

AC Attendance - 49 Members

Adam Ahmat Doungous

Alan Greenberg

Alan Woods (Donuts)

Alex Deacon

Avri Doria

Ayden Férdeline

Benjamin Akinmoyeje (Nigeria)

Benny Samuelson / Nordreg AB

Beth Bacon (PIR)

Bradley Silver

Chris Wilson

Chuck Gomes

David Cake

Dina Solveig Jalkanen

Erica Varlese

Evan Smith

Fabricio Vayra

Greg Aaron

Greg Shatan

Griffin Barnett

GZ Kabir

James Galvin (Afilias)

Jenn Taylor Hodges

John Bambenek

Justin Mack

Kathy Kleiman

Klaus Stoll

Kris Seeburn

Laura Margolis

Marc Anderson

Mason Cole

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID)

Michael Hammer

Michael Palage

Michele Neylon

Nick Shorey

Otieno Antony

Rod Rasmussen

Roger Carney

Sam Lanfranco

Sara Bockey

Stephanie Perrin

Steve Crocker

Steve Metalitz

Susan Kawaguchi

Tapani Tarvainen

Tom Undernehr

Vicky Sheckler

Volker Greimann - RrSG

On Audio Only: Daniel Nanghaka**Apologies:** Rubens Kuhl, Kal Feher, Andrew Sullivan, Bastiaan Goslings**Staff:** Caitlin Tubergen, Lisa Phifer, Marika Konings, Trang Nguyen, Berry Cobb, Dennis Chang, Herb Wayne Ombuds, Julie Bisland**AC Chat transcript:**

Julie Bisland: Welcome to the GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group teleconference on Tuesday, 13 February 2018 at 17:00 UTC

Julie Bisland: Agenda wiki page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_nAu8B&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QIF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=gsy0w_Jc9O5o_8ISF8F5wlyhhXjGfbrSivJ9xZln-FU&s=nTELXk-KaB32Q0nnvTx0bEX_dYWyY1yxuNaMbYRWLDQ&e=

Julie Bisland: If Adobe Connect is not functioning properly, please check your plug ins:

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A_tinyurl.com_icannactest&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QIF-

[05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=gsy0w_Jc9O5o_8ISF8F5wlyhhXjGfbrSivJ9xZIn-FU&s=QlsMRbw292Vci5HE7XQSCNcO6T9pWdwaQvlFr2rM2NY&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_download_attachments_79432604_Handout-2D13February-2DRDSWGCAll.pdf&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QIF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=gsy0w_Jc9O5o_8ISF8F5wlyhhXjGfbrSivJ9xZIn-FU&s=QlsMRbw292Vci5HE7XQSCNcO6T9pWdwaQvlFr2rM2NY&e=)

Ayden Férdeline:Hi all

Michele Neylon:I generally have to reinstall it once every couple of weeks

Stephanie Perrin:Thanks for the adobe fixit page Julie, very handy to have that at the start of meetings.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Hello

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):all

Julie Bisland:@stephanie, that's great news, thank you

Sara Bockey:yes, I was caught up 20 mins ago... alas I'm again behind LOL

Ayden Férdeline:Klaus has his hand raised

Lisa Phifer:Handout on the screen now: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_download_attachments_79432604_Handout-2D13February-2DRDSWGCAll.pdf&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QIF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=gsy0w_Jc9O5o_8ISF8F5wlyhhXjGfbrSivJ9xZIn-FU&s=uRr0XdnlJD3ZVEMS9VIJX9rIVPkULhfEFp0E6SLWISE&e=

Lisa Phifer:We are now on slide 3

Klaus Stoll:Update to my SOI: I am now also an Visiting Professor at Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University.
steve metalitz:Sorry, which slide has the results from latest poll?

Lisa Phifer:Poll results: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_download_attachments_79432604_AnnotatedResults-2DPoll-2Dfrom-2D6FebruaryCall.pdf&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QIF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=gsy0w_Jc9O5o_8ISF8F5wlyhhXjGfbrSivJ9xZIn-FU&s=h1awb1ERmVWwDCyewg1SLKhpSs_Z8EeQXNk6a9430A&e=

Lisa Phifer:We are now on slide 4, refering to poll results from 30 January call:
https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_download_attachments_79432439_AnnotatedResults-2DPoll-2Dfrom-2D30JanuaryCall.pdf&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QIF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=gsy0w_Jc9O5o_8ISF8F5wlyhhXjGfbrSivJ9xZIn-FU&s=g2wuxaTjt4QliTGH_GeUMf8Hi6odSmGFopwXmTgPxM&e=

Lisa Phifer:We are now on slide 5, reviewing previous agreements for Tech Issue Resolution and DN Management data

Alan Greenberg:Did Chuck just say we could have a justification for distributing but not collecting??

