# ICANN
# Transcription
# Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group call
# Wednesday, 29 November 2017 at 06:00 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: https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-nextgen-rds-pdp-29nov17-en.mp3

AC recording: https://participate.icann.org/p3uyaxlp6q3/

Attendance is located on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/LgByB

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 been started. You may now begin.

Nathalie Peregrine:     Thank you, (Noreen). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everybody, and welcome to the Next Generation RDS PDP Working Group call n the 29th of November, 2017. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken on the Adobe Connect room only. If you are, however, on the audio bridge would you please let yourself be known right now? Hearing no one, I'd like to remind you all to please remember to state your names before speaking for recording purposes and to mute yourselves when not talking to avoid any background noise.

Thank you ever so much and over to you, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes:    Thank you very much, Nathalie. This is Chuck Gomes. Welcome, everyone, to our call this week. Let me ask right up front if there are any statement of interest updates. Seeing no hands and hearing no one, I'll assume not.

Let me preface the call with an admission that I've - about halfway through my vacation I caught a little bug and so my voice could give out on me today. If it does Susan has volunteered to pick up the ball. I'll do the best I can. And I want to thank Susan for the good job she did chairing in my absence and

the leadership team for carrying the ball the last couple weeks and all of you for continuing to proceed with the work we have in front of us.

The agenda is in front of us, let's jump right in. So Lisa or Marika, if you can bring up the call handout for today. Thank you very much. And all of you have scrolling capability so please feel free to follow along. On Slide 2 you can see the agenda as well as in the Adobe Connect window on the upper right so let's go right at it.

Based on the results of last week's meeting, we conducted a poll and the results came out very strong in favor of the statement that was made. And if you look at - we'll look at those results in just a moment, but if you look at Slide 3 you'll see that we are taking a - what we're calling a building block approach deliberating on each purpose one by one. You'll recall that we formed some drafting teams to develop definitions of nine purposes that came from the EWG report.

And we spent a couple weeks, two, three weeks working on those. The teams did a good job. And so what we're doing now is we're going to take a look at each purpose one at a time and talk about whether the purpose should be considered legitimate for collecting some registration data and if so, why? Next we're going to identify data elements required to support the purposes. And keep in mind that we're going to defer discussion of collection conditions or access controls which might be applied to data elements until later, we will get to those, that's essential.

And note that any agreement on legitimacy of one purpose doesn't preclude additional purposes being agreed as legitimate for the same or other data. And you can - you've seen these examples at the bottom of Slide 3 several times so we won't go through those.

Going to Slide 4 then, we're going to start out with - we started out last week talking about technical resolution after finishing the team's - going over the

team's work on that. And we started deliberation on whether or not technical resolution is legitimate purpose for collecting some data. And there are some questions there that I won't repeat again that are just a subset of subset of questions, there are probably many others we could ask as to whether a purpose is legitimate. I'll let you review those again on your own.

The - and then we started out and we reached agreement on a statement in our meeting last week and there - on the call there were no objections, there were a couple no responses with comments in the results. Again, I'll let you review those on your own. But we had 92% support from those who participated in the poll that technical issue resolution was a legitimate purpose for registration data collection at minimum for resolving issues with domain name resolution. Again, remembering that we haven't decided which data elements, but collection of some elements was agreed to by 92% of the people on the poll.

Now if you go to Slide 5 then, you'll see the - basically the statement - the definitions - two definitions of technical issues, okay. The one that we focused on in the poll and had pretty strong agreement on in the meeting last week, that technical issues associated with domain name resolution is information collected to enable contact of the relevant contacts to facilitate tracing identification and resolution of incidents related to issues associated with domain name resolution by persons who are affected by such issues or persons tasked directly or indirectly with the resolution of such issues on their behalf.

Again, that one there was strong support for and no objections on the call last week and then 92% basically supported that as a purpose for collecting some data elements yet to be determined for technical issue resolution.

There was mixed responses - quite a bit of support but mixed responses on the other definition. And the leadership team in particular Lisa crafted the second definition of technical issue resolution. Excuse me. And you can read

it there. In fact rather than straining my voice let me ask Lisa if she would read that one and go over it.

Lisa Phifer:    Sure, Chuck. This is Lisa Phifer for the record. As you recall last week we actually did try a show of hands or the red green check and X marks in Adobe Connect looking at a couple of different variations of statements related to services that might be associated with a domain name. Some of the comments that were made last week were that it would be helpful for us to bring in some examples into the definition in order to clarify what the scope is. There were some comments that it should be tied to operational issues associated with the services.

And so to try to bring those concepts in to a definition of technical issue resolution that we could use as a starting point for discussion tonight, we crafted the second paragraph that you see on this slide. So this is not to replace what we discussed last week with regard to domain name resolution but to move us further into discussing additional - an additional purpose or an additional refinement to this purpose.

And that would be technical issues related to services associated with unresolvable domain names, that would - building on the definition provided by Drafting Team 1 would be, "Information collected to enable contact of the relevant contacts to facilitate tracing, identification and resolution," and here's where it becomes different - "of operational issues related to services associated with an unresolved domain name, for example, a Website unreachable because the domain name cannot be resolved or email undeliverable because a domain name cannot be resolved," and then continuing with the definition that Drafting Team 1 provided.

Chuck, back to you.

Chuck Gomes:    Sorry about that, I put myself on mute and have to try that again. This is Chuck. So what we're going to do now is talk about this second definition of

technical issues to see whether there's support by working group members on the call for this as a legitimate purpose for collecting some data elements in the RDS for technical issues as defined here.

