

Michelle DeSmyter:Dear All, Welcome to the GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group call on Tuesday, 05 September 2017 at 16:00 UTC.

Michelle DeSmyter:Agenda wiki page:

[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_community.icann.org\\_x\\_YmfwAw&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrw113mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8\\_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe\\_5iHWG1BLwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=nS8ggq4QQhhe\\_5U06AIpecUX41KdCD5xNYeKhnaFAA0&s=DiPLDWV-Rk-Pg0YgRlahA6An3yZiyZnYSZptaIsGehU&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_YmfwAw&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrw113mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe_5iHWG1BLwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=nS8ggq4QQhhe_5U06AIpecUX41KdCD5xNYeKhnaFAA0&s=DiPLDWV-Rk-Pg0YgRlahA6An3yZiyZnYSZptaIsGehU&e=)

Amr Elsadr:Hi Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi:good morning

David Cake:good morning

Greg Aaron:A new version of hte Adobe Connect add-on was released, and is required to download before getting into Adobe Connect today.

Greg Aaron:Yeah, it made me install it today.

Michele Neylon:afternoon

andrew sullivan:Grr, the fact that Adobe hasn't learned how to use open standards, and that ICANN continues to use this piece of proprietary garbage, really irks me.

Lisa Phifer:ICANN60 update: ICANN60 meetings: Saturday, 28 October: 08:30 - 12:00 and Wednesday, 1 November: 16:00 - 18:30 local time

Lisa Phifer:Poll results:

[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_community.icann.org\\_download\\_attachments\\_66086754\\_AnnotatedResults-2DPoll-2Dfrom-2D29AugustCall.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrw113mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8\\_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe\\_5iHWG1BLwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=nS8ggq4QQhhe\\_5U06AIpecUX41KdCD5xNYeKhnaFAA0&s=0PKuDwCxyb1JvfAi5yqMnmLId00nHvGgjOKCaJYCAw&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_download_attachments_66086754_AnnotatedResults-2DPoll-2Dfrom-2D29AugustCall.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrw113mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe_5iHWG1BLwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=nS8ggq4QQhhe_5U06AIpecUX41KdCD5xNYeKhnaFAA0&s=0PKuDwCxyb1JvfAi5yqMnmLId00nHvGgjOKCaJYCAw&e=)

Lisa Phifer:you all have scroll control

Lisa Phifer:page 3 - Q2 Reseller

andrew sullivan:Never, ever try to use this application on the ipad or iphone. It's like trying to cook using plastic cutlery.

Michele Neylon:LOL

Michele Neylon:Unless you cook with a microwave

Michele Neylon:which isn't really cooking

Volker Greimann:I agree to move on - but lets be clear about the question we leave open

Lisa Phifer:We will record WG agreement only that Reseller must be supported by the RDS.

Lisa Phifer:Page 5 - Q3 - Registrar Abuse Contacts(s)

Volker Greimann:how is the support distributed?

Volker Greimann:numbers do not matter after all

Daniel K. Nanghaka:could they explain why they do not support?

Volker Greimann:i meant distributed amongst stakeholder groups

Lisa Phifer:See page 6 for comments from those who did not support

steve metalitz:@Alan this question was about phone contact specifically.

Volker Greimann:Alan, my objection reason is in the comments  
andrew sullivan:That all seems to assume 'at lookup time', which assumes publication, which is not what we're talking about (only collection just now)

Volker Greimann:I do not think we can determine support based on numbers of participants alone

Volker Greimann:if we do, I will sign up the entire company for membership

Stephanie Perrin:Apologies for arriving late

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB:Registrars are already giving this for every registry

Greg Shatan:3 of those not supporting do support one abuse contact being required but not two.

Lisa Phifer:We do examine participation distribution overall

Volker Greimann:I agree!

Volker Greimann:Optional to provide

Greg Aaron:The registries get the abuse email and phone data from the registrars. And that is how the registries publish it in output.

Michele Neylon:except for thin registries - but either way it's there

Michele Neylon:and it's not optional

Greg Aaron:The registrars know their own abuse email and phone numbers, and publish that in their thick output.