Rod Rasmussen:I wasn't on that drafting team Chuck. :-)

Stephanie Perrin:yes

Lisa Phifer:We are now on slide 6, returning to deliberation on DN Certification as a purpose for PROCESSING registration data

Alan Greenberg:How can we use it if not collected?

James Galvin (Afilias):My question is going to be, how and when did we drop DNSSEC information from 47 and 49? I must have missed a call or fallen asleep somewhere along the way. Can anyone help?

Ayden Férdeline:re: 49, "registrant organization" data element - please remind me, was there an agreement that this was an 'if applicable' type field?

Lisa Phifer:@James, DNSSEC wasn't dropped from MPDS but I don't recall it being part of the data listed for those two purposes. We can double-check those calls.

Stephanie Perrin:Example: a registrar collects bank data in order to get paid. They release it to the police to assist in the investigation of a crime committed through a website.

Stephanie Perrin:e.g. tracing deposit of funds

Stephanie Perrin:That was in answer to Alan's question

Lisa Phifer:I just checked the DT outputs and DNSSEC was not recommended by either DT

steve metalitz:Note that slide 6 was the point at which the issue arose of accessing data for a purpose which was not deemed "legitimate" for collecting that data.

Alan Greenberg:Bu@Stephanie, but that is not RDS data.

Stephanie Perrin:it is data mandated to be retained, see RAA

James Galvin (Afilias):@lisa - Thanks.

James Galvin (Afilias):@chuck - thanks. we can reconcile later.

steve metalitz:In many data protection laws (and principles, e.g. OECD) this requires a determination of whether the "access" purpose is "compatible" with the "collection" purpose.

Stephanie Perrin:at the risk of channeling Thomas Rickert, there is a lot more to GDPR compliance than WHOIS.....including data listed in the RAA that is required to be retained or escrowed.

David Cake:What DNSEC info would we be talking about this is in the RDS, rather than the DNS?

James Galvin (Afilias):@david - either DNSKEY or DS

Stephanie Perrin:Indeed Steve is correct, and this is why the Art 29 group have gone on at length re legal basis.....and this of course is the motivation behind broadening every possible purpose for collection to include every possible purpose for disclosure. cf recent argument about legal vs lawful

Lisa Phifer:We are now on slide 8 reviewing data identified for DN Certification

Stephanie Perrin:Apologies for the digression

Michele Neylon:line is very weak

David Cake:I know for domain name certification, we didn;t consider things like DNSKEY that are in a DNS zone file rather than WHOIS/RDS. We looked at CAB forum rules, but did not consider things like DANE for certificate issuance.

Rod Rasmussen:Certification purpose may require data elements to be collected if they were not already collected. Most needed elements should already be present given other purposes. Again, certification would not be a required purpose for all domains holders, but you need to allow for collection of elements for those who do wish to use their data for certification.

Lisa Phifer:Note that slide 8 listed data collected for other purposes, based on WG agreements prior to reaching this point

Ayden Férdeline:what is the average number of respondents per poll? do we have this data, easily at hand?

Lisa Phifer:@Ayden, most polls have 25-30 responses (roughly)

Ayden Férdeline:thanks Lisa

Michael Hammer:Green for agree, red for disagree?

Kathy Kleiman:I disagree

Kathy Kleiman:Because it makes no sense to process data you are not allowed to collect

Lisa Phifer:show of hands: (green agree, red disagree): Proposed WG agreement to help move the WG along: Domain Name Certification is a legitimate purpose for processing registration data, based on the definition drafted by DT3

Volker Greimann - RrSG:Chuck: It is, if the customer ask for the certification.

Volker Greimann - RrSG:Otherwise it is not

Marc Anderson:legitimate to collect or legitimate to require collection?

Rod Rasmussen:Need to more carefully define when it is to be collected - needs to be voluntary as well.

