

Continuing our deliberation beyond "minimum public data set"

a) **Charter Question:** "What data should be collected, stored and disclosed?"
focusing on identifying set of data required in the RDS first

b) See poll results from 22 August call:

- Recent mailing list discussion of WG agreements on contactability
- Review poll results and confirm additional WG agreements:
<https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/66086750/AnnotateResults-Poll-from-22AugustCall-v2.pdf>
- For Question 7, categorize and examine write-in comments as the starting point for deliberation

c) Deliberate and consider next steps in relation to remaining data elements that more respondents agreed or were unsure should be in RDS in the 28 June poll:

- Registrant Type
- Registrant Contact ID (Registry Registrant ID)
- Registrant Contact Validation Status
- Registrant Contact Last Updated Timestamp
- Registrant Company Identifier
- Registrant Contact URL
- Server Status (Registry)
- Registrar Jurisdiction
- Registry Jurisdiction
- Registration Agreement Language

Recent Mailing List Discussions

- Mailing List Discussions over the past week include
 - Contactability
 - Registrar Data vs RDS Data
- Contactability discussion focused on WG agreements related to contact methods
 - To improve contactability with the domain name registrant (or authorized agent of the registrant), the RDS must be capable of supporting at least one alternative contact method as an optional field.
 - PBC types identified (Admin, Legal, Technical, Abuse, Proxy/Privacy, Business) must be supported by the RDS but optional for registrants to provide
- Comments made appear to align with input already received in poll responses and WG call deliberations
- All inputs (including possible inconsistencies between agreements) to be further considered during iterative second pass deliberation on all WG agreements

Review poll results and confirm additional WG agreements

<https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/66086750/AnnotatedResults-Poll-from-22AugustCall-v2.pdf>

Question 7: Additional Alternative Methods of Contact

Q7: The June 28 poll identified 5 data elements (alternative methods of contact) that most WG members who participated in the survey either disagreed with them being supported by and included in the RDS, or were unsure of whether or not they should be supported by and included in the RDS. These data elements were:

- Registrant Fax + Registrant Fax Ext
- Registrant SMS
- Registrant IM
- Registrant Social Media
- Registrant Alt Social Media

Please indicate in the comment box which of these alternative contact methods you believe should be supported by the RDS, and please also include your rationale. Note that your response will only serve to inform deliberations during next week's WG call. Responses to this question will not, at this time, contribute to a WG agreement.

Question 7 Result Summary

Responses	Explicit Support	Support All	Explicit Oppose	Oppose All	Comment Summary
Registrant Fax + Registrant Fax Ext	4	6	3	2	10 : 5
Registrant SMS	4	6	0	2	10 : 2
Registrant IM	3	6	2	2	9 : 4
Registrant Social Media + Registrant Alt Social Media	2	6	3	2	8 : 5

Responses categorized above to help assess degree of Support : Opposition

- Some comments provided explicit rationale supporting specific data element(s)
- Some comments simply supported ALL of these data elements
- Some comments provided explicit rationale opposing specific data element(s)
- Some comments simply opposed ALL of these data elements

“Comment Summary” column attempts to summarize comments in these 4 categories

Summary does not reflect respondents who either did not comment on that specific data element, or who provided a comment which indicated uncertainty about ALL data elements

Q7: General Comments

	Comments that apply to ALL data elements in Question 7
Ayden Férdeline	None should be supported by the RDS.
Steve Metalitz	In the interest of maximizing effective contactability, all these elements should be supported on an optional basis.
Rod Rasmussen	ALL contact methods should be supported including TBD future comms methods. Support for such elements does not indicate they must be provided by a contact, but at least allows the option.
Greg Shatan	All of the above should be supported as options.
Phillip Marano	All of the above, because, depending on the circumstances, each one might conceivably be used to effectuate service of process.
Roger Carney	I think this is a tough one, as I think this list changes over time. Thinking about “preferred” contactability, at one time phone (and arguably postal) was probably more preferable than email, today I think email is much more preferred than phone/postal. I think tomorrow (and some would argue yesterday) a new communications mechanism will be preferred over email.
Sara Bockey	I support forward thinking in our contact methods, but am undecided on exactly what those alternate contacts should be. Should it be specified? Should it be free-form? Undecided here.
Andrew Sullivan	I'm ok with any of them being optional.
Tim OBrien	I would suggest we provide the options; let the Registrant decide what communication providers they are comfortable with and are reliable in their area. Though I worry that these would be abused (openly marketing rather than support/abuse, linked to malicious sites/files, etc).
Volker Greimann	I do not think these should be included.
Krishna Seeburn (Kris)	Personally i do not mind which one works. The most important thing in this question is that we need to reach those people or owners by any means possible. I would even say the provided details should be verified by the registries and registrars.