Volker Greimann:Greg +1: One required method is perfectly fine.

Volker Greimann;;-)

Greg Shatan:That's not what I said.

Volker Greimann:I am not objecting against the participation, I am objecting against determination of consensus/agreement solely based on the number of proponents. This should be weighted

Volker Greimann:can't talk today

Volker Greimann:correct

Volker Greimann:I really think collection may be an issue too

Lisa Phifer:Note that last week we had good support for email and slightly less support for phone - but we decided to try to be consistent with the recently adopted CL&D policy and support collection of both

Volker Greimann:for smaller registrars at least

Volker Greimann:I know, I only realized this now

Volker Greimann:and it worries me

Lisa Phifer:thus the poll question - which seems to support last week's call show of hands

Volker Greimann:smaller than you

andrew sullivan:A lot of static here -- is it me or the source?

Greg Shatan:He's such a small registrant he can't even afford a proper phone line.

Greg Aaron:To be clear for everyone in the WG, both Registrar abuse email and phone are currently required to collect -- and required to publish. That's the fact.

andrew sullivan:@GregA: the fact that things are currently required is surely not a constraint

andrew sullivan:the whole point here is apparently to look at current rules including data gathering

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Alan. Well said.

Ayden Férdeline:Sorry I'm late. Adobe Connect demanded an update, but wanted me to update Flash etc first before I could even do that...

andrew sullivan:I would have dramatically preferred a PDP that was trying to cope only with the publication side, and something else about data collection

Greg Shatan:We should understand when we are considering reducing contactability.

andrew sullivan:but here we are.

andrew sullivan:@GregS: I agree with that

Volker Greimann:I do not want abuse complaints over the phone. We need a paper trail for every complaint to cover liability. So if someone calls, we will tell them to send an email. Helps no one, wastes our time

Michele Neylon:Volker - we get phone calls from LEA and from some of the security companies

Michele Neylon:the trail via email etc makes sense

Michele Neylon:but phone is fine

Michele Neylon:I don't see the problem

Volker Greimann:and we will even tell LEA to send an email. Could be anyone at the phone

Lisa Phifer:We will record Q3 as a WG agreement - of course all WG agreements will be deliberated upon further in our second pass in Phase 1

Alan Greenberg:@Volker, I can see that you would ALSO want a paper trail, but phone is the only way to get someone's attention quickly (and verifiably so)

Ayden Férdeline:I wonder how much it would cost to staff an abuse hotline 24/7? Glad I don't have to pay for it.

Tapani Tarvainen:I can imagine a registrar operated solely by people with speech impediment...

andrew sullivan:I can imagine a registrar operated solely by cyber-fraudsters. That doesn't mean we ought to enable such an arrangement ;-)

andrew sullivan:(the imagining in that case is, I will note, not totally imaginary)

Greg Shatan:Michele, that would be enabling those who make abuse complaints, and some people think that's a Bad Thing.

Tapani Tarvainen:I was serious. Quite a few groups of people with various disabilities run businesses.

Greg Shatan:Ayden, can you show me where a 24/7 hotline is being required?

andrew sullivan:@Tapani: I agree that there is an important issue there. But people who have various disabilities are not being asked to do something \_personally\_ that they cannot do

Ayden Férdeline:Greg, what would be the point of having a phone number to report abuse if it were not answered if you called?

Volker Greimann:Abuse phone number: Available form 0:00-0:01 on Fridays

Michele Neylon:Ayden - you can put an answering machien on it

Lisa Phifer:Page 7 - Q4 Alernative methods of contact with registrants (e.g., SMSi, IM, social media, fax)

Alan Greenberg:Ayden, there are LOTS of jobs in the wrold wher SOME staff member must be on call 24/7. It is a rather common job requirement.

Tapani Tarvainen:@andrew they would be asked to hire someone outside their group, with both financial and cultural cost

Greg Shatan:Tapani, do you believe that people with speech impediments should not work in customer-facing positions. That does not seem like a good accessibility position. FYI, my local grocery has a deaf butcher. So I write down the order.

