

Julie Bisland:Welcome to the GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group call on Tuesday, 8 August 2017 at 16:00 UTC

Julie Bisland:Agenda wiki page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_WGfwAw&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QIF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=zIOIFc-vIRnm6vpqSKEi8iTIAsVYjex-bB3x_AplBg&s=rXZjPmEe3Z50iaP4LB_W1rys8tQgLSENGSOidA1vs4&e=

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Hello All

Julie Bisland:hello Maxim :)

Chuck Gomes:Hello

Herb Wayne Ombuds:Good morning from LA everyone

jonathan matkowsky:Hello all

Fabricio Vayra:Congrats, Margie! Good to have you on here!

Margie Milam:Thanks!

Sam Lanfranco:Hello Chuck & All !-:

Lisa Phifer:Slides displayed can be downloaded from

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_download_attachments_66086744_RDSPDP-2DHandout-2D8AugustCall.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QIF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=zIOIFc-vIRnm6vpqSKEi8iTIAsVYjex-bB3x_AplBg&s=qf_spNhxUuFwOPq7Cn4zp3Xq-qR_FTrh_id_90DG9tE&e=

Lisa Phifer:All WG agreements are recorded in our working document, the latest version of which is

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_download_attachments_66086741_KeyConceptsDeliberation-2DWorkingDraft-2D1August2017.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QIF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=zIOIFc-vIRnm6vpqSKEi8iTIAsVYjex-bB3x_AplBg&s=VeZeTEq_3pagfF3Zli4f13A8nk4y5aJn8aabdf28_go&e=

Lisa Phifer:Slides 2-5 are from the Annotated Poll Results:

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_download_attachments_66086744_AnnotatedResults-2DPoll-2Dfrom-2D1AugustCall.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QIF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=zIOIFc-vIRnm6vpqSKEi8iTIAsVYjex-bB3x_AplBg&s=YeUuCKIJGhdu1yQ9iU7oARnKe8B0YBtGI7wWXuwnC5k&e=

Andrew Sullivan:If "should be" is used then "mandatory to collect" is obviously not possible

Andrew Sullivan:We're talking about collection today, AFAIK

Lisa Phifer:"data enabling...contact" means "data element(s) that enable contact through alternative or preferred methods" -- subsequent questions drill down on what data elements that might be

Alan Greenberg:My understanding is we are talking about collecting only. That presume SOMEONE may eventually gain access, but we have not talked about who or how one gets access.

Stephanie Perrin:I think that is a useful modus operandi Alan, but I just bring it up to make sure people are not leaping to any conclusions

Vicky Sheckler:+1 Alan

Farell FOLLY:I have a suggestion : Why don't we split the question in two ? Because, collection and disclosure should be separated

Lisa Phifer:WG Agreement: For resiliency, data enabling alternative or preferred method(s) of contact should be included in the RDS; further deliberation to determine whether such data element(s) should be optional or mandatory to collect.

Lisa Phifer:Note that the charter question contains many subquestions; we are only dealing with part of the entire charter question as a first step.

Andrew Sullivan:I wouldn't have sent a response sooner, either, since I was travelling the rest of last week and then was doing house repairs on the long weekend here :-)

Michele Neylon:I should have sent the email sooner though :)

Andrew Sullivan:I think it is entirely appropriate to discuss this on the list anyway -- it's a complicated and tricky problem and probably better worked out in text because that allows extended treatment of the issue

Andrew Sullivan:(we found last week that just doing it ad hoc in conversation was not that helpful :-))

Michele Neylon:Andrew - agreed.

Stephanie Perrin: Bear in mind our previous (some would say ad nauseum) discussions of the purpose of data collection. The data that has been demanded in the RAA would form the basis of the investigation of a privacy complaint, as has been made plain in the correspondence from the DPAs during the negotiations over the 2013 RAA.

Stephanie Perrin: Could we have scroll control please?

Andrew Sullivan: @Stephanie: I appear to have it

Lisa Phifer: You have scroll control

Stephanie Perrin: how odd, where would I find it if it is not appearing?