Lisa Phifer:show of hands (green agree, red disagree); DN Cert is a legitimate purpose for COLLECTING registration data

Susan Kawaguchi:in adobe now

Rod Rasmussen:+1 @Marc

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):not all registrants need certificates, so it is not a common item for all registrations

Michael Palage:I believe his statement was you cannot discuss processing if you are not authorized to collect it

Volker Greimann - RrSG:[Statement] It is only valid as part of the order process for the certification, not for the domain registration

Alex Deacon:I think what David is saying is that data collected for other legit purposes can be "processed" as is for the Certificate authority use case.

Michael Hammer:safety and stability of the DNS is part of the ICANN mission. DN certifications would be a subset of this.

Michele Neylon:+1 Jim

Kris Seeburn:+1 jim

Lisa Phifer:@Kathy please note listed data on slide 8 of data to be collected for other purposes

John Bambenek:+1 Michael

James Galvin (Afilias):@michael - the certificate is not part of the DNS. it is used for other purposes. so, in my mind, it is not a subset of DNS security and stability.

Stephanie Perrin:+1 Jim, twice

John Bambenek:The purpose of ICANN is not merely conferring domains to registrants... there is a broad purpose. TLS and certificates in a subset of circumstances rely on DNS. Unless we are going to tell people to rewrite entire protocols, this is where we are today.

Rod Rasmussen:@Jim - flawed logic here

Greg Shatan:The question of whether ICANN is in the certification business seems beside the point. The essence of Whois is that its information is collected for uses beyond ICANN, the Ry, the Rr and the Rnt.

Rod Rasmussen:Sorry, hit return too early - DNS is not the only thing a domain name is used for.

Griffin Barnett:apologies for joining so late, had a prior call run much longer than expected

David Cake:My feeling is similar to Jim Galvon's. ICANN is not opposed to the certificate business, but the existing uses of RDS data is essentially to mildly make the certification process slightly more efficient in a few cases.

James Galvin (Afilias):@rod - but a nuanced distinction to be made is whether ICANN and the DNS is in the business of supporting other purposes.

Greg Shatan:In any event, ICANN is in the security, stability and resiliency business, and certification is very much a part of that.

John Bambenek:DNS is inherently used for other purposes... the point of DNS is to make other things work.

Kathy Kleiman:According to purposes, as defined by the EU, what ICANN does is crucial to the evaluation of the purposes of collection and processing. ICANN is not an academic institution, a law enforcement agency, or a DN certification service.

John Bambenek:You don't get a domain just to publish text records, you want a website or email or some service.

Vicky Sheckler:an overall purpose of collecting the data is so that others can contact the registrant.

Volker Greimann - RrSG:see statement above

James Galvin (Afilias):@greg - no ICANN is not in the security stability and resiliency business. It is in the business of a secure, stable, and resilient identifier system.

Vicky Sheckler:reasons to contact the registrant / know who the registrant is flow from that.

Volker Greimann - RrSG:[Statement] It is only valid as part of the order process for the certification, not for the domain registration

Vicky Sheckler:presumably DN certification flows from that

Stephanie Perrin:It is not inherently used for other purposes John....it has been published in a manner that is not lawful in many jurisdictions, and therefore a host of uses have arisen. Whether they are beneficial or not is not the issue in DP law.

Lisa Phifer:Raise hand if you think DN Cert IS a legit purpose for collection

David Cake:As I've noted several times in this debate, many many certiication processes involve no contact with the RDS at all currently.

John Bambenek:Stephanie - DNS is inherently used for other purposes. To enable communication. That's the point of it. We created it so people didn't have to use hosts files or IP addresses. DNS enables communication.

Kathy Kleiman:We are missing the entire purpose of defining collection and processing...

Vicky Sheckler:@kathy no we are not. but suggsting that the sole reason to collect data is so that a registrar only can contact them is much too narrow.

Volker Greimann - RrSG:Certificates: They are not a part of the stability and security of the DNS, they are part of the end user security perspective.

Vicky Sheckler:i feel like Kathy/David/Aiden/Stephanie/Galvin are of the view that the only reason to collect data is so that the registrar can contact the registratn. I don't believe that is true at all.

Michael Hammer:+1 Vicky

steve metalitz:+1 Greg. At least some third party uses are among the core purposes of having RDS. (Indeed it was the initial purpose of having Whois.