Dick Leaning:Guys - can we be sensible here. how do you contcat you gas supplier or cable company - this is no different

Michele Neylon:Exactly

Greg Shatan:The Ministry of Silly Arguments seems to have opened shop here.

Michele Neylon:/me has been smacking his head off his desk for the last few minutes and is in pain

Ayden Férdeline:If you call this hotline to report serious abuse (thinking where there is a risk of substantial harm to vital harm), and leave a voicemail and it is not actioned immediately, it sounds to me like something many would have an issue with. Particularly those in litigious societies.

Rod Rasmussen:@Andrew EstDomains perhaps?

Ayden Férdeline:\* risk of substantial harm, scratch the next three words

Tapani Tarvainen:@Greg it could be people who can't speak at all. A group of such people could conceivably want to operate as their own registrar.

Volker Greimann:Steve+1

Greg Shatan:Ayden, do you think an email would be answered more quickly? Or do you think the solution is being completely uncontactable.

Ayden Férdeline:I think a phone number requirement here is absurd, but I am not going to strongly object, as I won't have to pay for its implementation.

Tapani Tarvainen:So while we \*can\* require phone service it's not as obvious and simple as some seem to suggest.

Michele Neylon:Ayden - how many abuse reports have you handled in the last month?

Rod Rasmussen:Why do I think we are being trolled here on this issue?

Lisa Phifer:This WG agreement must be read in conjunction with other agreements already reached on email

Greg Shatan:I think most of these registrars have phones already. The Introverted Deaf-Mute Luddite Registrar is an edge of an edge case at best.

Volker Greimann:Maybe make it an open field on both sides?

Ayden Férdeline:It is another barrier to entry for new registrars.

Michele Neylon:Ayden - seriously?

Volker Greimann:e.g. a registrant could specify the service AND the handle?

Greg Shatan:So is electricity and a computer.

Volker Greimann:not Facebook: -.....

Volker Greimann:but [Service] - [Handle]

Greg Shatan:MySpace only.

Volker Greimann:corredct

andrew sullivan:I think that April 1st will come again, so I propose that we get to work on a specification for RDAP over IP over Avian Carrier.

Stephanie Perrin:I think that the accessibility issues which Tapani raises are real ones, so are the liability issues that Ayden raises. I would throw in language issues, something we rarely if ever talk about. So while I agree that there is a faint whiff of the MInistry of Silly arguments here [I believe I used to work in that particular Ministry, prior to my retirement] I think it is unfair to describe these concerns as irrelevant or ill-informed.

Volker Greimann:that is what I meant

James Galvin (Afilias):@andrew +1

Rod Rasmussen:@Andrew - packet loss is high, but it was proven to work!

Michele Neylon:I love that RFC

Greg Shatan:As a lawyer who works on Americans with Disabilities Act matters, and with a legally-blind brother-in-

law, I'm very disappointed in the thought processes of some in this group.

andrew sullivan:@Rod: I think we need a new section, Pollution Considerations

Tapani Tarvainen:@Stephanie good point. Would a phone number imply someone answering speak anything but Finnish?

Volker Greimann:@Greg: No worries, 46 will got after this group next.

Lisa Phifer:+1 Marc - phase 2 will address specific policy and phase 3 implementation guidance - now we need to identify info required and why

Greg Shatan:Perhaps we should have Haben Girma, a lawyer who was the first deaf blind graduate of Harvard Law School talk to us about "protecting" people with disabilities.

Greg Shatan:@Volker, we're only on 45 at the moment. I'm hoping that 46 does not follow in his footsteps.

andrew sullivan:I don't understand how protecting anyone with any disability is remotely close to what we are discussing here.

Lisa Phifer:Show of hands: green check if you agree additional alternative contact methods should be supported by RDS

Greg Shatan:Because of Tapani's theories regarding use of phones by the disabled.

James Galvin (Afilias):What does accommodate mean?

Rod Rasmussen:Please clarify the question.

Sara Bockey:yes, please put the question in the chat

James Galvin (Afilias):Must - Should - May?

