. Let's start with Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. My different concern here is if we create hypothetically, unique database of registry IDs, when IDs are not issued by particular registries, like is done now with (unintelligible) of registrar IDs or something, then we will have to identify identity of the person. For example, I want to register one domain one day, and the next domain next day, and most probably they should be - have the same registrant ID.

And then the possibility to identify them that it's me, is to like see my passport or ID or what so ever. Registrars pass through this issue many times when

forged documents were made to get someone else's domains so it's not a new idea. And it leaves us to creation of the database too of IDs and it's way, way beyond what we need in DNS. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: And thank you, Maxim. And Rod, you don't need to raise your hand every time you want to respond. And I will give you opportunity to respond first if you'd like to in each case, so would you like to respond to that?

Rod Rasmussen: Yes, thanks, Chuck. This is Rod again. So, yes, and that's a - those are valid concerns, and I don't think this - I don't know if there's any system that can solve the particular problem that was just described because you could always create and - actually there's nothing saying you can't create multiple IDs and even for yourself to manage things, you know, let's say you had a small business and you wanted to manage things that way and you also had personal stuff you want to manage differently, you can create different identities for that and different contacts for that. I think there's actually legitimate uses for that particular one.

This is all around the ease of being able to do that so I've got like, say, two or three personalities that I would want to manage or be involved with domain names under. I can create those two contacts, but if I'm managing 100 domain names or in the case of businesses, you know, tens of thousands of domain names, then, you know, I don't want to make tens of thousands of different contacts, right? And oh by the way, you end up with a lot of different inaccuracies just because people type the things differently on different days and stuff like that.

Then also you don't - there's the whole, I mean, we haven't gotten to the validation authentication section yet, but there's a whole section there on - that we talked about in the EWG around different levels of validation. You could just create a contact and have like say a working email address or actually just create a contact, there's - that's - and just submit it, there's no - you don't necessarily have to validate it to use it but you would label that

based on that scheme as, you know, basically unconfirmed, unvalidated. It's syntactically correct is all we know, right, that's a - looks like an email address, looks like a phone number, etcetera, etcetera. That's where we are today for the most part.

And this gets back into some of the stuff we talked about as part of SSAC as well, different levels of validation. You could actually have the contacts if you, you know, follow that scheme, have a different level of validation based on yes, actually the email and the phone number actually works in some of the answers, it's a different level of validation. Then you could say - then if you really want to you can have like your - submit your business license or your passport or whatever and get like super validation. Yes, it looks like it really is that person.

You know, again, though, you still want documents and things like that, there's always that you know, we have that same problem in the real world with people opening so many businesses and using stolen documents or forged document, we're not going to solve that problem. But you can at least provide a mechanism for people who want to provide that level of information and assurance, particularly when thinking about business here, that ability to add that kind of information and those kinds of signals, if you will, to folks who are using the system and say okay that's probably who I think it is using that. So that's where we went with that. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: And Rod, a question that I think is kind of related to that was asked by Volker in the chat. And he had to leave early. But he said, "I am worried about the registrant ID field that being public would allow anyone to figure out the complete set of domains owned by a registrant, and that may allow cross referencing detective work." I don't know if you want to…

Rod Rasmussen: Right, so, yes, my answer to that is yes, it will, absolutely. And that's actually one of the things that us in the abuse community want. However, if you were concerned about and, you know, there's always a way to game the system,

just use a different registrant contact every time. That means if you're a legitimate person you actually have to handle tracking that. If you only have three domains it doesn't matter, if you have 3000 domains, well that's a pain. So it really depends on what your - who you're trying to protect yourself from, right?

I would posit that most people who have cross references and are worried about cross references is probably you're doing something that us abuse folks might be interested in. But there certainly could be legitimate uses where you don't want to have people cross reference. And, you know, then you go with what we do in the current system which is every domain has its own unique contact basically. And there's no conclusion - you're not precluded from doing that by the system, you just have to manage it yourself.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Rod. Michael, you're next.

Michael Hammer: Thank you. Michael Hammer for the record. So looking at the minimum public data on that slide, so this forces any contacts to go through the registrar, would that be a correct statement, Rod?

Rod Rasmussen: Or the validator.

Michael Hammer: Or a validator. Okay, so one, a lot of times when there's a problem and it's - what's called an innocent third party, a lot of times I'll look at the registration, find another way of reaching them that is look up their phone number, whatever, because they've been compromised.

This means that because it's not possible to do, and I think this is a consideration folks need to have, and, Rod, you said you're part of the abuse community, I really think you mean anti-abuse community, but be that as it may, I think what you're going to find is a lot more just going - it's not worth trying to reach out, you know, and go the extra distance, put people on RBLs,

block them, drop out, whatever. So I really think people need to think about, you know, be careful what you ask for, you just might get it.

Rod Rasmussen: Yes, got - I'll respond to that if that's all right, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, just briefly because we're just about out of time.

Rod Rasmussen: Oh okay, sorry. Yes, and okay so yes I'm a member of the abuse community when it comes to you, Michael, other than that anti-abuse. The - now I'm just kidding. The - this - I was debating whether to put this slide in at all. What's in and out of the public data set we have to decide, this is not - this is the recommendation we came up with. And we also provided for mechanisms through the via gated access to get a hold of exactly the information we're talking about. We're not talking about that right now, what we're talking about is basically the - at least what I'm talking about is this framework.