Volker Greimann - RrSG:So yes, when the registrant orders the certification, he should provide the data for the certification purpose to the certification authority.

Vicky Sheckler:+1 greg

Steve crocker:I am now parked and in the adobe room but only via iPhone and only for a short while longer.

John Bambenek:+1 Vicky

Volker Greimann - RrSG:But if he does not and until he does, there is no need

Kathy Kleiman:Technical issue resolution - I think we have huge agreement on that issue.

Kathy Kleiman:for collection and processing.

Michele Neylon:that's not how SSL certs work

Michele Neylon:and that doesn't give you any proper security

Rod Rasmussen:Looks like we are rehashing discussion of several weeks ago on this issue of RDS data in the CERT issuance and maintenance process. Unfortunately, I think there is a fundamental disagreement on the necessity vs. utilization of Whois data in current industry practices. Could probably be good to get actual data from CAB Forum.

Michele Neylon:They can still steal your credentials

James Galvin (Afilias):@vicky - not quite. technical issue resolution for DNS issues is permitted for contact. folks can do what they want with their domain name. There are plenty of mechanisms for seeing who owns a domain. ICANN is not in the business of support all the various purposes of using a domain name.

Michele Neylon:I think he's conflating SSL and DNSSEC

Lisa Phifer:@Rod, are you supporting or opposing this as a purpose for collection?

James Galvin (Afilias):@rod - current usage does not automatically mean continued usage. we are starting from a clean slate.

Greg Shatan:@Jim, what is your basis for saying that we are starting from a clean slate?

Rod Rasmussen:@Lisa - as written, neither. I stated earlier in chat that this should be an optional collection element for those elements not already collected by needed for the certification process.

James Galvin (Afilias):@greg - our charter

Ayden Férdeline:+1 Jim

steve metalitz:@Jim: "There are plenty of mechanisms for seeing who owns a domain. " For example?

Sara Bockey:Agree with Jim

Stephanie Perrin:+1 Jim again....seems we have to remind people of the clean slate every week. no wonder this is taking a long time

Vicky Sheckler:@james - contactability / trust in a registrant is part of its mission to promote the safety, security and stability of the internet. increased access and accuracy of whois is directly in ICANN's bylaws. that doesn't mean all of the data has to be public, but it does mean that mere technical resolution isn't the only legitimate use of the data

Rod Rasmussen:@Jim - you know how much I disagree on this point - we may as well replace DNS entirely by the same logic. :-b

Ayden Férdeline:+1 stephanie

Volker Greimann - RrSG:correct

John Bambenek:If we're talking clean slate, IP addresses can be PII, why not rewrite the DNS protocol to require authentication so I can control who can resolve what on my domain?

Kathy Kleiman:current usage does not equal continued usage ==> good point

James Galvin (Afilias):@steve - contact the registrar. also take note that Let's Encrypt issues certificates without checking registration. they also don't check who you are but they could add that they do and simply check your identity.

Michele Neylon:+1 Jim

John Bambenek:Jim - but they do, for instance, check DNS CAA records.

Volker Greimann - RrSG:correct as well. it can become a legitimate purpose, but is not per se for every registration

steve metalitz:@Jim and is registrar required to respond to me when I ask them who is the registrant?

David Cake:Vicky, I don't feel that at all in the general case. I just think the case is very weak for this particular purpose.

Lisa Phifer:@Rod, would that be an opt-in purpose for collection?

James Galvin (Afilias):@vicky - I don't agree with "trust in a registrant".

John Bambenek:Chuck - I had green check mark and then raised hand and it showed only the check mark until I cleared it.

Rod Rasmussen:@Lisa - yes

David Cake:(also, I would everyone please be forgiving regarding any typos for the next few weeks - I had eye surgery last week)

Rod Rasmussen:@Michele - I actually don't think we're very *good* at arguing, but we keep trying to get better at it by continuing to do so a lot.

James Galvin (Afilias):@steve - same question regardless of the solution we decide on in this PDP working group. note that I don't object to the processing for "certificate issuance purposes", so access to the data is not an issue. I just object to it being collected for that purpose.

Vicky Sheckler:@david. I hope you feel better/ see better soon

James Galvin (Afilias):@rod - :) all I can think of to add is that I don't have an issue with processing for certificates, just collection for certificates. So, we not that far apart, I would hope.

Ayden Férdeline:those are not the only two reasons to register a domain name...