Lisa Phifer:Show of hands: green check if you agree additional alternative contact methods should be supported by RDS

Lisa Phifer:must oops

Rod Rasmussen:Nevermind - I see that it was clarified earlier.

andrew sullivan:Ah, now I understand. It seems to me that various TTY services fixed this in the 1970s, no?

Lisa Phifer:Show of hands: green check if you agree additional alternative contact methods MUST be supported by RDS

Stephanie Perrin:I am not quite sure what you meant Greg, but having lived through the successful lawsuits against the federal govt for not making our materials accessible to the blind, I think it is an important matter to consider. And many years ago when I worked on the publication of the radio license database, I got educated quickly on how many folks with disabilities were reliant on communications, and geekier than most. So I don't find Tapani's example to be an edge case of an edge case, I regard it as something worthy of consideration, without necessarily understanding how the business might run....

Rod Rasmussen:Fax is just one "additional" method in my mind - some organizations still use it for "official" correspondence.

Rod Rasmussen:@Susan - soft "u"

Ayden Férdeline:Greg, please spare me your faux outrage for those with disabilities. No one here has suggested anything but trying to address the structural barriers that make a disability abnormal in society. By which I mean, people here have been advocating for more universal design and integration in policy so to try to reduce the stigma for those who might otherwise need to request legitimate accommodations.

Rod Rasmussen::-)

andrew sullivan:I think the official allowable content of the fax field ought to be "have you heard of the Internet?"

Michele Neylon:lol

Lisa Phifer:I think the question is whether any additional agreement on fax is needed

Greg Shatan:Ayden, that is not faux outrage. And you have violated the Standards of Conduct. Withdraw that remark or I will refer this to the Ombudsman.

andrew sullivan:I think we should allow any contact method, to be clear

Alan Greenberg:@Michele +1

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Michele

Rod Rasmussen:I use eFax myself - makes email appear magically on a fax machine.

Michele Neylon:Rod - we do too

andrew sullivan:I don't care about fax, or Instagram handle, or Skype ID, or carrier pigeon co-ordinates

Greg Shatan:+1 Michele.

Michele Neylon:we still get chargeback notices from the bank via fax

Michele Neylon:I have no idea why

Justin Mack:+1 for Fax being an optional, and additional, method of contact

Rod Rasmussen:@Michele - some banks think "firewall rules" mean how thick to build the fireproof walls around the safe...

Alan Greenberg:In some jurisdiction, fax has legal import, e-mail either does not, or requires explicit approval from recipient to make it "official"

Michele Neylon:Rod - yup

Greg Shatan:That was Ayden. And I'm still waiting.

Greg Shatan:Insulting other people's beliefs is completely unacceptable.

andrew sullivan:I hope I didn't say anything that involved any ombuds! If I did, I apologise unreservedly and withdraw any such remark.

Greg Shatan:Andrew it wasn't you. It was Ayden Ferdeline.

Ayden Férdeline:@Greg, I am sorry you misinterpreted my remarks

that way. But I withdraw my comment and apologise for the offense that was taken.

Greg Shatan:"faux outrage" cannot be misinterpreted.

Greg Shatan:Are you apologizing for the remarks, or only the offense that was taken? The latter is not acceptable.

Lisa Phifer:Record WG agreement : In the interest of maximizing contactability, additional contact methods must be supported by the RDS as an open-ended list and be optional for Registrants to provide.

Ayden Férdeline:Greg, as I said, and I quote myself here, "I withdraw my comment."

Greg Shatan:That is not an answer to my option question. Try again.

Lisa Phifer:Let's note this does not preclude agreements that require other contact methods

Greg Shatan:Strike the word option.

Lisa Phifer:Proposed WG agreement : In the interest of maximizing contactability, additional contact methods must be supported by the RDS as an open-ended list and be optional for Registrants to provide. This does not preclude agreements that require other contact methods.

steve metalitz:OK with Lisa's additional language (does not preclude other required contact methods).

