

Steve Crocker: (3/10/2018 08:18) Good morning.

Caitlin Tubergen: (08:28) Good morning, and welcome to the the RDS PDP Working Group Meeting on 10 March 2018. My name is Caitlin Tubergen, and I will be the Remote Participation Manager for this meeting. As the Remote Participation Manager, I am the voice of the remote participants. If at any point during today's meeting, you would like a comment read aloud, please preface your comment or question with QUESTION or COMMENT, and I will read the question or comment aloud to the room.

Caitlin Tubergen: (08:28) Please find an agenda and additional materials for today's meeting here: <https://go.icann.org/2GgBm9f>.

Theo Geurts: (08:35) Is there a waterfall in the room? crackling noises on adobe

Caitlin Tubergen: (08:37) Thank you, Theo. We are looking into this for you.

Caitlin Tubergen: (08:37) Please find a link to today's presentation here: <https://go.icann.org/2GgBm9f>.

Caitlin Tubergen: (08:38) Please find a link to the DTs' consolidated output here: <https://go.icann.org/2twoNUB>.

Marika Konings: (08:41) @Theo - we decided to do this meeting from the beach so you may be hearing the waves ;-)

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB: (08:42) that explains the terrible sound

Theo Geurts: (08:43) Marika a wise choice! enjoy the beach :)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): (08:44) Hello All

Marika Konings: (08:44) Has the audio improved? We decided to move back into the windowless meeting room :-)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): (08:45) in the room - yes

Theo Geurts: (08:45) nope, and Chuck sounds very distorted like he is in some heavy metal band

Rubens Kuhl: (08:47) "Death Ray Chuckie" could be his heavy metal band stage name

Tapani Tarvainen: (08:47) :-D

Marika Konings: (08:47) For WG members that are remote, if you want to speak during the meeting, please remember to connect to the phone bridge (see details

here: <https://go.icann.org/2FuE4dV>

)

Marika Konings: (08:49) Tech support is working on the audio issues - please bear with us.

Theo Geurts: (08:58) Sound is fine now

Caitlin Tubergen: (08:58) Thank you, Theo.

Lisa Phifer 2: (09:03) Please find a link to today's presentation here: <https://go.icann.org/2GgBm9f>

Caitlin Tubergen: (09:06) Please find a link to the DTs' consolidated output here: <https://go.icann.org/2twoNUB>.

Rubens Kuhl: (09:14) Question: is the expectation that anyone can confirm domain ownership, or that just the person who the domain owner is dealing with can verify that ? Because the use cases point more to the later.

Rubens Kuhl: (09:16) Domain registrant can supply a look-up key to potential buyers.

Rubens Kuhl: (09:17) Contactability is different from publication of data.

Rubens Kuhl: (09:17) Yes it does Chuck.

Steve Crocker: (09:18) I am confused. It would seem the sensible thing is for the potential buyer to send a note which reaches the account holder. The pathway may be via forwarding via the registrar in case the account holder does not want to be known. I don't see any issue with respect to whether the account holder has control of the domain name.

Marika Konings: (09:19) @Steve - is this a comment / question you would like to have read out or this is for the chat conversation?

Marika Konings: (09:19) As a reminder, if you want staff to read a comment or question as part of the meeting discussion, please precede it with 'COMMENT' or 'QUESTION'.

Steve Crocker: (09:19) Marika, yes, thanks. That was indeed question.

Marika Konings: (09:20) @Steve - Caitlin will get into the queue to raise your question

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): (09:21) it could be on automated acution of some sort, which does not disclose any info and it is only up to a buyer if it is still desirable to go further

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB: (09:22) I don't understand this is an ICANN problem to solve

Steve Crocker: (09:23) Question for Susan: It seems you want it to be a requirement to be able to find out the full set of domains controlled by a single entity. Is that what you mean, or is this simply a desire that you have?