Michele Neylon:I need to drop

Volker Greimann - RrSG:wrong, John, that is DNSSEC

David Cake:@vicky everything went great, just vision really mismatched until they do the other eye

James Galvin (Afilias):@john - yes they do but that is checking that you have "control" of the DNS zone. verifying identity is a different thing and ICANN is not in that business.

Alex Deacon:So I think Jim is saying the same thing David C said earlier. i.e. if the data has already been collected for a legit purpose it can be processed (legitimately) for the cert issuance process.

John Bambenek:Jim - Wasm

John Bambenek:Jim - Wasn't suggesting verifying identity

Alex Deacon:it can be used to process
steve metalitz:@Jim, with respect, not the same issue. Contractual requirement to collect certain RDS data is enforceable; registrar response to 3d party request is not. But thanks for response.

Rod Rasmussen:@Jim - we are and we aren't, but we've had plenty of those discussions over beer and otherwise. :-)

John Bambenek:Volker = I love it when you keep telling me I don't know what I'm talking about. It really helps move the discussion forward.

Kathy Kleiman:Isn't that a registrar choice?

Kathy Kleiman:a business choice?

Kathy Kleiman:not an RDS WG choice?

Lisa Phifer:Are you opposed to DN Cert as an OPT-IN purpose for collecting data at the registrant's choice

Herb Wayne Ombuds:Must leave for another call... regards everyone

Michael Hammer:If the data elements were already collected for a different (legitimate) purpose and the domain registrant wanted a certificate, they could authorize the release of the information for certification purposes.

Stephanie Perrin:I am beginning to think that we are arguing here about whether ICANN is allowed to behave like Amazon and sell anything.....

Michael Hammer:A certificate authority could decide to not issue a cert if the information were not provided.

Michael Hammer:ICANN does not sell Certs.

Marc Anderson:+1 good point Jim

Marc Anderson:it because sort of optional to offer but required to support - at least at the registry level

Rod Rasmussen:@Jim - precisely on the need for *support* of data elements at the registry level which is why it is important we agree on even "optional" data elements in the RDS universe (universe vs. system). That's why we can't just use "call it optional and we're good" as a get out of jail free card.

Rod Rasmussen:Interoperability and data portability, and a whole lot of other factors matter too for transfers between registrars.

Michael Hammer:+1 Rod

John Bambenek:I am ok with this approach, Chuck (optional to enter data, required to support)

James Galvin (Afilias):@rod - yes i understand and agree

David Cake:because some businesses have elected to build some optional business processes on the availability of certain data is a very weak argument

Stephanie Perrin:If the remark about selling certs was aimed at me, yes I am aware. The analogy was not exact.....really what we are talking about is ICANN acting as a data emporium for the DNS and for web presence. As Dick Leaning said one time when he was still with the police, they need one stop shopping for data. Possibly that would be desirable for many parties, but it is not permissible under DP law, nor is it desirable from a human rights perspective.

Ayden Férdeline:+1 David

Kris Seeburn:that suggests that the registrar and or registry are not following the contract....RAA

James Galvin (Afilias):if the TLD wanted to be exclusively in the certificate business, kind of like the .bank being exclusively in the banking business, then they can seek to have rules just for themselves. I don't have a problem with this.

Kris Seeburn:Then we need to ensure that all follow the same standard

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):those restricted TLDs usually do not have persons as registrants

Lisa Phifer:Possible WG agreement on collection: DN Certification is an OPT-IN purpose for collecting data at the registrant's choice.

Volker Greimann - RrSG:ultimately, those registries and their contracts also will have to adapt.

Stephanie Perrin: Capturing "optional" data requires informed and revokable consent. This is a high bar to maintain, and costly. It also adds to data breach risk factors.

Lisa Phifer: Possible WG agreement on collection: DN Certification is an OPT-IN purpose for collecting data at the registrant's choice (that is required to support collection, but collected at the registrant's discretion)

Sara Bockey: Agree with Stephanie.

Alan Greenberg: I have to leave now.

steve metalitz: @Kathy you have given a reason to vote no on the poll, not a reason not to poll.....

Volker Greimann - RrSG: Optional means consent. Consent means security about the identity of the person providing the content being the data subject the consent is being provided for.