Michele Neylon: Audio is not very clear

Lisa Phifer: @Stephanie, side scroll bar on right or page numbers under slides right above Chat

Fabricio Vayra: what do credit cards and banks use where post addresses don't exist?

Kal Feher: if a registrant has an option, and they choose a poor method for their circumstances as you suggest, should we prevent that choice?

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks Lisa, the side scroll bar seems to have disappeared but page click still there, all good (I guess)

Fabricio Vayra: for that matter, what do legal processes rely on where there are no post addresses?

jonathan matkowsky: Give me a sec to fix my mic, sorry

Greg Aaron: Why does the speaker not support inclusion of postal addresses?

Kris Seeburn: Actually very true a postal address is required to have a proper postal address

Michele Neylon: Nominet is a ccTLD

Kal Feher: @Greg, I think the reasoning was that it isn't particularly reliable in the speaker's region.

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB: There are a lot of places which don't have it

Michele Neylon: they only have to deal with one jurisdiction (in theory)

Michele Neylon: I think the previous speaker's point was that postal addresses are an issue in some places

Farell FOLLY: Yes.. Nelylon

Kris Seeburn: i agree.... but some jurisdiction does

Greg Shatan: Phone is unreliable in some jurisdictions, apparently....

Kris Seeburn: yes that is true as well... we are in the middle on this

Michele Neylon: Greg - where my sister lives there is zero mobile coverage

Lisa Phifer: Q5 I think addresses the purposes (problems being solved) - may be helpful to look at that first, then circle back to methods

Julie Bisland: the operator is having difficulty reaching Daniel. We'll continue to try

Sara Bockey: Agree with James 100%

Michele Neylon: same here

Andrew Sullivan: I think I agree with Jim Galvin

Marc Anderson: +1 - Agree with Jim

Vicky Sheckler:as I have described in the polls, we need a method of day to day contact, typically electronically, some urgent method for communication, typically some form of phone content, and a physical address for legal purposes.

Andrew Sullivan:Moreover, we don't need to make a policy that postal is required if some other policy actually requires that

Kal Feher:also agree with Jim. it was what I had in my mind while answering the poll.

Andrew Sullivan:since if the other policy changes the policy we create would still work

Fabricio Vayra:So if a registrar is defrauded to register domains and payment is bad, are we OK with contact being an FB handle or email?

Stephanie Perrin:+1 Jim. Furthermore, it is not a given that current ICANN policies are compliant with DP requirements.

Vicky Sheckler:@andrew yes we do need it for legal purposes

Andrew Sullivan:@Vicky: who needs it for legal purposes?

Andrew Sullivan:i.e. who is "we"?

Lisa Phifer:Apologies for tiny font on slide 5, but categories are Contactability, Resiliency, Preference, Abuse Reporting, and Other

Fabricio Vayra:"we" the community

Fabricio Vayra:"we" the person defrauded

Fabricio Vayra:"we" us on this group

Kal Feher:@Fabricio. the registrar is free to require further details to protect themselves.

Andrew Sullivan:The person defrauded is the registrar. Surely, the registrar already has a lot of contact info

Andrew Sullivan:not related to the RDS (see my question on list about RDS/registrar db boundaries)

Fabricio Vayra:Oh, but those not the registrar, defrauded, their recourse is to shoot off an email or SMS?

Andrew Sullivan:Also, if the registrant defrauded the registrar, what possible reason do you have to suppose the postal address is useful?

jonathan matkowsky:Postal address is also important exactly because it is not always reliable and for due process, the sender needs to know whether it was delivered successfully

Kris Seeburn:you want the exact location and not just a poital address

Andrew Sullivan:@Jonathan: interesting argument. I think it'd be good to expand that on the call

Kal Feher:@Fabricio, if you're premise is that we need to ask enough data so that criminals are exhausted into accidentally giving valid contact details, we will likely need a _lot_ of data

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Jonathan

Stephanie Perrin:A registrant must not be required to publish a postal address. Different from requirement to collect.