I'm going to start off by just opening it up for discussion. What do you think about that? Do you support that? Why? Do you not support it? Why? Are there any questions about what is meant by this definition? And again, we're on Slide 5, the second bullet. Jim, go ahead. Are you on mute, Jim? We're not hearing anything. Still not hearing anything, Jim. Not sure what's going on. Okay, he's going to reconnect. In the meantime, anybody else want to jump in please raise your hand. And if you need a dial-out, Jim, as you can see, just provide a dial-out number to Nathalie and she'll do that.

Marc, go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. This is Marc. Can you hear me okay?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Marc Anderson: I guess I'll start off since Jim's mic is having trouble. I guess reading these two, I'm not really sure what the second statement is trying to accomplish. You know, the first one I can get behind. It states, you know, technical issues associated with domain name resolution, that's the purpose. I understand that, it makes sense. In the second one, you know, we're adding - we're adding this related to service associated with something breaking because of domain name resolution. And I'm not - I'm just not sure what that accomplishes.

You know, as I read it, I don't think it matters if you have an unresolvable domain name, if there's an issue with the domain name then the purpose of it is to aid in resolving that whether it's because of related services or, you know, just because you want the domain name to resolve, you know, I'm just not sure that the second statement really adds anything or what it's trying to

accomplish. So, I mean, I'm good with the first statement, I just - I'm not sure what we're doing with the second one. And I can't seem to get behind it. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. This is Chuck again. And so before I go to Jim again, so am I understanding you correctly that you think that the second one is really covered by the first, is that a correct conclusion on my part?

Marc Anderson: I do. I think the second one, you know, in a way a subset. You know, you're saying technical issues related to services with an unresolvable domain name. The first one is saying technical issues associated with domain name resolution. You know, so we're adding some qualifiers. I don't see why - you know, I don't see what we're gaining by saying technical issues related to services, you know, it's, you know, who cares what it's related to? It's an unresolvable domain name, there's issues with it, it needs to be resolved.

So, you know, unless I'm missing something I just - I just don't see what that second statement is trying to accomplish.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. Thanks for making that clear. And notice that there's a couple people agreeing in the chat as well. Let's go to Jim.

Jim Galvin: So Jim Galvin for the record. Just check, can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Jim Galvin: Okay thank you. So I was actually part of the design team for this and the distinction being made here in these first two bullets, in these two choices, is an issue that was discussed within the design team. And actually I'm not comfortable with the change that is being proposed here for the second bullet because the distinction to be made here is whether or not the issue is about the domain name or about things that you do with the domain name.

And we carefully had that discussion and made the distinction to focus on domain name resolution. It's about the domain name itself, it's not about services associated with it because, you know, services associated with it is far and away beyond the remit of ICANN in any case. We don't collect information about domain names to support all of the, you know, fast and furious and interesting things that one might do with the domain name. It's really about the name itself and the resolution of that name itself and issues associated with, you know, the DNS in particular. It's not about websites, it's not about phone services or anything else.

So I find that I can't support these proposed changes. I much prefer the prior. And to speak directly to the way that Marc was referring to it, I agree in any case, domain name resolution, you know, I mean, it encompasses what's in the second sentence - in the second proposal. So thank you.

Chuck Gomes:     Thank you very much, Jim. This is Chuck again. And again, we're not changing the first one, okay, so we've already accepted as a tentative conclusion based on the poll results the first one. The second one was being added as the possible addition in addition to the first. And so, so far we have some people speaking out against that and supporting it in the chat as well.

Is there anyone who thinks that the second one adds something that isn't covered in the first one? And if so, please let us know what you think it adds so that people can respond to that. Jim, go ahead.

Jim Galvin:     Thanks, Chuck. Jim Galvin for the record again. Yes, the second one adds things that are not covered by the first and adds things that don't belong there. It talks about the services associated with a domain name, that's things that are not (unintelligible) by design that was an explicit choice as opposed to just being about the domain name itself. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes:     Thanks, Jim. And I should have qualified my statement, so thanks for doing that for me, I appreciate that. Does anybody think that there's value in

considering the second statement as a definition of technical issues? Is it needed? Several people have said it's really not needed, it's a subset of the first one. And like Jim said, the services like a Website and so forth, are really not part of ICANN's mission so we shouldn't even go there. I'm not seeing - and I better look at the chat, again there's more agreement in the chat. Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. Lisa Phifer for the record. I'm wondering for those of you who were on last week's call if you recall who was advocating for services? And I believe maybe it was Andrew gave several - the examples that were given or incorporated here on this slide. Also, just thinking back to the drafting team's definition I know that there was some back and forth about whether or not to include the related services in the definition that came out of the drafting team. And the final text actually did include related services. So maybe someone who was part of that discussion in the drafting team if that's you, Jim, or someone else, can explain, you know, maybe a little bit more about who was advocating for that and why.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa. This is Chuck. Again, if somebody can help explain why there was some support for going, you know, mentioning the service - related services that may be impacted because of a unresolved domain name and operational issue, please raise your hand or let us know in the chat and note that Jim doesn't recall who was advocating for that. What I'm concluding right now, there's nobody on this call that is advocating for it.

So unless somebody thinks otherwise I don't think we'll spend any more time on the second one. And we needed to follow up on it because there wasn't a final resolution on the call last week. There did seem to be some support for this, although apparently those people aren't on the call or maybe it's just become clearer on this call here.

Okay, all right so let's go on then, okay? We'll set that aside and we'll stick with the agreement that we have on technical issues. Lisa, your turn.

Lisa Phifer:     Thanks, Chuck. I just want to clarify the edits that are made in the first bullet here on this slide, Slide 5, that tie technical issues specifically to domain name resolution, those would be reflected in the working group agreement that we'll record in our working document?

Chuck Gomes:   Yes.

Lisa Phifer:     Thank you.

Chuck Gomes:   So we have reached another working group agreement. Again, those are tentative, we can always come back and revisit them but there's - was very strong support in the poll and in the call last week. Thanks, Lisa, for clarifying that.