Michele Neylon: (09:24) I'll get CHuck to do remote participants in a minute

Daniel K. Nanghaka: (09:25) The Account Holder should have control of the domain name

Carlos Gutierrez (GNSO Council): (09:25) I have a question to Susan's

Susan Kawaguchi: (09:28) @Daniel I agree but the account holder is not always the registrant and sometimes does not have the ability to sell a domain name

Daniel K. Nanghaka: (09:29) @Susan that is where controls and rights come in - in most cases the Account Holders seem not to mind about this and what bothers them is that the domain is active

Susan Kawaguchi: (09:29) @ Steve, the value of a domain name will be higher if a full disclosure is made

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): (09:30) please add me to the queue

VOLKER GREIMANN: (09:30) I agree, and a seller that understands that could make the information available.

VOLKER GREIMANN: (09:31) but other markets for vanity items like telephone numbers also lack such a public database

Steve Crocker: (09:31) @Susan: I can see the value of supplying additional information, but it seems to me these are best handled outside of the basic system, e.g. by exchanges for listing names potentially available for sale.

VOLKER GREIMANN: (09:32) Steve: agreed

Griffin Barnett: (09:33) Not sure all registrants are sophisticated enough for that kind of approach

Susan Kawaguchi: (09:33) @ Steve, independent analysis of registrations is critical

Griffin Barnett: (09:33) (Per Steve's comment above in chat)

Susan Kawaguchi: (09:35) @ Steve I would consider spending more for a domain name based on availability of information about the registrant and their portfolio

Steve Crocker: (09:35) @Susan: Two questions: What do you mean by "independent analysis" and to what extent must this be supported by the mandatory system as opposed to external services that have developed and will continue to develop?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): (09:35) 3rd party auditors?

Steve Crocker: (09:40) Comment to Fabricio: There's a sharp distinction between validating whether the seller has title versus whether the car is in running order. For the latter, the state does not participate; you get an assessment from your own mechanic

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): (09:42) not all cars from police auctions have clear history (just left e.t.c. via some unpleasant stories happen to be tied to the particular car)

Steve Crocker: (09:43) Comment to Stephanie: Signalling willingness to sell seems outside the scope of our work. Third party exchanges provide that service.

Steve Crocker: (09:45) Comment re Andrew: The listed "Registrant" is not necessarily the person or entity that actually controls the domain name.

Kathy Kleiman: (09:46) It's often a lawyer...

Kathy Kleiman: (09:46) Also, I think we are merging Domain Name Purchase/Sale with Domain Name Certification.

Tapani Tarvainen: (09:47) "The first thing we do, let's..." :-)

Steve Crocker: (09:47) @Kathy: My point is stronger. The info listed in the Registrant field is supplied by the Account Holder, and it's entirely possible that the information is unrelated to the account and domain.

Carlos Gutierrez (GNSO Council): (09:48) @Steve, while I agree that signalling (and portfolio strategies) it is and should remain out of scope of the PDP, the objectives of increasing competition and consumer choice of the expansion in the last round, require come consideration of how these objectives can be measured and followed. If the RDs can provide some light on these developments, it would be great, if not, we might continue tapping in the dark of the markets behind the dns

Lisa Phifer 2: (09:49) @Steve, that is why the answer focuses on identifying the entity with the right to sell the DN and not the Registrant or the account holder

Steve Crocker: (09:51) @Lisa, how or when is the person with the right to sell different from the account holder?

chris oldknow: (09:51) Apologies if this has been dealt with already, but how do purchasers do due diligence to ensure the seller is not subject to sanctions by the UN or individual states - e.g. US OFAC?

Lisa Phifer 2: (09:52) @Steve, easy example - proxy-registered DNs - it is the PP's customer you wish to reach and not the PP itself

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): (09:53) @Lisa, also cases with Reseller's registrations

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): (09:53) where you see only the Reseller's info, and not the actual end-user

Steve Crocker: (09:54) @Lisa, I understand your example, but it seems to me that the relationship between the PP and his customer is a private matter between them. From an external perspective, there is only the PP.