Lisa Phifer:green if you agree red otherwise

steve metalitz:Green on understanding that physical address and phone will be revisited as required to be collected

Lisa Phifer:move on

Greg Shatan:+1 to Steve's understanding.

Lisa Phifer:Handout:

[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_community.icann.org\\_download\\_attachments\\_66086750\\_RDSPDP-2DHandout-2DFor29AugCall-2Dv2.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl13mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8\\_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe\\_5iHWGlBLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=nS8ggg4QQhhe\\_5U06AIpecUX41KdCD5xNYeKhnaFAA0&s=SLVZfL21xhx2R4-LEd0x6WbDAKHcHTCpjzq--8-mfoo&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_download_attachments_66086750_RDSPDP-2DHandout-2DFor29AugCall-2Dv2.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl13mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe_5iHWGlBLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=nS8ggg4QQhhe_5U06AIpecUX41KdCD5xNYeKhnaFAA0&s=SLVZfL21xhx2R4-LEd0x6WbDAKHcHTCpjzq--8-mfoo&e=)

Lisa Phifer:We will also record note to deliberate on phone and email in a future call

Greg Shatan:@Ayden. Still waiting for an acknowledgement that the remarks were inappropriate before they were withdrawn, and an apology for the remarks, and not only for my "offense."

Ayden Férdeline:Hi Greg, please re-read my previous comment: "I withdraw my comment."

Lisa Phifer:Slide 11 of Handout - Registrant Type

andrew sullivan:I don't understand why this is valuable. Neither do I understand why it is helpful to create a



whole new category of disputation as part of a plan to move forward.

Volker Greimann:Registrant Type: If this is a self-declaration, I am fine with it, if it is a requirement enforceable upon registrars, I am not.

James Galvin (Afilias):I do not understand why or how a self-declaration of this type is useful. It is easily "gamed" and thus will more or less be immediately useless.

Greg Shatan:@Ayden, please re-read my response.

Rod Rasmussen:Default is "undeclared" which is what we have today with no field. Being able to declare this reflects many ccTLD's operations, and also allows those with interests in having certain treatment under different privacy and other legal regimes to more readily take advantage of them. It is "gamed" by bad guys, just like anything else, that's no change. It is useful for "good guys" in several use cases.

James Galvin (Afilias):My apologies. I have to step away and must drop off at this time.

James Galvin (Afilias):@rod - how do you distinguish good from bad?

James Galvin (Afilias):Sorry have to go.

Lisa Phifer:yes there is a WG agreement on those PBC types

Rod Rasmussen:@Jim - easiest would be those who lie on stuff like this and those who don't ;-)

Stephanie Perrin:Is Andrew breaking up for others or is it my connection?

Lisa Phifer:#36 Purpose-based contact (PBC) types identified (Admin, Legal, Tech, Abuse, P/P, Business) must be supported by the RDS but optional for registrants to provide.

Rod Rasmussen:@Stephanie - sounds like its just you.

Stephanie Perrin:Thanks Rod!

Ayden Férdeline:@Greg Shatan, trimming down just to the substance, you said, "Withdraw that remark or I will refer this to the Ombudsman." I promptly replied with, "I withdraw my comment" and issued an apology to you. Your repeated requests that I further wordsmith my sincere apology to you is detracting from my ability to engage and listen to the contents of this call.

steve metalitz:@Lisa but if registrant chooses "Legal Person" then Business PBC must be provided?

Lisa Phifer:@Steve, that's what the EWG proposed but it doesn;t have to be that way

Rod Rasmussen:Contacts don't get a "registrant type" field, only domains. At least if I remember correctly.

Volker Greimann:I will go out on a limb here and state the obvious: The default has to be undeclared based on the fact that

current registrations are undeclared. When we look at importing the legacy data into the new set, no one in their right mind will dream of contacting each and every registrant and make them update their data to fit the new fields. Thus the default has to be what exists now: No data provided.

steve metalitz:@Lisa but we are being asked to approve these registrant types now, correct, including the definitions?

Lisa Phifer:no we are starting deliberation on the idea of a registrant type being supported - values and other agreements that depend on those values are all up for discussion

Stephanie Perrin:Not sure that that was the consideration at the EWG, actually Greg.