So that then brings us to another important task. Okay, so we've reached a tentative conclusion that technical services, as defined last week and reiterated this week in the first bullet on the previous slide, are a legitimate reason for collecting some data elements for that purpose. So now we get to the sticky question, okay, which data elements should be collected for that purpose, the technical services purpose.

And we've broken it down on the slide into categories, so - and just to facilitate going through them, the - what - the first area is technical contacts. Which technical contact information should be collected for this purpose? And I'll try and guide the discussion somewhat so that we don't just take it bit by bit but I'm going to start off leaving it fairly open for discussion. And if you look ahead to the next slide, you'll see a list of currently collected data elements, okay, you can see domain name, and registrant information, admin, technical, the next to last group there is the technical contacts. So feel free to refer to that if you need to.

But which - in fact you may want to just focus on Slide 7 and those technical contacts there and I'll open it up for discussion. Which if any of those technical contacts do you think should be collected for the purpose of technical issue resolution as we've defined it? And Lisa, go ahead and jump in.

Lisa Phifer: Sorry, Chuck, that was an old hand.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay, thanks. Marc, go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. It's Marc Anderson for the record. I just want to put out a plea here that we try not to let our notion of what we're used to in a Whois response sort of cloud you know, sort of this potential blank slate approach we can take. You know, so, you know, we all know what the existing Whois records look like but, you know, I think we should try not to use that as a starting point.

And I actually like the way, you know, Review Team 1 approached this, rather than enumerate, you know, sort of existing Whois records, they went more generic. You know, they said, you know, technical contact, registrant contacts, you know, whatever those fields may be, information about name servers, information about server status, information about expiry data. You know, I don't want us to use the existing Whois records as our starting point. I think we should look at what is the data that is needed to meet this purpose and to fill it out from there. So I guess that's just sort of my plea to, you know, not let our, you know, not let our views of what has been cloud what could be.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Marc. This is Chuck. And totally agree with you, the intent of showing these is not to use it as a starting point but just to facilitate discussion. And of course the data elements are not limited to what we see here either. But are there any - at some point because one of our questions is to define data elements, right, in the RDS - at some point we're going to have

get very specific. Does not have to be, like you said, the ones that we collect now.

And it can be some new ones. It could be none of these. But we have decided that collecting some information with regard to fulfill the purpose of technical issues is legitimate. So we're going to have to define the technical - the data elements - they don't have to be technical data elements - the data elements to fulfill this purpose. So - but thanks for clarifying that. Jim, go ahead.

Jim Galvin:    Thanks, Chuck. Jim Galvin for the record. First a clarification. It shouldn't say "server status" it should say "domain name status" because, you know, it's not about a server, it's about what the registry thinks about the name is to, you know, delegated to deleted or pending delete or something like that and various other things that might be present.

And then I'll speak, you know, for myself here since I already identified myself as being part of the design team. I think that it should say "technical contact information," both whoever and whatever that might be so, you know, when you get into specifics it's like whatever is associated with technical contact. I would prefer to see registrant contact as subordinate to technical contact in the sense that if a technical contact exists that's what you offer, if it doesn't, you fall back on the registrant and that's the way that you do it.

Again, not presupposing that things will work the way that they do today in Whois in that all contact elements are always all shown so the generic definition so technical contacts, name servers, domain name status and expiry data and then a registrant as a fallback contact if technical contacts are not available. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes:    Thanks, Jim. This is Chuck. So you would not suggest making technical contact information a requirement, but an option. And if it's not provided it would fall back to the registrar contact information? Is that correct?

Jim Galvin:       No, not quite, Chuck. The data elements to be provided includes technical contact information so whatever contact information is available for the technical contact and the other elements and the name servers and domain status and expiry, if technical contact information is not available because one was not specified, then you would provide the registrant contact information as a fallback to always provide it.

Chuck Gomes:      Okay. And this is Chuck again. And what I was trying to clarify, it's up to us, we can make recommendations that technical contact information does have to be supplied, and you're kind of leaving the door open that if it's not - again, it's up to us to define what the requirements will be, but I think your point is well taken. And you give us a very good start.

                  And when you say "technical contact information" that's something we'll probably have to define in more detail, I mean, does - what does it include, a physical address, an email address, phone number, whatever, but we can deal with that later. I think you've given us a really good start that information whatever we define that to be as well as the name servers and the expiry dates. Did I get all the elements?

Jim Galvin:       And the domain name status.

Chuck Gomes:      Yes, domain name status, correct. Okay, thank you. Let's go to Marc.

Marc Anderson:    Thanks, Chuck. Marc Anderson again. You know, I like what Jim said. I want to expand on it a little bit and just remind everybody of the conversations that we had in the past about role-based contacts. So instead of today where we have registrant admin tech and sometimes billing contacts all as required, you have a domain name contact, a, you know, so the authorized contact point for the domain name registration. And that person has the option of defining additional roles.

And if, you know, that registrant wants to assign somebody else for purposes of technical contact, they can set up a separate role. But if they don't assign somebody separate then sort of that registrant, that main contact assumes that role as well. You know, I'm a proponent of that roles-based approach, I think that was one of the, you know, the EWG recommendations. And so I think that plays I well to what Jim was suggesting is, you know, when technical contact is available you know, a.k.a, the technical contact role, then you have the option of contacting that person or entity, as Jim pointed out, otherwise you fall back on the registrant as your contact point.

You know, so, you know, again just a reminder of that role-based conversation we've had in the past. And then I'll throw out one other sort of separate point or comment. I think there's probably a reason to include the registrar in technical issue resolution. You know, I can imagine use cases where you know, knowing who the registrar is would be useful for technical issue resolution. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes:     Yes, and thanks, Marc. And this is Chuck. And I'm looking here, we don't have - do we have registrar contact information? Am I overlooking it on this slide? I don't think so. But anyway thank you for that, okay, that's good. Let's go to Kal.