Griffin Barnett: (09:56) @Steve, but your question was for an example of where the named account holder (in this example, the P/P provider) is not the party with the right to sell the domain (the P/P customer)

Caitlin Tubergen: (09:56) Please find a link to the DTs' consolidated output here: : <https://go.icann.org/2twoNUB>.

Steve Crocker: (10:00) @griffin: My point is the potential buyer contacts the PP, and the PP either does or does not respond. The actual owner may have previously delegated to the PP permission to sell, or the PP may have to forward the request to buy back to the actual owner, but the potential purchaser cannot tell, nor does he need to know.

steve metalitz: (10:04) <COMMENT +1 Thomas but third party legitimate interests are not limited to those of contracted parties. COMMENT>.

Erika Mann: (10:04) .... and none of the topics Thomas mentioned might actually directly relate to ICANN's mission ...

Carlos Gutierrez (GNSO Council): (10:05) all non-lawyers in the room totally lost after Thomas intervention. Coffee pause pls

Griffin Barnett: (10:05) @Steve, it's a fair point

Daniel K. Nanghaka: (10:06) The issue here is driving consensus

Daniel K. Nanghaka: (10:07) Every group has its own user interests, and when we go deeper, we have sunk into ICANN's mission

Steve Crocker: (10:15) Comment: I am not comfortable including Administrative Contact unless there's a careful definition of what this means

Griffin Barnett: (10:15) Just to add quickly to my last comment above....the third-party potential buyer of a domain may not need to initially know the underlying P/P customer but if the transaction is to proceed, there will need to likely be some transparency for the due diligence purposes we were earlier discussing

Steve Crocker: (10:34) I have another commitment following this WG meeting and will have to leave about fifteen minutes before our scheduled end.

Steve Crocker: (10:41) What is the understanding of the meaning of Administrative Contact and Technical Contact?

Steve Crocker: (10:42) Absent a crisp, definite meaning for these fields, I suggest deleting these from the RDS.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): (10:43) quite often Registrant info is the same as Tech, Billing, Adm contacts

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): (10:44) numbers though vary from Registrar to Registrar

Lisa Phifer 2: (10:45) @Steve, the intention of answering these questions is to define entities to be identified or contacted. Those might end up being the definition of Tech or Admin Contacts, or they might end up being definitions of new contact types, or neither if the purpose isn't legitimate

Steve Crocker: (10:45) @

Steve Crocker: (10:45) lisa,

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB: (10:46) somebody fix the sound please

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB: (10:46) sorry local problem

Caitlin Tubergen: (10:46) Thank you, Benny -- we are looking into this.

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB: (10:47) was a local disturbing on the sound all good again

Steve Crocker: (10:47) @Lisa, if I understand your response, I think you're saying whatever roles the registrant wants to advertise should be accessible. There may or may not be roles for admin contact, tech contact or others, right?

Lisa Phifer 2: (10:48) @Steve, I'm not going so far as to say they SHOULD be accessible, only that we must start by understanding better what MIGHT be accessible

Lisa Phifer 2: (10:49) And that those may well not be Admin or Tech Contact or Registrant, depending upon the purpose

Griffin Barnett: (10:51) @Reubens - but what about the many domains not associated with a website?

Caitlin Tubergen: (10:51) As a reminder to remote participants, if you would like a question or comment read aloud to the room, please begin your question/comment with QUESTION or COMMENT.

Lisa Phifer 2: (10:54) The definition Alex just read: Information collected by a certificate authority to enable contact between the registrant, or a technical or administrative representative of the registrant, to assist in verifying that the identity of the certificate applicant is the same as the entity that controls the domain name.

Lisa Phifer 2: (10:55) That comes from : <https://go.icann.org/2twoNUB>

Gg Levine (NABP): (10:58) in this scenario, who is the certifying agent?

Caitlin Tubergen: (10:58) @Gg Levine - would you like me to read you question aloud to the room?