Vicky Sheckler:@andrew, as you have said in the past, the data is necessary for trust among all of the actors, not just teh registrar/registry with the direct relationship with the registrant

Fabricio Vayra:@Kal, no, my premise is that we need postal address for all the real owrld processes that don't rely on SMS and email for "contact"

Farell FOLLY:If you want to know the exact location, in my country we don't haave system like in europe for mail distribution. So knowing the exact location would be a problem.

Vicky Sheckler:physical address is necessary for jurisdiction analysis.

jonathan matkowsky:@vicky 100%

Andrew Sullivan:@Vicky: surely merely knowing country would be enough for that?

Farell FOLLY:It will be one in the bylwas of the entity..

Stephanie Perrin:Street address is not required for jurisdiction analysis

Sara Bockey:Andrew just said what I was going to say...country indicates jurisdiction

Farell FOLLY:If it is individual address, it may kee changing without any update at the registration

Farell FOLLY:thanks @steph

Farell FOLLY:+1 sara

Andrew Sullivan:_Maybe_ province/state: I think in India there are legal differences among sub-country jurisdictions

Lisa Phifer:Summarizing some of the benefits given in chat: ability for sender to confirm receipt, ability to support policies and laws that require postal delivery., ability to determine jurisdiction Summarizing disadvantages: postal address not reliable in some locations and criminals may give fraudulent addresses anyway.

Andrew Sullivan:The "mechanism of identification" is precisely what some people are worried about, of course.

Richard Leaning:what ever the contact information - it has to be correct and accurate

Fabricio Vayra:@Sara - So your company is in all jurisdictions in the USA?

Andrew Sullivan:What about the notion that registrars MAY not collect postal address but MUST provide it if they do collect it?

Stephanie Perrin:you could of course ask the registrant to specify jurisdiction. That would force them (and the registrar) to think about jurisdiction.

Vicky Sheckler:for service of process, physical address is generally the preferred method for most courts. @andrew, yes, there are different rules in legal divisions lower than country which needs to be taken into account. I appreciate that in some countries a true street address is not possible, but that, as Greg Aaron just mentioned, is a corner case and is an exception, not the rule

Lisa Phifer:@Stephanie, note we already have WG Agreement #25: Registrant Country must be included in RDS data elements; it must be mandatory to collect for every domain name registration.

Greg Shatan:@Fab, they're trying...

Andrew Sullivan:This would allow others to identify registrars that do not collect by policy, and others who could cope with exceptions

Andrew Sullivan:If you're making a requirement in a computer system, it's not allowed to be empty

Stephanie Perrin:However, country is not always sufficient in federal states. State, province or lander or canton might be necessary

Andrew Sullivan:period

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB:With the pushing on for validation of data this can be a challenge in a big part of the world

Kris Seeburn:what happens...if someone wants to hide everything in the cloud with a hidden which is what happens at this stage... which country would they say

Michele Neylon:Kris - the "cloud" has jurisdiction

Michele Neylon:cloud is just someone else's computer

Alan Greenberg:People's postal address may be a PO Box or "General Delivery", but generally everyone has an address. All sorts of forms such as passport and visa's require "an" address.

Vicky Sheckler:+1 Michele

Sara Bockey:People travel. Some hate email. I think we need to be forward thinking as new technologies may come into play

Michele Neylon:I use my mother's address when I'm out of the country

Michele Neylon:I use the office address for most things

Kris Seeburn:i agree with you muchele...so which one would be used..as terms of address...your own country of where things are hosted

Andrew Sullivan:I will note that I personally just don't care about this requirement -- if it's added I don't mind -- but I am allergic to the idea that "corner cases are fine"

Michele Neylon:Kris - you'll find it's both

Andrew Sullivan:that makes for really poor technical policy

Lisa Phifer:@Jonathan, it sounds like you are making a case for at least one formal address, and an option for informal alternative addresses (or preferred addresses)

Michele Neylon:Kris - if you are breaking your local law in country X or the provider by hosting it breaks the law in country Y (where they are)

Greg Aaron:Ahen, Andrew: I said that corner cases will exist, they should be discussed, but you have to make choices about whether they're truly compelling enough to deal with in policy. Engineers make exactly those kinds of decisions.