Kal Feher:     Thanks. Kal Feher for the record. I wanted to I guess agree with Marc that we're in the context of technical resolution, the contact will always be the technical contact whether that's the label they've chosen to apply to themselves or not so to opt for the role-based allocation to context that would seem to fit. You're never communicating with someone from the domain name in the context of a technical resolution or for any other purpose, and if you are then it doesn't fit into this particular purpose.

The other thing I wanted to point out was that although you might have technical problems as a result of lifecycle milestones, I would list things here only specific to people that are trying to resolve technical challenges outside

of those because communicating lifecycle milestones is up to the (unintelligible) typically and they may have other methods of communicating with the registrant and technical contact. So for example, the interruption that they might take to a domain name resolution at the period of expiry will cause technical problems and people will potentially try and resolve those through Whois.

But I don't think there is a reason to communicate with the registrant to tell them that their domain name is about to expire separate to the communications that a registrant already send.

Chuck Gomes:    So, Kal, this is Chuck. Are you agreeing with Jim that the expiry dates - I think Jim said expiry date - should be included?

Kal Feher:    Yes, I think the...

((Crosstalk))

Kal Feher:    ...expiry date should be included. I was just trying to clarify that the fact that those expiry dates might have occurred we're not expecting the public to communicate with a registrant and say hey, your domain name is expired.

Chuck Gomes:    Yes, okay.

Kal Feher:    We're assuming that that's part of the registrar's responsibility. It's still published though, the data is certainly useful information.

Chuck Gomes:    Thanks. Thanks, Kal. And keep in mind too, we'll talk later about whether any, you know, what kind of access would be given for any data elements that we think should be collected for this purpose, okay, we'll come back to that later whether it's - becomes public or gated or whatever, we'll get there as well so just want to remind everybody of that. Let's go to Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi:    Thanks, Chuck. This is Susan Kawaguchi for the record. So I just wanted to clarify on the domain status, we did sort of discuss the fact that server status was probably not the right description last week. But then Jim, I'm not sure in Jim's explanation whether or not he was using that broader than just domain status as you see on this Whois record and, you know, there are actually two other server statuses that could be a possibility there too. But would that also include like the updated date or if there was a hold on the domain, those type of statuses too? So little more broad than just domain status as we see in the record that we're looking at.

Chuck Gomes:    And keep in mind, this is Chuck, that domain status - the example given is server update prohibited, so that's not necessarily a server status there, that is a domain status I think if I'm stating that accurately. And I'd like Jim to respond to Susan's question there. But before I give it back to Jim, I'd like to request that in the notes we list - make a list of all of the data elements, even in their broader term like technical contact information, be listed in one place in the notes so we can kind of see all together the suggestions that have been made so far, even if only one person has supported those.

We'll come back later and drill down in terms of how much support there is for all of them. But if we could kind of keep in one place in the notes a list of all of them that have been suggested and we'll let the people on the call make sure that we have a complete list so far. So, Jim, would you like to respond to Susan's question?

Jim Galvin:    Thanks, Chuck. Jim Galvin for the record. No, domain status is what we meant and just the status that's there. I appreciate that the example shows server update prohibited, but that's a status reference not related to, you know, the updated date.

The updated date and creation date are interesting dates that are known and are mostly present, but the only date information that we had discussed and agreed to for technical issue resolution was the expiry date was the important

reference, and there were some examples given for why that would be a useful thing to have when trying to do technical issue resolution but we could not find any examples of when an updated create date would be there so just expiry date and just the domain status as shown there, domain status is a known reference, a known element in terms of EPP transactions. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes:     Thanks, Jim. Susan, did that answer your question? And if you want to follow up further, that would be fine.

Susan Kawaguchi:     Yes, it did answer my question and I was starting to type this into the chat. But so then what we need to do - there's actually three domain statuses for server, you know, and I just refer to the server status as the registry status but that's probably not technically correct. So there's three server statuses, server delete prohibited, server transfer prohibited and server updated prohibited so we should capture those in our notes.

Jim Galvin:     Not quite.

Chuck Gomes:     Go ahead, Jim.

Jim Galvin:     Yes, not quite. Domain status is the appropriate reference and that may or may not be a client status or a server status. And there are delete, renew, transfer, update statuses on both the client and the server side. So, no, the appropriate reference, which is a known quantity in EPP transactions is domain status. And it just incorporates all of them by reference.

Chuck Gomes:     Yes and - go ahead, Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi:     I think just for clarification and people - and for those that are not as familiar, that we should define domain status and provide all the details on the - on all of the statuses that could be under domain status. You know...

Jim Galvin:     Sure.

Susan Kawaguchi: Because...

Jim Galvin: I mean, I agree with that. We can go find the RFC which defines what they currently are but I think for...

Susan Kawaguchi: yes.

Jim Galvin: ...purposes of discussion now, domain status is sufficient but, yes, I agree with you, ultimately we need to lay out all the details. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, thanks. This is Chuck. Thanks to both of you. And for everybody's understanding, and I'm - I probably don't even need to say this, the - what we're looking at here is an example. The particular example given, which is an artificial example, example.tld, they're showing four of the possible domain statuses. There are other possible statuses as Jim pointed out. So don't focus so much on what the status is in this example, as the category domain status. Okay?

For any particular domain registration, and somebody correct me if I misstate this, but for any particular domain status, for a given domain name, it will list each of the statuses that exist at the present time for that domain name. This example shows four that could exist simultaneously. So okay? Thanks for that discussion. Notice in the notes what we have so far, technical contacts, whoever or whatever they may be, registrant contact information, name servers, server status, now what is meant by server - is server status the right term there?