Michele Neylon:For now .. ..

andrew sullivan:To hammer on what I said in my spoken remarks, this requires an extension to EPP in order to make this work

Stephanie Perrin:In some jurisdictions, legal persons have some protection.

andrew sullivan:are people really, seriously willing to wait until some extension of the EPP contact mapping is settled before we can be done?

Michele Neylon:Nominet registrant validation is a disaster #justsaying

Lisa Phifer:@Andrew, it's just an enum dat element, collected at time of registration, why would that require an EPP change?

Stephanie Perrin:Furthermore, in registereing a slew of brilliant names, I may not have decided how to use them yet, in my corp or in my personal capacity.

andrew sullivan:@Lisa: because there's no current way to map it in the registration protocol

andrew sullivan:Since it doesn't exist in the XML, you have to create an extension

andrew sullivan:That's not impossible, but since this is apparently to be required, you need a standard way to do it

Lisa Phifer:any new data element would be like this - how does it differ w/r/t EPP support?

Volker Greimann:see my comment above: the need to import legacy data dictates the default as undeclared

andrew sullivan:Yes, any new data element has this problem

andrew sullivan:It is very far from obvious to me that we need new data elements

Greg Shatan:@Ayden, I'm sorry that you can't see the difference between an apology for a remark and an apology if the other person was offended. Or between withdrawing a remark and disavowing it. Both too cute by far. And your insult has distracted me from participating. But that's all I'll say here, as you clearly will not change your position.

Rod Rasmussen:So how do we handle other required stuff for various TLD's at the domain level that have "special requirements" like .tel today?

Lisa Phifer:we just agreed on an additional contact methods element

andrew sullivan:@Rod: tel has all manner of extensions

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):@Rod: many use custom EPP extensions

andrew sullivan:@Lisa: yes, and they're all optional

andrew sullivan:so not-supported is not a problem

Michele Neylon:Lots of registries have extensions

Rod Rasmussen:Right - was asking the question to draw that out. :-)

Michele Neylon:as long as the damn thing is documented properly and we have time to write code etc., it's not really a problem

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):...and extensions can cause support headaches for registrars

Lisa Phifer:so you are saying Andrew that any new mandatory data element cannot be supported by EPP? (or did I miss the point?)

Michele Neylon:Scott - usually due to bad / unclear documentation

Michele Neylon:or people being "innovative"

Michele Neylon:which usually means doing something downright dumb

andrew sullivan:@Michele: and also because standardisation is hard

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):Right, or different registries doing the same thing in different ways

andrew sullivan:people disagree about how to do it, and then you have multiple ways to do it

Michele Neylon:Scott - yes

Michele Neylon:As a registrar having to support 4 methods of achieving the same result is a pain

Rod Rasmussen:Given that .uk has a very good market penetration, I would wager most registrars could handle "registrant type" technically. Of course, I could be wrong...

Michele Neylon:Rod - you'd be wrong

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):As Andrew said, it requires extension and standardization

Benny Samuelson / Nordreg AB:Not really hard to implement, several registries are doing it simple if there are only data in the first name / last name field its a natural person

Rod Rasmussen:@Andrew - that's precisely the point - is this worth the effort or not? That's a policy decision not a technical one.

Rod Rasmussen:Our discussion was making it sound like it was a technical limitation.

Lisa Phifer:Just reminding us all that our job is not (at this stage) to work out implementation. Our task in phase 1 is to identify what's required in registration data and directory services and why. So WHY is it useful or necessary to identify registrant type?

andrew sullivan:@Lisa: I guess that's mostly what I'm trying to ask -- or rather not just why it is useful or necessary, but how useful it is

andrew sullivan:it's plainly not necessary, since the default is "undeclared"

Rod Rasmussen:It's a technical complexity with cost to be sure, but does it help solve some other difficult problems?