Q7: Specific Comments: FAX

	Comments that apply to REGISTRANT FAX
Greg Shatan	If there are specific uses for the fax number in the DNS (noting that there are still various processes outside the DNS that mandate faxing) it should be mandatory.
Vlad Dinculescu	Registrant Fax + Registrant Fax Ext: No support. This is old technology which the majority of companies now send to an email inbox. This is an indication that this type of technology (fax specifically) is outdated and should be replaced.
Sam Lanfranco	I would retain optional fax even though most individuals no longer have fax, but most companies retain it for legal reasons
Greg Aaron	Let's not collect Fax number anymore. Or also include a field called "Carrier Pigeon Coop Number". ;-)
Nathalie Coupet	Registrant Fax + Registrant Fax Ext In Third World countries, faxes are widely used and are sometimes more reliable than phones or the Internet. Why pretend conditions are the same everywhere in the world? In Chad a couple years ago, the Internet was shut down for over 1 month because Orange refused to pay bribes to government officials. All transactions were done by fax during that period of time.
Chuck Gomes	Registrant Fax + Registrant Fax Ext
Michael Hammer	I support Registrant Fax+Registrant Fax Ext

Q7: Specific Comments: SMS and IM

	Comments that apply to REGISTRANT SMS
Kal Feher	Agree that SMS, IM, social media should be supported by RDS, noting that the specific technologies may be transient and might thus be replaced by new technologies. None of these should be required. optional only.
Vlad Dinculescu	Registrant SMS: Optional Support. This seems very targeted for a specific purpose. If you have the contact number where an SMS can be sent, then most likely you can call that number as well. This seems redundant to me.
Vicky Sheckler	Ok with adding SMS.
Sam Lanfranco	I would retain optional SMS/IM since anyone seriously using their domain name would probably have stable SMS/IM addresses.
Michael Hammer	I support Registrant Fax+Registrant Fax Ext as well as Registrant SMS.

	Comments that apply to REGISTRANT IM
Kal Feher	Agree that SMS, IM, social media should be supported by RDS, noting that the specific technologies may be transient and might thus be replaced by new technologies. None of these should be required. optional only.
Vlad Dinculescu	Registrant IM: Optional Support. If a registrant wants to provide it then they should be able to. This must in no way be mandatory.
Vicky Sheckler	I don't believe that neither IM nor social media should be allowed or supported as an alternative means of communication because those methods are not typically validated and are therefore unreliable.
Sam Lanfranco	I would retain optional SMS/IM since anyone seriously using their domain name would probably have stable SMS/IM addresses.
Greg Aaron	Maybe there should be one (optional to provide) field for Registrant to fill in a social media or IM address; it can be a multi-purpose field and in any case would need to be free-form because such identifiers vary greatly in format.
Michael Hammer	I do not support registrant IM, Registrant Social Media or Registrant Alt Social Media as these items may (generally) require registration with a 3rd party provider in order to access the Registrant information or to use as a contact method.

Q7: Specific Comments: Social Media

	Comments that apply to REGISTRANT SOCIAL MEDIA
Kal Feher	Agree that SMS, IM, social media should be supported by RDS, noting that the specific technologies may be transient and might thus be replaced by new technologies. None of these should be required. optional only.
Vlad Dinculescu	Registrant Social Media: Optional Support. If a registrant wants to provide it then they should be able to. This must in no way be mandatory. Registrant Alt Social Media: Same
Sam Lanfranco	I would not support social media for two reasons. First, their existence is in flux, and second, there is a risk of provider data mining, depending on national data privacy policies. Also, I fear that social media contact is more susceptible to spoofing.
Volker Greimann	"Social Media" is too unspecific. For example if I provided "Volker_Greimann" for the social media field, this would not tell anyone which social media this belongs to.
Greg Aaron	Maybe there should be one (optional to provide) field for Registrant to fill in a social media or IM address; it can be a multi-purpose field and in any case would need to be free-form because such identifiers vary greatly in format.
Michael Hammer	I do not support registrant IM, Registrant Social Media or Registrant Alt Social Media as these items may (generally) require registration with a 3rd party provider in order to access the Registrant information or to use as a contact method.