And then expiry date and sponsoring registrar. What is meant in the notes there by - oh okay, so the clarification - I think probably we should put domain status instead of server status. That's clarified in the first bullet under that so that is stated, but I think it would be better to call it domain status instead of server status unless somebody thinks I'm wrong on that. Okay I should

update myself in the chat. Jim, you said the same thing I said, thanks for reinforcing that. So thanks for that parenthetical, that's helpful.

Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Chuck. Michele for the record. Would it help if we just said "EPP status" or is that unhelpful?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. This is Chuck. And I think of course we can decide whichever way we want to do it. Or maybe we put in brackets after the domain status title, EPP status, do you think that would help? Jim, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: Yes, Jim Galvin for the record. No, not EPP status because now you're talking about the EPP protocol itself and it has many more status codes than domain statuses. The correct term is domain status. That's the correct reference. And that's what we need to detail. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: You okay with that, Michele?

Michele Neylon: Not sure, I was just asking, I don't care one way or the other.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks. That's good. Just want to make sure we're all on the same page as much as we can be. Okay, so let's look at that list that's in the notes there, it's in the bottom part of the notes if you're not down there. Starts off with technical contacts. So what's been suggested so far is that domain name elements associated with those - what is it, six categories, be collected for the purpose of technical issues, the purpose that we've agreed to so far.

Does anybody disagree with any of those, understanding that some of them eventually will have to be defined in more detail as to - with regard to specific data elements. But we can take care of that later, whether it's useful to do that today or later we can decide. But does anybody disagree with the

collection of those categories of contact information or status information for the technical purpose?

Does anyone want to add any other categories? Do you think we've got enough? Now we're going to have to eventually deal with the data minimization principle, which came up I think last week, maybe the week before too, and so we need to keep that in mind and not just throw everything into the pot recklessly.

At the same time it's probably going to be easier to deal with the data minimization principle once we get a set of data elements and we begin to see now do we really need all of these? Could it be minimized? And part of that will depend on probably what access is given as well, but so certainly keep that principle in mind but I think it'll be easier to come back and deal with that once we have a set of data elements that we think should be collected. And of course it'll come up again when we talk about access. Susan, go ahead.

Susan Kawaguchi:     So I'm just, in your question of, you know, looking at those notes and do we agree with that, so we haven't really discussed the - what are the data elements associated with the technical contact or the registrant contact. So until we discuss the actual data elements, you know, I couldn't say whether I agree or disagree.

Chuck Gomes:     But - and point well taken, that's what I was getting at. And we can decide in this meeting whether we want to dig down and talk about the specific elements or postpone that, I'm comfortable either way. But you may be right, maybe it's really hard to answer the question until we do that. But in general, Susan, realizing that we have to take that step that you just mentioned, do you disagree with any of those assuming the right data elements are included or not included?

Susan Kawaguchi:    No, I agree with that as, you know, the list right now as long as we discuss the data elements associated with those two roles.

Chuck Gomes:    Thank you. Anybody else have a comment on this high level list that doesn't specify the data elements except in some cases like for example the name servers and the domain status are pretty well defined, but when we're talking about technical contacts and registrant contacts it's a little bit different. And sponsoring registrar gets into some more detail.

Okay, now anybody opposed to digging down a little bit further on the contact ones and talking about which data elements should be collected for this purpose? Anybody opposed to that or anybody want to suggest that we postpone that? I think Susan's right, to fully answer the question of whether or not these categories of information should be collected, we're going to have to define specifically what falls in the category. So I think we have to get there at some point. Is there any reason not to do that now? Okay.

Then let's take a look at technical contacts. And again, don't restrict yourself like Marc said, to what's displayed there, don't think that we have to include all that. My guess is we probably won't include all of those things. But which - what specific data elements should be included under technical contacts? Anybody want to start it off? Jim, go ahead.

Jim Galvin:    Thanks, Chuck. Jim Galvin for the record. So I'll propose something for discussion purposes here. I think that something along the lines of at least one mechanism, one method of contact including postal address information. So that's intended to say that either a phone number or an email address or a fax number or anything else that we might come up with but explicitly not postal information, thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: So thanks, Jim. I'm going to follow up because I want to make sure I heard you correctly, I don't want to misstate anything. So you wouldn't require postal address - collecting postal address, is that correct? Or you would?

Jim Galvin: I would note. That's correct.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, good. I just want to make sure I got it right. But there needs to be at least one contact method, is that - so in other words, that could be email, it could be phone, could it be postal address, the one contact method?

Jim Galvin: So I'm implicitly also suggesting a policy that would go with this, which is to say that there must be a method not including postal address for accessing or contacting a technical person.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. That's clear. Thank you. Marc.

Marc Anderson: Thanks. Marc Anderson for the record. I liked Jim's suggestion, you know, again something we've talked about before. The key, you know, in my mind is contactability. There must be, you know, information necessary to contact somebody associated with the technical role for this domain name registration. And you know, I also agree, you know, I - with Jim's point about, you know, postal info, you know, I think the use cases we've heard, sending somebody a letter via, you know, postal service just isn't going to be sufficient, it needs to be something you know, much more real time such as email or a phone. So, yes, I agree with Jim's suggestion, I think that's a good starting point for, you know, for the technical role.

Chuck Gomes: Now this is - thanks, Marc. This is Chuck again. So going back to our minimum public data set, and I know we're not talking about that now, okay, but the reason I'm going back there is when we we're doing that kind of work and so forth, we said there had to be at least one email contact that was an agreement we reached. Should we require - and I'm not advocating for this I'm just trying to generate thought and discussion - should we require a

technical email contact or is Jim's suggestion that as long as there's one, I'll call it a timely method of contact, is that sufficient?