Hadrien Huet: (11:02) COMMENT: 2 example I am thinking of: ICP in China and SSL, in both case having public email makes it much easier. We face difficulties with .co.uk to get SSL validation, because email is not available in whois bdy design.

Sara Bockey: (11:05) I'm not understanding how certification, which is a value added services, is a purpose. If the user wants to certify, then they would purchase the service and provide the info for verification, correct. I'm not seeing the WHOIS connection.

Caitlin Tubergen: (11:06) @Sara - would you like your comment read aloud?

Sara Bockey: (11:06) not necessary

Caitlin Tubergen: (11:06) Thank you, Sara!

Gg Levine (NABP): (11:13) @Sara. certifying authority might require access to registration data.

Alex Deacon: (11:14) I think what sara is saying is that if a CA (other than the CA run by the registrar) wants access to data to provide their service they could pay the registrar to get access. These kinds of business model issues are out of scope of what we decided in this PDP however.

Alex Deacon: (11:16) \*decide

Greg Shatan: (11:19) The DNS Orc sounds very scary.

Tapani Tarvainen: (11:21) @Gred :-D Hmmm... is there DNS Orcrist too

VOLKER GREIMANN: (11:21) OARC

VOLKER GREIMANN: (11:21) Much more difficult opponent than a DNS Orc.

Tapani Tarvainen: (11:25) Not all DNS names resolve to IP addresses

Hadrien Huet: (11:25) COMMENT: contacting the domain holder can also be usefull

Hadrien Huet: (11:25) sorry

Michele Neylon: (11:26) Tapani - if they don't resolve I don't see how they're going to have an issue :)

Tapani Tarvainen: (11:26) They can resolve but not to IP addresses

Michele Neylon: (11:26) Tapani - huh? Like?

Hadrien Huet: (11:26) COMMENT: contacting the domain holder can also be usefull if the site is partially pirated, to warn the owner. no need for the host to shut down the site, but for the domain holder to clean its database

Tapani Tarvainen: (11:26) I've seen one with only TXT records

Tapani Tarvainen: (11:26) OK SOA and NS too

Tapani Tarvainen: (11:27) ones with only MX are actually pretty common (of course those'll eventually resolve to IPs but not directly, any more than CNAMES)

Michele Neylon: (11:29) now you're just being super pedantic :)

VOLKER GREIMANN: (11:32) nice spin, greg, but not the point I was making

Greg Shatan: (11:33) Not attempting to spin, but I did think that was the point you were making. What was your point then?

VOLKER GREIMANN: (11:34) We can only regulate certain areas and have no regulatory powers in others. Certain problems need to be addressed in different venues.

VOLKER GREIMANN: (11:35) For example: Website content with hosters

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): (11:43) I am not sure words in consent "You agree to be researched" are going to improve trust in the DNS system :)

Griffin Barnett: (11:44) Is including certain information in RDS that can be used to identify the hosting provider considered "regulation" of them?

Griffin Barnett: (11:45) (for instance, in cases where the identity of the hosting provider cannot be asily ascertained from the hosted website itself)

Steve Crocker: (11:46) With apology, I must break off. Thanks for a very vigorous session

Lisa Phifer 2: (11:49) DT5, DT6, DT7 answers are all deferred to Wednesday's F2F session

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): (11:50) @Griffin, hosting provider can offer services to another hosting provider (hiding behind the cloud), and I am not sure ICANN is in content regulation business

Griffin Barnett: (11:53) Sure, Maxim I understand that....but my question was whether having certain info in RDS (such as IP address for the domain name or name servers) which can be used to identify the web host (at least the "public" facing hosting provider) equates to "regulation" - I'm not sure it does

Griffin Barnett: (11:53) In this scenario, no one is asking ICANN to regulate anything

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): (11:53) not always it can help

Caitlin Tubergen: (11:57) Thank you to all of the remote participants for your participation today.