

RDS Attendance and AC chat – 20 December 2017 at 06:00 UTC

Attendance on the call

Alex Deacon	Lisa Phifer
Andrew Sullivan	Mason Cole
Benjamin Akinmoyeje Nigeria	Maxim Alzoba (FAITID)
Benny Samuelson / Nordreg AB	Michele Neylon
Chuck Gomes	Nathalie Peregrine
Daniel K. Nanghaka	Rod Rasmussen
David Cake	Stephanie Perrin
Fabien Betremieux	Susan Kawaguchi
GZ Kabir	Tim Chen
Kal Feher	Tim O'Brien
Krishna Seeburn - Kris	Tomslin Samme-Nlar

On audio only: Greg Mounier

Apologies: Rubens Kuhl, Greg Aaron, Steven Metalitz, Alan Greenberg, Marc Anderson, Andrew Sullivan, Griffin Barnett, Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong, Greg Shatan, Marika Konings (staff), James Galvin, Sam Lanfranco, Tapani Tarvainen

Staff: Lisa Pfifer, Nathalie Peregrine

AC Chat

Nathalie Peregrine: Dear all, welcome to the GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group teleconference on Wednesday 20 December 2017 at 06:00 UTC

Nathalie Peregrine: Meeting agenda page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_NQByB&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=PDd_FX3f4M_VgkEli9GHvVoUhbcevsLhgsyXrxgtbL10DTBs0i1jYiBM_uTSDzggG&m=Cw6YtDoFwbuE-pjGDnkXHXqY05CBvojRe3lh6mv8Hso&s=i3Eype_Fpo2HJxRum2xHWiGbilFzqvn4jMRYJ8fNJGQ&e=

Chuck Gomes: Hello

Alex Deacon: hi chuck

Chuck Gomes: Let's wait two more minutes to start the call to allow a few more to join

Krishna Seeburn - Kris: hi chuck and hi all

Lisa Phifer: Call Handout: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_download_attachments_74580021_Handout-2D20Dec-2DRDSWGCAll.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=PDd_FX3f4MVgkEli9GHvVoUhbcevsLhgsyXrxgtbL10DTBs0i1jYiBM_uTSDzggG&m=Cw6YtDoFwbuE-pjGDnkXHXqY05CBvojRe3lh6mv8Hso&s=tmR26i6tgyu5g9eCz4_dsn9oBKa_p5J3-H7lg4zRTI8&e=

Lisa Phifer: 22 participants in this week's poll

Lisa Phifer: Chuck is referring to WG Agreement 44. There is no requirement for the Original Registration Date as proposed by the EWG Final Report.

Tim O'Brien: understood; still sad & disappointed about that

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): Hello All

Lisa Phifer: Slide 4 provides an overview of poll results; slide 5 provides comments given in poll results

Andrew Sullivan: OCD is a zombie idea that won't die. but it won't work for reasons we already discussed

Andrew Sullivan: seed

Andrew Sullivan: wow. Adobe connect is even worse on Android!

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): @Andrew at least it works :) and quite good in transit / car

Lisa Phifer: We are now moving to slide 6

Tim O'Brien: I would ask that we include them

Lisa Phifer: @Tim, can you please provide rationale for including them

GZ Kabir: Agreed @Daniel

Lisa Phifer:Chuck, can we get rationale for inclusion?

Tim O'Brien:sure: there have been a few occasions where other contacts have failed/were dead - gave an opportunity to get a real live person to resolve the problem at hand

Tomlin Samme-Nlar:I don't think it is a must have

Kal Feher:convenient yes, required no

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Do we have any processes requiring sending info to registrant via ground mail? (for Domain Management Purposes)

Lisa Phifer:if you agree registrant postal address is needed for DN transfer, put green check in AC

Alex Deacon:to be clear - we are talking about Registrant Postal Address, right?

Andrew Sullivan:I don't care about this, but I think Maxim's argument is Angkor

Andrew Sullivan:angood

Andrew Sullivan:a good one

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):without it persons without fax /email on hand will be out of the process of domain name transfer (and it might be a role for Admin contact, in case there is one)

Lisa Phifer:@Andrew, a bit faint but I can hear you

Lisa Phifer>Note: At this point we are trying to agree on the data required for this purpose, not the data that might be collected for other purposes or optional to collect

Lisa Phifer:There are certainly fields in Admin Contact today that may or may not be populated

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):in Transfer Policy "The registrar may use additional contact information on file when obtaining confirmation from the Prior Registrant and is not limited to the publicly accessible Whois." ... though it does not mean that the data needs to be in the RDS, on the other hand

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):in footnotes : https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_resources_pages_transfer-2Dpolicy-2D2016-2D06-2D01-2Den&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=PDd_FX3f4MVgkEli9GHvVoUhbecsvLhgsyXrxtbL10DTBs0i1jYiBM_uTSDzggG&m=Cw6YtDoFwbuE-pjGDnkXHXqY05CBvojRe3lh6mv8Hso&s=efGa64Y_hjGaKefMAHsZTWFLfyOowxW9yMvcwGnZzIE&e=

Kal Feher:@andrew you could still have requirements based on roles, you simply don't allow non compliant contact objects to fulfill that role

Andrew Sullivan:You could do that, but it's a serious mismatch with the protocol

Kal Feher:no mismatch. policy based allocation is reasonably common in my experience

Lisa Phifer:Here's where we started: Registrant Postal Address (77%) and Phone (73%) are not included in above-proposed agreement, based on lack of support in poll - no rationale given for inclusion or exclusion in the poll