Alan Greenberg:We MUST consider implications!

Richard Leaning:but Michele - which address to tell your bank or passport office?

Richard Leaning:or gas company, telephone provider, sky

Kal Feher:I'm struggling with the idea that to buy a domain you need a physical address. yet to host the content or deploy services on the internet you can do so with an email address and some payment info.

Stephanie Perrin:A post office box in my neighbourhood costs over 180\$ last time I checked, two years ago. So demanding an address will cost innocent registrants a lot of money if they do not trust the RDS with a postal address.

Fabricio Vayra:@ Andrew - How are you defining "contact"?

Lisa Phifer:It should be understood that after this WG makes recommendations in phase 1, we are required by our charter to identify costs and risks/benefits that must be considered when developing policies to support those requirements - and that step may cause the WG to refine the initial requirements developed at this stage

Greg Aaron:Or, Stephanie, that registrant could purchase privacy protection for \$10 per year...

Vicky Sheckler:+1 alan

Stephanie Perrin:I believe we have heard that legal practitioners prefer to have a postal address to serve papers.

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Greg

Sara Bockey:We are still discussing collection, not publication, right?

Alan Greenberg:@Sara, yes

Sara Bockey:thanks :) just keeping it clear

Kris Seeburn:michele i mean some people have a cloud business of colocation in another country where that jurisdiction accepts certain gaming or gambling....when the origin of the company doing that from a different jurisdiction....i know quite a few who cannot gambling on Mauritius but still have gambling servers elsewhere where the jurisdiction lets them do ahead....

Lisa Phifer:Here we are discussing contact methods - we will discuss roles later in the agenda, to which each method may apply

Jonathan Matkowsky:For due process, having a formal mailing address is absolutely needed -- not just multiple contact methods

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Jonathan

Stephanie Perrin:agree with Greg

Kal Feher:@Jonathan what process are you thinking of specifically? there are plenty of legal internet based services a person can use without a physical address

Lisa Phifer:@Jonathan, it sounds like you are making a case for at least one formal address, and an option for informal alternative addresses (or preferred addresses)

Jonathan Matkowsky:It's not just UDRP

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):one of the parties interested are LEAs

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):and courts

Jonathan Matkowsky:The UDRP is based on common principles of due process in the law

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Jonathan

paul keatin g:DUE PROCESS requires that one goes OVER AND ABOVE the norm to ensure that notice is provided

Alan Greenberg:I just IF that is the place. Clearly we need to consider all implications of omitting a contact method.

Lisa Phifer:@Jonathan, for example, a possible requirement might be that there be at least one contact method required and mandatory to collect which satisfies the needs of due process (including UDPR)

Stephanie Perrin:The fact that postal address is necessary or desirable does not mean that it must be collected in a registration process.

James Galvin (Afilias):@stephanie - YES, exactly my point

paul keatin g:THE WORLD is not the US. Much of the WORLD is unconnected and our system must account for them as well.

Fabricio Vayra:@Stephanie, it also doesn't mean it shouldn't

Stephanie Perrin:As long as there is a contact method, the individual can be contacted and asked to provide the postal address as required.

Margie Milam:the transfer policy refers to emails I believe

James Galvin (Afilias):I'm not objecting to collection postal address but I'm concerned about why.

Alan Greenberg:@Stephanie, I would tend to disagree. Registration information is the one kick-at-the-can to get whatever we may need.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):but spam can be physically sent to these addresses

paul keatin g:There should be as much contact data as possible. Access and privacy relative to that data is a separate issue.

Greg Shatan:@Paul, domain name registrants need to be somewhat connected....

James Galvin (Afilias):@alan - but why are we required to serve all needs. What is the purpose of registration data? To serve all needs or for our own purposes still to be deliberately determined?

Stephanie Perrin:Alan, I realize that this is the attitude at ICANN which has prevailed over the years and resulted in over-collection of data. Not acceptable from a privacy perspective.