Marc, is that a new hand?

Marc Anderson: Technically no, but I don't mind jumping in here.

Chuck Gomes: Good, go ahead.

Marc Anderson: I don't think it's necessary to require a separate technical contact information. I think if phone is your preferred technical contact mechanism, I think that's sufficient here. And I think if you don't provide it we already have the requirement, as you pointed out, that an email must be associated with the domain name registration essentially. So, you know, so there is an email address already associated with this domain name registration that's available. You know, I think you know, I think we would want to have the option that a separate technical email address could be provided but I don't think it's necessary to make it required.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marc. And notice Benny's comment in the chat that it doesn't need a person's name. And that may be something we want to - when we start developing - well even when we're doing requirements but even more so maybe when we get to developing policy, we may want to consider developing policies where we discourage use of personal contact information unless the person's willing to allow access to that. But we can get to that later, but good point, Benny.

Excuse me. So let's go to Jim. Go ahead.

Jim Galvin: Thanks, Chuck. Jim Galvin for the record. I want to highlight Lisa's reminding us in the chat about working agreement Number 32, right, at a minimum one or more email addresses must be collected for every domain name in the RDS for contact roles require an email address for contactability. So it's that

last phrase that require an email address for contactability. I want to carefully restate what I was proposing for elements here which, you know, implicitly has an effect on that Working Group Guidelines Number 32. I simply said that there must be displayed - well with respect to technical contact, there must be a method of contact not including postal address present.

And in fact, I was explicitly not saying that it should be an email address, and I was not saying that it should be a phone number. I think that my personal you know, going a step further than where this discussion is at the moment, is that the implied policy here is that the tech contact whoever or whatever that might be, would simply provide you with the most relevant and appropriate contact point for their point of view.

So, you know, I think that's consistent here with what Working Group Agreement 32 is but we've been batting around this idea that it has to be an email address and I want to be just clear about at least my position here that there needs to be a contact method not including postal address. And implicit in that is the tech contact picks the one that they want you to have or there might be other policies that bear on them, but that's not under discussion here. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes:    Thanks, Jim. This is Chuck again. And I don't think that contradicts Agreement 32 at all, 32 just says there has to be an email contact in there and what you're saying, it doesn't have to be the tech contact that has an email address, that could be a registrant email, it could be admin email, so I don't think there's any contradiction there.

Okay, Susan, go ahead.

Susan Kawaguchi:    So just adding onto what Jim was saying, so can we jump to the conclusion then that if the tech contact, you know, if we take that thinking down the line and decide that we all decide that the tech contact can decide how they want to be contacted, which could be, you know, so providing very

limited information in the RDS available for a technical resolution issue, would we be advocating for verifying that that method of contact is actually valid and accurate for that technical person or technical contact.

Chuck Gomes: And thanks, Susan. And I think - this is Chuck again. And I think that as we move further and further down the line, and especially when we get into implementation of the requirements in particular the policies that are developed in Phase 2, we're probably going to have to consider ways to ensure that the contactability really works, but that's something I think we can deal with later. But I don't want to minimize your point. If somebody provides a - they just provide one contact method of their choice and it doesn't work, we've got a problem. And so I think that's something we can deal with ultimately in the implementation of the policies that we create.

So if we create - recommend a policy that there has to be one form of contact that's not postal address for a technical contact, when we get to the implementation of that policy we're going to have to recommend ways that what happens if that doesn't work, because that's going to be a flaw. But we can deal with that and your point is well taken. Maxim, go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. From our registrar, yes, side, we had issues with just in response to Susan with the fact that positive identification of a person's contact in - on one doesn't mean that it's going to be the same like in a week or in a month because formerly - currently users are not prohibited from using the same email number if they can be contacted on the verification stage.

And we saw something like people are using the same cell phone, just giving it to the next one for identification. So and we're not tracking what the person does with his email or his phone or her phone, and that's, I think it's just a formal idea of having a working phone at the stage of registration or update because we cannot verify it on other stages instantly. So there is no point to

think that we have valid contact information. We can check it on update and on collection, that's it.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Maxim. Chuck again. But there's no reason why the working group cannot make it a requirement and ultimately build it into policy and the implementation of that policy that this technical contact information must be current, must be updated. Now, we can get into enforcement and everything else there, but we can deal with that later. Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Chuck, thanks. Michele for the record. I would be very, very, very wary about creating a policy mandating that any contact needs to be current. It's just - I don't - how do you actually enforce that? That's - look, at the moment there are certain - trying to think - there's so many instances where people just want to get a domain name in order to be able to set up an online presence, an email address, a whatever, a Web thing. Expecting them to really understand the - any of these concepts around contactability is realistically - it's a bridge way, way, way too far. And I don't want this to end up in a situation where we're looking after it later because by then it will be too late. We don't - I just don't want us going down that route. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: So, Michele, this is Chuck. I want to follow up with you on that because I understand what you're saying that a lot of people may not understand fully and so forth but if technical issue resolution is a legitimate purpose, and we need to get a hold of someone, doesn't seem unreasonable to me to require them to keep their - that technical contact information updated.

Now agree with you that may be hard to enforce with some people, but that doesn't make it an invalid requirement.

Michele Neylon: Chuck, thanks. Okay, if you want to talk about a second at an academic and purely abstract level, what you're saying is completely reasonable. The reality is, as a hosting provider and as a registrar, I can assure you that 90 plus percent of my clients don't care. And trying to force something like that on

them means that they will stop using domain names that have that requirement.

