

RDS PDP AC Chat 16 August 2017

Nathalie Peregrine: Dear all, welcome to the GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group call on Wednesday 16 August 2017 at 05:00 UTC

Michele Neylon: it's not quite daylight here yet :) https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.instagram.com_p_BX15NIIhIbC_-3Ftaken-2Dby-

[3Dmneylon&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xc4I5cM&r=PDd_FX3f4MVgkEfi9GHvVoUhbcevsLhgsyXrxgtbL10DTBs0i1jYiBM_uTSDzggG&m=P9Rj9M7wIwIVzMkSLgxEjtCj8w-](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.instagram.com_p_BX15NIIhIbC_-3Ftaken-2Dby-3Dmneylon&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xc4I5cM&r=PDd_FX3f4MVgkEfi9GHvVoUhbcevsLhgsyXrxgtbL10DTBs0i1jYiBM_uTSDzggG&m=P9Rj9M7wIwIVzMkSLgxEjtCj8w-)

[TsnE6Wjwj3PZBQ6c&s=2kycCWkBl96kK2FmR0fHRSjsPYEojoqqwBU05_C_tis&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.instagram.com_p_BX15NIIhIbC_-3Ftaken-2Dby-3Dmneylon&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xc4I5cM&r=PDd_FX3f4MVgkEfi9GHvVoUhbcevsLhgsyXrxgtbL10DTBs0i1jYiBM_uTSDzggG&m=P9Rj9M7wIwIVzMkSLgxEjtCj8w-TsnE6Wjwj3PZBQ6c&s=2kycCWkBl96kK2FmR0fHRSjsPYEojoqqwBU05_C_tis&e=)

Tapani Tarvainen: This is more convenient time for me than the usual one, although not radically so.

Alex Deacon: Evening....

Michele Neylon: The only upside to the call being this early is that I am wide awake by the time I get into the office :)

Alex Deacon: 10pm here in San Francisco - first day of school is tomorrow (Summer is over!)

Marika Konings: In order to provide resiliency to overcome communication failure, at least one alternative contact method (possibly multiple alternative contact methods) MUST be supported by the RDS as an optional field(s).

Michele Neylon: they start back early

Marika Konings: @Alex - my kids are starting school tomorrow as well here in Costa Rica. Now our vacation starts ; -)

Stephanie Perrin: apologies for being a few minutes late

Chuck Gomes: My grand kids have been in school for a week.

Nathalie Peregrine: Welcome Stephanie

Stephanie Perrin: Seems reasonable wording

Marc Anderson: <--- I'm back in Adobe, at least for the moment

Alex Deacon: ok. thanks.

Nathalie Peregrine: Maxim Alzoba has joined the call

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): Hello All, sorry for being late

Nathalie Peregrine: Susan Kawaguchi has joined the call

Susan Kawaguchi: Sorry for being late lost track of time

Marika Konings: This is the presentation that Rod provided for the previous meeting

Nathalie Peregrine: Kal Feher has joined the call

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): in cases of physical persons & small companies - all of these are going to be duplicates

Stephanie Perrin: I agree, these are really only useful for large organizations

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): also in most companies Legal depts do not speak with outsiders and only consult staff members

Alex Deacon: @maxim - i don't see a problem (as marc just said) these are roles and not separate contacts.

Kal Feher: if these are simply roles, then they needn't be separated into contacts

Marc Anderson: apologies, I seem to be having technical difficulties this morning.

Kal Feher: perhaps these are attributes of a contact

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): is it possible to make roles tag like ?

Michele Neylon: A "role" is a type not a "contact"

Kal Feher: @Michele the document describes them as contacts.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): and with few contacts - it will look like contact 1: adm, legal, business : contact2:tech

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): and in large companies, most probably, they are going to be contacts of departments (people tend to go on leave, have x-mass e.t.x.)

Kal Feher: @michele I understand the functioning and have built such services in the past. don't want to take us down the rabbit hole. probably an implementation discussion anyway

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): I am not sure Business contact needs for work of DNS

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): the same for P&P

Stephanie Perrin: When we say either role or contact, the item is going to be a method of contact, correct?

Kal Feher:In principle I wouldnt collect information for anything that doesnt exist. we force people to create placeholders or to overload their contacts

Stephanie Perrin:I do agree with Kal. To a naive consumer (like me), all these differentiations are confusing.