James Galvin (Afilias):Certainly the minimum purpose is to be able to contact the registrant. This seems self-evident to me. What other purposes are we serving and why?

Stephanie Perrin:Indeed James, that is the point.

James Galvin (Afilias):If the contact method fails then the registrant loses, whatever loss means given the circumstances.

jonathan matkowsky:If the contact *doesn't* work, that is legally relevant too, and is taken into account for due process

Kal Feher:I note that South Africa has allowed the serving of papers via Facebook.

Lisa Phifer:@Jim Galvin, some comments in response to Q5 indicated a desire to report domain name abuse either to the registrant or to someone else - two examples of purposes served

Michael Hammer:Apologies for being late - conflicting meeting.

James Galvin (Afilias):"loss" could mean losing the domain name, or perhaps locking, or perhaps removing from the zone so it stops working, or even something else yet to be proposed.

jonathan matkowsky:We will encourage a flood of litigation by restricting access--major public policy consideration

Greg Shatan:Over-collection is in the eye of the beholder.

jonathan matkowsky:If we don't collect the data, then we need to change the safe harbor provision so that the registrar is liable

Greg Shatan:I honestly don't see this as a "trust" issue.

Michele Neylon:I need to drop off - talk to you all via email :)

Richard Leaning:You need to collect enough data to establish that trust

Richard Leaning:trust is long gone

James Galvin (Afiliis):REGRETS - I need to drop off now.

Fabricio Vayra:@Stephanie - This isn't a trust issue, it's an issue of practicality. Can one open a bank account, obtain a credit card, buy a car, etc. with a simple email?

jonathan matkowsky:Abuse concerns and legal due process are not the same concerns

jonathan matkowsky:They are equally valid concerns

Richard Leaning:+1 Fabricio

Fabricio Vayra:@Stephanie - Should registrars also accept domain registrations based on email and sms?

jonathan matkowsky:Registrars must be responsible for the unlawful activities of the registrants if they don't collect adequate data for due process requirements

Stephanie Perrin:Dick, that is my point. There is no trust.

Fabricio Vayra:@Jonathan - At a minimum, registrars will be on the hook to produce contact info every time there's a legal dispute.

Richard Leaning:Exactly Stephanie

Stephanie Perrin:But demanding more data is only going to result in more creative attempts to get validatable data.

Greg Aaron:And yet UDRP works really well...

Kris Seeburn:agree with paul...it is a real challenge

Lisa Phifer:It seems that comments are identifying underlying requirements (not specific to contact method itself) such as: at least one contact must be accurate, at least one contact must be trustworthy, at least one contact must be suitable for use in legal proceedings for due process

Richard Leaning:I have to go, sorry ;-)

Stephanie Perrin:I believe it was the UN special rapporteur who asked the question during our session in Copenhagen, is the purpose of the RDS law enforcement? It is a good question. We appear to be designing it for the purposes of law enforcement, but ICANN does not have a mandate to do so. I suggest everyone needs to have a look at the new EU Directive on data protection in the context of policing and law enforcement.

Fabricio Vayra:@Stephanie - Law enforcement and enforcement of contracts and laws are not necessarily the same.

Andrew Sullivan:I like Lisa's observation. I think it's right on

jonathan matkowsky:Civil rights and remedies is not the same as law enforcement

Stephanie Perrin:Sure Fab, but we conflate them here in our discussion all the time, and I have heard IP lawyers argue that enforcement of Trademark law is law enforcement....I certainly argue that enforcement of data protection is law enforcement.

Fabricio Vayra:That's my point, stop conflating

Fabricio Vayra:this isn't about the FBI, NSA, CIA, OR IP Lawyers and owners

jonathan matkowsky:@paul Registrars though must collect the data if they want to have a safe harbour even if registrants don't want to volunteer it

Kal Feher:I don't think anyone is suggesting that we limit the type of contact methods we allow (within sane limits of course). it's the minimum requirement that is causing heartache

Stephanie Perrin:Sadly Dick has left the call, Fab, law enforcement agencies may have different views

Alan Greenberg:I can't comment on to what extent the UDRP is written from a US perspective, but the current list of providers who implement the policy include those in the US, Switzerland, Czech Republic and Jordan

jonathan matkowsky:Which line are we looking at for the vote?

jonathan matkowsky:Where is this question in writing so we can look at it while we vote?