I mean, bear in mind that ICANN policies only cover gTLDs, they do not cover ccTLDs. So if you end up in a situation where you're requiring people to jump through hoops in order to register and maintain domain names they're going to use an alternative that will actually work for them. So like in Ireland for the last 20 years, the dotIE ccTLDs has been very awkward to deal with so the - a larger number of people register dotCom domains. Now if you end up in a situation where five years down the road dotCom domain names are harder to register, people will just stop using them.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. Point's taken. Jim, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: Thank you, Chuck. Jim Galvin for the record. I want to draw what I hope is a helpful distinction here. There is a distinction between telling the registrar that they have to make sure that the contact information works and instead having a terms of service, if you will, that says that you the registrant are obligated to make sure your technical contact information works. And oh by the way, if you fail to do that then, you know, if we ever need that information and it doesn't work, the risk to you is that you lose the domain name.

And I think you know, that distinction between who's accountable, whether it's the registrar or the registrant, is important in this discussion. And I think putting the burden on the registrant would obviously be the way to go, but I'm guessing that's a discussion for another day. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, and thanks, Jim. And as Lisa points out in the chat, what I think is our fifth charter question is on data accuracy, excuse me, and we will get there and this will come up there. And so forth, but Michele's points are important ones to understand. Maxim makes an interesting point as well. And like Jim said, we can have it in the terms of reference, deciding how to police that and

how to ensure accuracy is a subject for another time and we will get to that so thank you.

Let - if it's okay, let's jump ahead to registrant contacts. Would they - would the contact information for registrants follow the same pattern? I guess I can ask Jim. Jim, would you recommend the same approach for registrant contact information giving them the choice of a contact method and would the other elements that we talked about for technical contacts apply for registrant contacts in the same way?

Jim Galvin:   So Jim Galvin for the record. Yes, thanks, Chuck. I'm going to resist, you know, having a firm position here on registrant information in general. I mean, unless - you know, there's a question of what's important for a domain name and, you know, right now we're talking about a particular purpose in mind. So, you know, data needs to be collected for technical issue resolution. This is the data that I need. If you want to be talking about a different purpose, you know, if I have to have registrant information, you know, I think I need to collect registrant information for the business purpose of having a domain name.

You know, that's a separate discussion. I'm going to resist having a position at the moment if you don't mind. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes:   No, no that's okay, Jim. This is Chuck. I'm just - but we do have registrant contact information as something that should be collected for this purpose, the technical resolution purpose. If we're going to have that, what data elements would be included? And it's okay for you to pass on that but does somebody have a suggestion?

Jim Galvin:   Okay.

Chuck Gomes:   Go ahead.

Jim Galvin:        Yes, I'm sorry, Chuck. And I misunderstood your question. So, yes, and I'll answer your question. The rules that apply for technical resolution you know, the idea here is that you need to have contact information and I would say that you know, what we want to say is that there should be a role, a technical contact role that should be present if you agree that technical contact - technical resolution - technical issue resolution is important and so what we had said earlier is there should be technical contact information.

And the way I had phrased it earlier is if there is no technical contact information present, so implicit in that is perhaps a policy that says you may not provide all of these - this role-based contact information. All that really means if you don't provide it is that you will instead inherit whatever is present in the registrant information. So that's the long winded way of saying yes to you, Chuck. If technical contact information is not present, then the implicit policy is your registrant information then has to get inherited into that particular spot because you need to have technical contact information and therefore you had better have a method of contact not including your postal address available to be - to serve in that role. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes:       Thanks, Jim. And is that - that's being captured in the notes right now. And if anybody thinks that's not sufficient, so in other words, if you don't have the technical contact information then registrant contact information needs to be supplied to fill that need. Hope I said that right. So, Maxim, go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba:      Maxim Alzoba for the record. Actually reading lots of current spam messages, which say okay, we're contacting you because we failed to contact the administrator. I think is going to be the next, yes, thing to do when we issue such policy. My personal thinking is that getting, yes, making information available to the registrant that if you do not - are not sure who's in your tech contact please be aware that when technical issue arise and it's not resolvable by contacting the tech contact, most probably you will have to deal with the consequences, lose your name due to some technical issues, etcetera.

Because I think we will see the rise of spam messages saying, yes, official messages saying, yes, we're contacting you because your technical contact was not available, please give us this and that. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: So, Maxim, this is Chuck. Am I understanding you correctly that you're okay with the formulation that's in the notes there if the tech contact role is not supplied, registrant contact information would be required to fill that need for this purpose. Is that right? You're okay with that formulation?

Maxim Alzoba: I'm not sure but more yes than no.

Chuck Gomes: I didn't - say that again, please.

Maxim Alzoba: I'm not sure now but I think it's more yes than no.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thank you. Marc, go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. It's Marc Anderson. You know, I guess first thing I want to reference, you know, Lisa put in chat - you may have to scroll up a little bit, but it was working group agreement 36, and I'm scrolling up to it myself. On purpose based contacts, you know, so purpose based contacts such admin, legal, technical, just be supported by the RDS but optional for registrants to provide. You know, so, you know, so the discussion was, you know, the discussion is sort of implicit that, you know, there is a registrant contact of some sort, right?

Agreement 36 doesn't work if there isn't a registrant contact. And, you know, having the purpose-based contact idea is if the registrant wants to delegate somebody else for technical contacts, and if I remember correctly we also had a working group agreement that we have to provide definitions for each of those, you know, purpose-based roles. So we would know, you know, so

we would have a definition on when exactly a technical contact would be used.

But, you know, going back to, you know, the question, you know, is, you know, is it necessary, you know, I think a registrant is sort of the default. That's going to be - we're going to have a registrant contact mechanism of some sort for all domain names and then the option of providing a technical contact role, you know, a purpose-based contact mechanism, you know, if the domain name registrant wants the ability to delegate, you know, technical contact to, you know, to another entity of some sort.

So you know, I guess that made sense in my head before I opened my mouth. But I think it's getting late because I'm not sure that came out quite right.