More Agree/Unsure than Disagree

Data Elements from 28 June Poll

<https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/66086729/AnalysisResults-Poll-from-28JuneCall.pdf>

Q	Data Element	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral/Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree		Support
4	Registrant Type*	12	8	7	3	5	35	19
5	Registrant Contact ID (Registry Registrant ID)	14	10	5	2	4	35	28
6	Registrant Contact Validation Status*	9	8	10	1	7	35	11
7	Registrant Contact Last Updated Timestamp*	13	10	5	0	7	35	22
8	Registrant Company Identifier*	12	7	10	4	2	35	23
23	Registrant Contact URL*	9	9	9	2	5	34	15
31	Server Status (Registry)*	12	8	10	1	4	35	23
36	Registrar Jurisdiction*	10	8	13	2	2	35	22
37	Registry Jurisdiction*	10	7	14	2	1	34	23
38	Registration Agreement Language*	7	12	9	2	3	33	18

* indicates data element not in 2013 RAA

Score: Sum of SA=2, agree=1, disagree=1, SD=2

In today's call, we will focus on data elements not yet discussed...

Definitions from EWG Report

Registrant Type

- Indicates the kind of entity identified by Registrant Name, for use in applying registration data requirements, as follows:
 - **Undeclared** – Applies by default if none of the following options are selected and shall be treated by the RDS in a manner similar to natural person.
 - **Privacy/Proxy Provider** – Must be selected for domain names registered using an accredited Privacy/Proxy Provider. When selected, a Contact ID of an accredited Privacy/Proxy Provider must also be supplied to enable relay/reveal request escalation to the PP PBC.
 - **Legal Person** – May be selected for domain names registered to entities that are NOT natural persons NOR proxy providers. When selected, a Contact ID of a designated Business PBC must also be supplied to facilitate consumer inquiries and complaints.
 - **Natural Person** – May be selected for domain names registered to natural persons. When selected, neither Privacy/Proxy PBC nor Business PBC shall be defined, and Registrant Name and addresses shall be treated as personal information in compliance with Data Protection laws applicable to the data subject's jurisdiction.

Definitions from EWG Report

Registrant Contact ID (Registry Registrant ID)

- A unique handle assigned to a pre-validated block of contact data identified as this domain name's Registrant. Refer to [Section V](#) for a more detailed definition of Contact ID and how it is created and used. This ID enables reuse and maintenance of contact data within the RDS. Note that when Registrant Type = Privacy/Proxy, the Registrant Contact ID will reflect the unique identifier assigned to that accredited Privacy/Proxy Provider.

Registrant Contact Validation Status and Registrant Contact Last Updated Timestamp

- The highest level of validation achieved and the date that it was most-recently validated, as further defined in [Section V](#).

Registrant Company Identifier

- The UK trading number, D-U-N-S number, or other unique real-world company identifier assigned to the Registrant by a public business directory. This enables searching for a company outside the RDS.

Definitions from EWG Report

Registrant Contact URL

- New data elements that optionally lead to web pages where contact or abuse reporting instructions, policies, or forms may be placed to facilitate more productive communication.

Server Status (Registry)

- Expanding upon 2013 RAA client status values, these data elements contain the Registrar (client) and Registry (server) status values currently applied to this domain name: DeleteProhibited, RenewProhibited, TransferProhibited.

Registrar Jurisdiction and Registry Jurisdiction

- The legal jurisdiction in which the Registrar or Registry operates, as indicated in their signed agreement with ICANN.

Registration Agreement Language

- The language in which the Registrar's contract with the Registrant is written.