Lisa Phifer:@Paul, pursuant to Q2, we agreed to determine whether contact methods were mandatory or optional later in deliberation (that is, after methods were agreed).

Marc Anderson:Page 6

jonathan matkowsky:thanks

Lisa Phifer:Question posed now: Do you support improved contactability as a purpose for collecting alternative contact methods?

Sam Lanfranco:Raise the probability = improved contractability

Andrew Sullivan:I confess I'm indifferent to this. I don't think it'll improve anything

Fabricio Vayra:@Stephanie - Agree. He probably does have different view, as do you. That's bc there are different stakeholders here and we should not conflate or make overly broad conclusory statements that generalize these view, etc.

Alan Greenberg:Improved probability of...

Lisa Phifer:If you have N methods of contact, you may be able to reach the target easier or faster, independent of failure. Thus improving contactability.

Kris Seeburn:@ stephanie i think this is not a bad approach

Daniel K. Nanghaka:There should be a best preferred method - the second best alternative is used when the first fails

Andrew Sullivan:But we today have 3 methods

Andrew Sullivan:they're all required

Andrew Sullivan:so I don't see the "improvement"

Lisa Phifer:As agreed for Q2, for the moment, don't assume any alternatives are mandatory to collect - optional or mandatory is to be determined after further deliberation

Daniel K. Nanghaka:@Andrew - they are all required but there is the most preferred

Fabricio Vayra:@Stephanie - And then where there's an issue (crime, contract dispute, etc), the registrar is responsible to respond to court cases, et al? or hand over the contact data?

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Alan

Lisa Phifer:Question now posed: Do you support resiliency to communication failure as a purpose for collecting alternative contact methods?

paul keatin g:sorry but i must leave the call

Stephanie Perrin:just how resilient do these contact methods have to be?

paul keatin g:yest but it should be voluntary by the registrant

Sara Bockey:agree with Paul

Stephanie Perrin:ditto agree with Paul

Roger Carney:agree with Paul and Sara

Kris Seeburn:agree with paul. +1

Lisa Phifer:Question posed now: Do you support providing contacts with a choice of contact method as a purpose for collecting preferred contact methods?

Stephanie Perrin:I think this question needs to be clarified, it is too open-ended

Kal Feher:that question doesnt make sense to me

Sara Bockey:that sentence makes my head hurt...

Griffin Barnett:agree, confusingly-worded question

Stephanie Perrin:The purpose of having multiple contact points could be resiliency

Alan Greenberg:@Stephanie, it probably depends on the relative reliability of contact info. We know that e-mail is relatively poor, and for completely innocent reasons. e-mail addresses fail to work regularly due to everyday occurrences (such as using an isp-based address and changing ISPs or moving out of their areas.

jonathan matkowsky:yes, vague

Lisa Phifer:We are trying to establish the reasons for collecting either alternative or preferred contact methods, based on comments given in the poll

Daniel K. Nanghaka:The questions needs more clarity

Lisa Phifer:If there is a valid reason, then perhaps we can agree on the alternative(s) or preference option(s) to be offered or required

Sara Bockey:Yes, as long as it's supposed by the registrar... and that would be a business decision by the registrar

Stephanie Perrin:Exactly Alan, I agree. Indeed, given the difficulties that some of us have with bandwidth, email can be quite problematic.

Kal Feher:agree with the basic premise. but noting that there are different costs to some contact methods

Daniel K. Nanghaka:yes they should choose the preferred method of contact

Griffin Barnett:No problem with asking registrants to identify their preferred method, assuming this doesn't at this stage exclude or otherwise impact requiring back-up methods

Greg Shatan:Agree with Griffin

Stephanie Perrin:but we need to be precise about whether we are looking for alternative channels or alternative contacts

Greg Aaron:Someone needs to post a better question, with better wording. So confusing the polling is not helpful.