Chuck Gomes: It's really late for you, I know, thanks. This is Chuck. So let's go to - so let's quickly go to sponsoring registrar and see if we can just talk briefly before we end this meeting on what would - what specific data elements would be required for this technical purpose for collection in the - in our, you know, delineation of the specific data elements for sponsoring registrar. Anybody want to kick that one off?

Go ahead, Jim. You've been a great asset tonight, thanks.

Jim Galvin: Yes, so Jim Galvin for the record again. Thanks, Chuck. Why not? Let's kick things off here. You know, there' really only two interesting elements, the IANA ID, you know, or the name and there really is just no reason not to have both. You know, why make someone have to do the lookup? I mean, the IANA ID is obviously sort of the obvious index thing that one should have to do. But I don't see any reason to exclude the name too, otherwise you just make somebody go look it up. So there you go. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jim. Michele.

Michele Neylon:   Thanks. No I totally agree. I mean, I would go so far as to say, I mean, while the IANA ID could be useful for people who know what an IANA ID, the actual name and a link to the registrar's Website is useful and, you know, ultimately if you want to get - if you want to resolve a lot of issues knowing who the registrar is is helpful and, you know, can help you to get something done. Knowing who the registrant is, might not be particularly useful.

Chuck Gomes:   Thanks, Michele. So you would add to what Jim said, the link to the registrar's Website as well, is that correct?

Michele Neylon:   Yes, and I'll explain to you the rationale is that some registrar entities, if you look at the IANA list, have kind of mumbo-jumbo crazy names that, you know, don't bear any relation to reality, whereas, you know, 250 accreditations all actually end up pointing to, you know, whateverthehell.com.

It's like adding - having a link so somebody can click on the link and go, right, oh so that's who that is, rather than telling me mumbojumbo.com registrar LLC, blah, blah, blah, which is meaningless. Whereas if you said to me well actually Mumbojumbo is, you know, a trading name of, you know, Blacknight or Go Daddy or whoever. Anyway just the link, as I say, it's just - it's simpler, it's easier, I don't have to jump through hoops, I don't have to...

Chuck Gomes:   Yes.

Michele Neylon:   ...you know, hurt small animals to get a simple bit of information that I should be able to get. Any - look, as registrars our information is public, there's no issue with making it public, anybody who thinks there's an issue with making it public really should consider not being in business.

Chuck Gomes:   Thanks, Michele. And keep in mind we'll come back later and talk about what type of access, whether it be public or gated or whatever for each of these data elements, but for right now there seems to be support for collecting this

information to the extent that - keep in mind that sometimes it's not collected, sometimes it's automatic, I think we all know that by now. We've been over that many times.

Let's go to Maxim. Okay, hand went down.

Maxim Alzoba: It wasn't...

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: I'm sorry, it was an old hand.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thank you, Maxim. So now we have a list of data elements for these categories. Does anybody disagree with any of those being collected for the purpose of the technical reason that we're talking about tonight? No objections to that. And so okay very good. So we will poll on this list. It's going to be a longer poll in the sense that we've got a big list here, but I don't think necessarily complicated. We'll ask people I'm sure although we haven't designed the poll yet, to identify any they disagree with or any that are left out.

But we - I think we made really good progress here on this and we will test it in a poll this week so watch for that. And those - I hope those on the call will participate and of course we want people who weren't on the call to chime in as well so that we hopefully can reach another tentative working group agreement on the data elements to be collected for this purpose under these categories.

So is there - any other discussion on these data elements for this particular - collecting these for this purpose? Okay. Go ahead, Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. We have expiry date currently actually have an expiry date and time. And as I see expiry date is useful for the registrant so

she doesn't forget to pay on time, but expiry time, it's something really useful for registrar and registry. I'm not sure it needs to be published because what we see now is registrar - registry that the closer time to the expiry time the more requests we have for that particular name. I'm not sure if we need to also registrant to publish the full...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Keep in mind we're not talking about whether we publish it yet or not, but you're okay with expiry date, is that correct?

Maxim Alzoba: Yes, expiry date for publishing and for collection obviously we need the time stamp.

Chuck Gomes: We're just talking about collection.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: We're just talking about collection now.

Maxim Alzoba: Oh collection...

((Crosstalk))

Maxim Alzoba: Yes, now for collection it should be full.

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry, you cut off there, for collection it should be what?

Maxim Alzoba: For collection it should be full time stamp with all the seconds and parts of seconds.

Chuck Gomes: So for collection it should be expiry date and time?

Maxim Alzoba:     Yes.

Chuck Gomes:     Okay, does anybody disagree with that? Okay so we'll add date and time. Thanks for that. Okay, we're within a few minutes of our adjournment time. Let's quickly go over the action items. And they're in the notes, the poll, okay. Please watch for that. We'll try and get it out quickly. Now it's a little later in the week than it normally is so you have just a little bit less time to complete it but at least for those on the call it should be - should be fairly easy to respond to the poll. So please do. And hopefully others will listen to the recording or look at the transcript and join us so that we, next week, our meeting will be at our regular time next Tuesday, so we will do that.

Is there anything else we need to cover on this call? Okay. All right so let's go ahead then and let me say thanks to the great contributions on this call. Those that were active and verbal as well as the rest of you for participating and I'm assuming that you would have expressed disagreement if you had any. So I think this has been very productive. And we made some good progress tonight. Hopefully the poll will reinforce that or at least identify any things that need further work by our working group.

That said, let me adjourn the meeting and the recording can stop. Thanks a lot, everyone. And certainly feel free to participate on our list as we continue discussing these issues. Meeting adjourned.

Nathalie Peregrine:     Thank you very much, everybody. You may now disconnect your lines. This meeting is over. Operator, please stop the recordings and have a great remainder of your day. Bye-bye.


END