Daniel K. Nanghaka:Yes, I am able to see the slides

Kal Feher:that should be out of scope for RDS

Benny Samuelson / Nordreg AB:@Rod registrant are not equal to payer

Lisa Phifer:Data required to process payment is not included in WHOIS today (e.g., credit card numbers)

Lisa Phifer:It just happens that there is overlap between registrant contact data and data needed for some forms of payment

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):I think Registrant Address is collected the same time as the Admin contact Address, and if they are different, then Registrant Address is not required in RDS (it needed for Registrars and not for RDS)

Lisa Phifer:the address and phone associated with a form of payment may not be the registrant's address/phone at all
Michele Neylon:+1 Lisa

Michele Neylon:Mentioning payment seems to be causing confusion

Rod Rasmussen:Sorry about the confusion - just catching up here, and this points out that we should separate out "payment" from Domain Name Management perhaps since there are these clear differences.

Lisa Phifer:We are now on slide 7, moving to slide 8 for intro by DT3 of Domain Name Certification

Kal Feher:I think the key point to understand between EV, OV and standard certificates is that they all rely on section 3.2.2.4 of the baseline requirements to prove domain control.

Chuck Gomes:see slide 10

Kal Feher:CA's can use any one of 10 methods to prove control. all methods are equally acceptable. the first 4 listed on slide 10 use RDS, the remainder use alternative methods

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):would notary signed apostilled copy of a Registrant contract replace it?

Chuck Gomes:And slide 11

Kal Feher:David said it well

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):it means higher price of such validation though

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):the business of CA's is on the top of the WHOIS infrastucture , and needs to follow it

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):thanks for clarification

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):yes

Lisa Phifer:Moving to slide 12 now

Andrew Sullivan:not going to struggle to talk again, but I think the language is wrong

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):like bills from the postal office

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):as a proof of the company has something to do with that particular address

Andrew Sullivan:it seems this isn't a legit use to _require_ collection but is a legit use to collect, if the registrant wants to use that biz model @ CA

Alex Deacon:@maxim - many CA's use business registration databases (like D&B in the US and others globally) to authenticate and verify addresses. I guess the question is what are the CA rules when that data doesn't match similar data in the RDS. (I don't know the answer to that FWIW)

Lisa Phifer:@Andrew, we will deliberate use (access) requirements separately, and this may be a legit purpose for use

Andrew Sullivan:that's not my point

Lisa Phifer: Does anyone opposed Possible WG Agreement: Domain Name Certification is NOT a legitimate purpose for collecting registration data, but may be a legitimate purpose for using some data collected for other purposes. (Access requirements to be deliberated at a later stage.)

Kal Feher:@andrew hopefully that is what people understand our recommendation to be

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB:I will remind that using data for other purposes than collected for are a big problem GDPR wise...

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):It seems to be Administrative contact

Lisa Phifer:@Rod, I think AdminContact was the purpose-based contact for DN Cert in the EWG Report

Kal Feher:perhaps we should have WG agreements on optional elements. so far I've interpreted them as required or not.

Alex Deacon:security and stability for sure.

Lisa Phifer:@Benny, use for other purposes that are compatible is permitted by GDPR, yes?

Stephanie Perrin:How often would this feature be used by individuals, as opposed to corporations?

Alex Deacon:loud and clear andrew

Daniel K. Nanghaka:I will leave the meeting, going into another meeting

Kal Feher:need to drop off call. support optional fields. perhaps any poll derived from this could clarify if fields must be present or may be present based on registrant's choice.

Daniel K. Nanghaka:I wish you a Happy Festive Season

Daniel K. Nanghaka:Bye

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB:@Lisa My point is that we cant collect data just because it might be used for something else later. The collection must be for a purpose and only that which are given consent for

Stephanie Perrin:Thanks A ndrew, well put!

Lisa Phifer:"May be a legitimate purpose for using some data..." will be deliberated later

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB:+1 Andrew

Lisa Phifer:Revised Possible WG Agreement: Domain Name Certification is NOT a legitimate purpose for requiring collection of some registration data, but may be a legitimate purpose for using some data collected for other purposes. (Access requirements to be deliberated at a later stage.)

David Cake:That revision seems fine to me.

Rod Rasmussen:@Andrew +1 - Optional vs. Required purpose for collection is something we have to be defining all along the way on this process.

Lisa Phifer:In this pass we are focusing on required data, not optional data

Rod Rasmussen:@Lisa - true, but we keep confusing things in our discussions.

Lisa Phifer:Revised Possible WG Agreement: Domain Name Certification is NOT a legitimate purpose for requiring collection of some registration data, but may be a legitimate purpose for using some data collected for other purposes. (Access requirements to be deliberated at a later stage.)

Alex Deacon:OK - looks good to me...

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):prevention of abuse sounds better than domain abuse purpose :)

Tim O'Brien:can we ever prevent abuse?

Lisa Phifer:The purpose Chuck was referring to: Criminal Activity/ DNS Abuse – Investigation

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):it is endless

Stephanie Perrin:are we talking about prevention of abuse, or abuse mitigation?

Lisa Phifer:That's it

Benny Samuelson / Nordreg AB:Happy Holidays to all

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Happy Holidays!

Tomslin Samme-Nlar:Happy holidays!

Alex Deacon:see everyone in the new year!

Tim O'Brien:see you all next year!1

Stephanie Perrin:Happy holidays everybody!

David Cake:Thanks Chuck

Lisa Phifer:Happy holidays and a healthy New Year to all