Volker Greimann - RrSG: also Kathy +1

John Bambenek: Scope is NOT mere delegation of DNS zones to registrants... the mission is broad

Ayden Férdeline: +1 Kathy

Lisa Phifer: Possible WG agreement on collection: DN Certification is an OPT-IN purpose for collecting data at the registrant's choice (that is required to support collection, but collected at the registrant's choice)

Tapani Tarvainen: I don't see why certification process would need anything *in the RDS*. That being the case making it "optional" doesn't help.

Stephanie Perrin: If anyone on this list has not read the ECO proposal for GDPR compliance (the workbook or playbook) they should, they do an excellent analysis of the risks of consent.

Justin Mack: With recent and planned web browser changes, nearly every website operator in the future will want to have a TLS certificate. Pure domain-validated (DV) certs might use data that only exists in DNS, but for other types of validation (Org & Extended), contact information is required.

Ayden Férdeline: +1 to Stephanie's point about consent needing to be revokable (and of course, informed)

Kathy Kleiman: right - ICANN does not sell CERTS

Michael Hammer: +1 - look at what happens with Chrome 68 and after.

Lisa Phifer: Slightly simplified: Possible WG agreement on collection: DN Certification is an OPT-IN purpose for collecting data (that is, required to support collection, but data collected at the registrant's choice)

steve metalitz: @Lisa, no it is not just registrant's choice. t

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): +1 Chuck

Lisa Phifer: @Steve, that was Rod and Michael's proposal

Kathy Kleiman: ... and transferred into the RDS? Does the Registrant get that option too? Or could the data be locally held?

Rod Rasmussen: ICANN doesn't sell domains either. ;-)

steve metalitz: As noted some registries are required to collect data that others are not. Persons wishing to register in these domains must comply with that.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): @Rod, but ICANN send bills for domains

Michael Hammer: @Rod, but ICANN gets a slice of the domain sale. I'm neutral on that but some people have strong opinions.

James Galvin (Afilias): Can someone say again why it's important that DN certification be a valid reason for collection? Why is it not enough for it to be a valid reason for processing?

Rod Rasmussen: @Maxim - more of a tax to keep the system running, but maybe they should consider the same for CERTS - would help with the budget crunch...

Michael Hammer: @Rod, does that mean working group members would be compensated?

Michael Hammer: Other than the Lulz.

Rod Rasmussen:@Michael, I think so if we add an e-mail address fee and a web address fee option. Then we can all retire!

steve metalitz:@Jim, one reason might be to ensure against the risk that obtaining a cert might be treated as a use incompatible with whatever was the ourpose for which the data was originally collected.

steve metalitz:.....whatever was the purpose for which the data was originally collected.

Lisa Phifer:We are now discussing the specific data identified for DN Cert on slide 8

Michael Hammer:One reason that justifies collection (vs just processing) is if the legitimacy of the certificate is challenged you need to have the collected data for evaluation (without stating who would do the evaluation).

James Galvin (Afilias):@steve - have to think more about that. it doesn't seem to directly follow for me.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):if we do not explicitly write that certification was the reason of collection, then using this set of data for certification might be seen as violation of GDPR

Kathy Kleiman:Agree with Alex! Tough phrasing...

Vicky Sheckler:apologies I need to run. -Vicky

Nick Shorey:I'm not convinced by the case made for this data being required to be collected via a public whois dataset

Tapani Tarvainen:+1 Nick. I'm pretty convinced it is *not* a good reason for doing that.

Kathy Kleiman:The Data Protection Act says that: Personal data shall be obtained only for one or more specified and lawful purposes, and shall not be further processed in any manner incompatible with that purpose or those purposes.

Kathy Kleiman:(I didn't write that -- just cut and pasted :-))

Michael Hammer:I am not likely to be able to make next weeks call - traveling.

Julie Bisland:thank you, Michael. I'll note your apology, no need to email

Julie Bisland:(tentative) @ Michael

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):bye all

Ayden Férdeline:thanks all

Fabricio Vayra:Thanks, all!

Marc Anderson:good meeting, thank you all

Alan Woods (Donuts):good night all

Michael Hammer:If you are in PR for the meeting, Bella Vista Bar and Grill in Loiza is an excellent restaurant not to far from the airport.

Michael Hammer:Wish I could be there.

Michael Hammer:Thanks all.

Adam Ahmat Doungous:thanks

Otieno Antony:Thanks. Good evening