Rod Rasmussen:"Solve" may be too strong - mitigate better.

andrew sullivan:I might feel differently if the default was obviously legal person or something, but it seems to me that this is plainly off the table for GDPR reasons anyway

Stephanie Perrin:The problem is that implementation is important. If a registrant can't figure out how to fill this out, they are going to go to the default, making this field not at all useful.

andrew sullivan:@Stephanie: and the existing base of >>100M domain names are all in the Undeclared category today

Rod Rasmussen:@Stephanie - depends on the registrant type. *\*Most\** domains are not owned by private persons.

Volker Greimann:Classification may have benefits to the registrant.

Rod Rasmussen:End of the Day, is there a benefit to the registrant to declare themselves as a certain type or not?

Rod Rasmussen:s/owned/registered by/

Stephanie Perrin:I argue that for the average user (who must be considered to be our target audience, fits public interest mandate) they will not be able to understand all this. I do understand that Rod, the Facebooks of the world will find this useful, so will the Procter and Gambles etc. But it is certainly going to be a nightmare for the average individual.

Volker Greimann:But ultimately, we will have to import 120+million existing registrations.

andrew sullivan:This is going to create real costs -- development and support costs -- for every registrar and registry in the gTLD space. If this is a desirable set of distinctions and people want this feature, then create the permissions to have this data to begin with

andrew sullivan:let the registrar and registry market expose whether it is valuable to anyone

andrew sullivan:I have no objection to this being an optional element

andrew sullivan:(in the English meaning of "optional", not the apparent ICANN one)

Stephanie Perrin:I would just add to Greg's remarks that we have not actually done a risk analysis yet. Actually just reread this (Don't hit me Michele) and she raises good points about the complexity of the EWG report.

[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A\\_blogs.lexisnexis.co.uk\\_wipit\\_online-2Dprivacy-2Dbig-2Dbrother-2Dplans-2Dfrom-2Dicann\\_d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrw1l3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xc14I5cM&r=8\\_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe\\_5iHWGlBLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=nS8ggq4QQhhe\\_5U06AIpecUX41KdCD5xNYeKhnaFAA0&s=hr2DLdzjm5UCpgLBsaTBSA3XFdvhqiwkOartHIwzS0s&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A_blogs.lexisnexis.co.uk_wipit_online-2Dprivacy-2Dbig-2Dbrother-2Dplans-2Dfrom-2Dicann_d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrw1l3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xc14I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe_5iHWGlBLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=nS8ggq4QQhhe_5U06AIpecUX41KdCD5xNYeKhnaFAA0&s=hr2DLdzjm5UCpgLBsaTBSA3XFdvhqiwkOartHIwzS0s&e=)

Rod Rasmussen:Sounds like a good research project - what is the experience of ccTLD's that have tried to address this issue with various approaches?

andrew sullivan:I cheerfully predict that, if it is optional, it will be a commercial failure, but I prefer to be wrong as an empirical matter than to make policy on the basis of a guess.

andrew sullivan:I don't think anyone is confused about how they could be valuable for display purposes

Rod Rasmussen:We do actually have some market evidence to look at if it could be gathered, and I agree its better to make decisions on approaches to solve problems bases on empirical evidence. We unfortunately don't always have that luxury, particularly in the fast-changing Internet space.

andrew sullivan:I think the question is whether they'll ever work given that the "undeclared" option is what many contacts will be

Rod Rasmussen:@Andrew - correct, again, is there a real benefit to registrants to incent them to use the field?

andrew sullivan:@Rod: yes: as Phill Hallam-Baker said, "On the Internet, you are so not in control for every value of 'you'."

Rod Rasmussen::-)

Lisa Phifer:ICANN60 meetings: Saturday, 28 October: 08:30 - 12:00 and Wednesday, 1 November: 16:00 - 18:30 local time

Ayden Férdeline:Thanks for the dates for the ICANN60 f2f; really great to know them this far in advance.

Michele Neylon:bye all

Ayden Férdeline:Thanks all

andrew sullivan:bye all

Fabricio Vayra:bye

Benny Samuelson / Nordreg AB:bye

Daniel K. Nanghaka:bye

Greg Shatan:Bye all.