The framework supports, you know, we could publish - we could say, hey, all the data has to be public, it doesn't matter from the perspective, what I'm trying to get though is the idea of the concept around this framework of contacts versus domains and tying those two things together as an important concept to get to. Then we can support whatever kind of policy we want as far as what is published when. And we can have those debates separately from the how does this - how is this collected with regard to a domain name? Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Rod. And thanks, Michael. Michele, you get the last comment on this or question.

Michele Neylon: Yes, thanks. Michele for the record and all that. I suppose just kind of going back to this thing about, you know, one a single contact - sure, I can see the attraction for it but at the same time I would echo Volker and other people's concerns about that, I mean, it's - and assuming that just because people are - have concerns about what people can do, I mean, if you think about it's like

meta data, you know, the phone numbers I've called, the places I've been, you can put together an interesting picture about what I'm into, what I'm doing, maybe, you know, my political leanings, my sexual proclivities, my taste in all sorts of other things could be inferred from that. And that's - it's that kind of thing that I think some people would have concerns with.

And I can see an upside to it as well, and I totally get that. But I think it's something that people would need to look at a little bit more closely and just kind of going well, hey, if you want to avoid this then you have to, you know, jump through lots and lots of hoops. I don't think that's particularly helpful either because the advantages serve one set, they don't serve all. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. Rod, just one last question, on the six contact roles, when - I hadn't looked at these for a long time and re-looking at them, it seems to me that the business and the admin are awfully close to each other. And not that we need to resolve that now, but did the EWG think about combining those?

Rod Rasmussen: My recollection was that, yes, we had talked about this - those - talk about - I have to, you know, it was three years now or whatever it was, two or three years ago so I don't remember exactly what the deliberations were. There were - there definitely were cases where you would have somebody who is administratively handling things like domain transfers and those kind of things, versus here's a contact for our business.

Let's say I'm a shoe store, I want to make sure you can, you know, find my shoe store wherever it is and that's - or if you've got a complaint about the shoes that you just bought, you might be able to look up the business contact to get that versus somebody who's (unintelligible) the domain name itself. I believe that was the distinction. Somebody else in the group might remember better than me, though.

Chuck Gomes: Okay and we don't need to resolve that now, it's just an observation when I was looking at that on your slides. So and Lisa, looks like your hand went

down. Okay, we need to wrap it up because we're out of time. The - one of the things I want to point out is that the leadership team will introduce a discussion topic on the list this week, and there will be a message to the list that'll describe it, but basically dealing with the question what does it mean for an element to be in the RDS? This will not be in a poll, but it would be good to have some discussion on that on the list.

We will - one of the action items is to create a poll in follow up to all the discussion that we had and the poll results on Question Number 6, so that's one action item. Let me ask staff to help me out here, what are the other action items from this meeting? And I mentioned the one discussion point, if somebody from staff can jump in there.

Lisa Phifer: Chuck, I'll jump in. I think we have an action to - as you say, to create a poll question to probe further on the open points, the various concepts that were raised during discussion of poll Question 6. Do we have any other items that you wish to cover in a poll this week?

Chuck Gomes: And let me just qualify that with Item 6, it doesn't have to be one question, there were a lot of different ideas and so I'm giving ourselves freedom to maybe make it several questions or one question, whatever works best. But mainly just to get people thinking and do a quick view of their reactions including for example, Greg Shatan's third alternative. So it can be one question, it can be two or three but around all that discussion because a lot of good things were said and asked. So that's it.

Anything else on the action items? Okay…

Lisa Phifer: Chuck, the only other action item is the one that you mentioned to raise a question for list discussion, at least one question.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Lisa Phifer: And to stimulate the discussion on, you know, what does it mean to be in the RDS? There was a discussion in chat that we can recirculate some slides that I think was Holly and Jim Galvin created way back for our Marrakesh meeting based on SAC 054 that gives kind of an overview of what is in and out of Whois today.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Okay, our meeting next week is at the same time; the one two weeks from now will be at our alternate time on the 3rd meeting of the month. So hopefully we'll see all of you then. Watch for the poll, we'll try and get that out if not end of the day today first thing in the morning. And that one probably will not lead to any tentative conclusions, it could, but at least it'll help spur additional discussion and maybe give us some guidance for next week. We'll - I'm sure we'll spend a lot more time on this framework, some of it of course will relate to implementation, if and when we get there, for a new RDS. But thanks, Rod, for preparing that.

I think that just being aware of that framework will help us think through some of the issues and key concepts that we will be considering over the next few weeks. Anything else before I adjourn the meeting? Thanks, everyone, we had a great turnout on the call. Good discussion, good questions, appreciate that. And look forward to continuing to make progress on these things. We actually came up with I think five tentative conclusions over the last couple weeks so that's great. And in the meantime have a good rest of the week. And I will adjourn the meeting and the recording can stop.

Julie Bisland: Great, thanks, Chuck. Bye all. Have a great day. And (Darin), can you please stop the recordings? Thank you.

END