Michele Neylon:Kal - for personal registrations sure, but having the option for domainers + corporates is important

Kal Feher:option is fine. I'd only object to mandatory roles/contacts

Michele Neylon:Kal - exactly

Sam Lanfranco:Since these are "roles" the individual could (if mandatory) put same information in all roles, or (if optional) leave some roles blank.

Stephanie Perrin:the roles may well all apply, but the person responding will be the same. Even if I choose to blow some of the 100 email addresses I am not using, all roads lead to Rome (i.e. me)

Tapani Tarvainen:If we drop the requirement for multiple contacts, could it result in registrars not even offering them or making it difficult to have them? I've found them useful in sometimes temporarily sharing DNS administration of my own domains.

Sam Lanfranco:@Tapani, The fields could be mandatory (to be there) but optional to fill

Tapani Tarvainen:Sam: yes, that would work. Not that I see a big difference between that and allowing same data in all.

Stephanie Perrin:It was the legal contact that I objected to the most on the EWG

Susan Kawaguchi:I doubt a large corporate would enter their lawyers details but may insert the corporations most common legal internal role contact details

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):medium companies - most probably will enter operational management into legal

Tapani Tarvainen:Steph: yes I can see Legal being a scary one for individual or small org registrants

Tapani Tarvainen:and I'd want to leave Business blank when I'm not doing any business with some domain

Sam Lanfranco:We are calling these "roles" but alternatively they can be seen as "nature of query" identifiers so "Legal" need not point to a lawyer.

Stephanie Perrin:The real question is how we authenticate the users of these contact points.

Stephanie Perrin:In other words, if I am getting spam on all channels, does this really help?

Stephanie Perrin:It is the accreditation part that is the really hard part

Alex Deacon:Accreditation and authentication for contact info?

Stephanie Perrin:Not suggesting we do it now, just pointing out that the only reason to segregate contact points as far as I can see is also to differentiate the requestors.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):on slide 6, middle picture , most probably going to be p&p too (no reason of hiding every contact and leaving tech one open)

Kal Feher:I think display requirements can wait

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):at least for physical persons

Stephanie Perrin:We are not there. But this data is not necessarily published, either. We are talking about collecting only. SO the question will arise, who gets access to what contact points.

Marika Konings:What I had noted in the chat is: Tentative WG agreement could be that PBC types identified (Admin, Legal, Technical, Abuse, Proxy/Privacy, Business) must be provided for by RDS but optional for registrants to fill out.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):common idea of personal protection legislation in different jurisdictions - is about collection of only what you need, and collecting of unneeded info is not in line with that

Kal Feher:the main issue with display requirements today are the limitations with whois formats. replacement protocols such as RDAP's json response will not fail if a field does not exist

Stephanie Perrin:INdeed.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):if roles are made tag-like - so it is just about few contacts per record + tags of them

Stephanie Perrin:I like Marika's wording.

Marika Konings:I've updated the possible WG agreement as you suggested in the notes

Tapani Tarvainen:+1 Marika

Marika Konings:I've changed it to 'supported by'

Sam Lanfranco:Marika's wording captures much of the sense of what we seem to be generally agreeing on.

Tapani Tarvainen:After rethinking I prefer allowing blank entries over having same information repeated

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):if we set minimum amount - it is going to be used for registrations ... there is no incentive to add more info than that

Tapani Tarvainen:Maxim: there may be, sometimes registrants may benefit from having extra info there

Kal Feher:can we conclude then that alternate time WG meetings are more productive and therefore should always be at this time?

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB:@Tapani... Registrants are lazy and do not fill in more than absolutely needed

Tapani Tarvainen:@Benny I think you're generalizing too much. But in general they *should* not fill more than are really needed.

Stephanie Perrin:I totally agree that differentiation is important. There is a big difference between a data service and a directory service.

Kal Feher:so long as we make it clear in our discussions that we are talking about "publication" regardless of gated'ness or collection/storage of data

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):given the overall number of people now .. number of AP members is relatively high

Michele Neylon:I hate mornings

Kal Feher:agree with Michele, we should always have it at this time

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):good morning all

Sam Lanfranco:Bye to all...

David Cake 2:Thanks Chuck.

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB:bye

Michele Neylon:now to cook breakfast and Hoover the sitting room