Lisa Phifer:contact methods - not roles

Kal Feher:preferred for registrant may not be preferred for contactor.

Stephanie Perrin:agree with greg. I am all for agreement when we can get it but this question is too much of a mess at the moment

jonathan matkowsky:I don't think it's more complicated

jonathan matkowsky:I think that is the ambiguity I am feeling here too

jonathan matkowsky:It's very confusing

jonathan matkowsky:But if interpreted to mean additional preferred methods, I am voting YES

Roger Carney:Agree with Sara, choice and also the method needs to be supported by registrar

Daniel K. Nanghaka:I agree the multiple point of contacts but its better to have the preferred method

Sara Bockey:It's not about word-smithing...it's about understanding what is being asked

jonathan matkowsky:A lot of people feel there is ambiguity to the question, which is what I felt too

Stephanie Perrin:Exactly Sara

Lisa Phifer:Possible alt question: Do you support allowing registrants to indicate their preferred contact method?

Daniel K. Nanghaka:+1 Allan

jonathan matkowsky:So I think it makes sense to reword the question

Daniel K. Nanghaka:They should specify the preferred contact method

jonathan matkowsky:We should re-write the question we want to poll

Greg Aaron:I dont believe that registrants should be allowed to choose which contact methods they can submit.

jonathan matkowsky:@greg For sure they should not - but they should be allowed to submit additional optional ones if they want to right?

Stephanie Perrin:and we will all come away with a different version of what we supported, which is not likely to speed things up. I think we have to embrace the unfortunate fact that conflation of issues and a lack of clarity about the different perspectives we bring to this multi-stakeholder discussion has caused a lot of our roadblocks in previous WHOIS efforts

Lisa Phifer:Let's be clear - these are NOT poll questions. They are probing the level of support for concepts suggested in poll responses, so that poll questions can be constructed on possible key concepts

Andrew Sullivan:I so want a "confused emoji" checkmark

jonathan matkowsky:@andrew - Me too!

Benny Samuelson / Nordreg AB:+1 Andrew

Sara Bockey:Agree with Alan

Lisa Phifer:Question posed now: Do you support enabling reporting of domain name abuse as a purpose for collecting alternative contact methods?

jonathan matkowsky:I have to run but it has been fun - sorry I have to drop off a few minutes early. Have a great day folks.

Stephanie Perrin:There is a good reason the SSAC called their report 3 Blind Men and the Elephant.....

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):some addresses are in reality PO boxes (virtual offices e.t.c)

Alan Greenberg>Contact info is involved in addressing a report of abuse, but not needed for the complaint.

Lisa Phifer:Several poll responses identified the ability to reach the registrant when there was domain name abuse as a reason for collecting alternative or preferred methods. For those who said that, this is a chance to explain why to other WG members.

Greg Aaron:contact info is involved in addressing a report of abuse, but is needed for the complaint if you want to contact the registrant.

Stephanie Perrin:I think consideration should be given to having optional contact data entrusted to the registrar, not the RDS. After my (stupid) registrar cut me off in 2014 due to inoperative phone number they failed to correct, I considered changing registrars. Transparency to hapless registrants is a weak point in the system....hard to know how to pick a better registrar. (Please dont spam me with your ads, tell me why I should trust you)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):bye all

Kal Feher:yay alternate time!

Julie Bisland:The next GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group teleconference will take place on Wednesday, 16 August 2017 at 05:00 UTC for 90 minutes.

Andrew Sullivan:I must offer my regrets for the next two weeks: I'll be travelling

Julie Bisland:apology noted, Andrew

Lisa Phifer:All, "RDS" and "RDDS" were acronyms resulting from two separate efforts that occurred at roughly the same time. I am not aware of any difference intended when adopting these acronyms in the RAA and EWG.

Fabricio Vayra:thanks!

Andrew Sullivan:bye all

Sam Lanfranco:bye

Daniel K. Nanghaka:bye

David Cake:Than you everyone