

Adobe Connect - Chat Transcript
RDS WHOIS2 Review Plenary #32
18 June 2018

Brenda Brewer: (6/18/2018 09:24) Good day all! Welcome to RDS-WHOIS2 Plenary #32 on 18 June 2018 @ 15:00 UTC.

Brenda Brewer: (09:25) Please note this meeting is recorded. Kindly mute when not speaking by pressing *6 and *6 again to unmute. Thank you!

Lili SUN: (10:03) Why the attendance is so poor?

Alan Greenberg: (10:04) If we get to the Safeguards section, can we also be prepared to display the Rec. From the version I distributed last night?

Volker Greimann: (10:04) Just joined

Alice Jansen: (10:04) hi Alan - noted!

Cathrin Bauer-Bulst: (10:06) Sorry I'm late, all, just joined now

Carlton SAMUELS: (10:16) Howdy all, I am full of woe this am!

Carlton SAMUELS: (10:17) First the A/C wanted a new add-in. Then afterwards it failed. Then I had another go and here we are!

Cathrin Bauer-Bulst: (10:17) Hi Carlton, glad you made it despite all of these obstacles!

Carlton SAMUELS: (10:18) Dear Brenda, would you be so kind and arrange a dial-out for me please? 8xx-xxxxxx.

Carlton SAMUELS: (10:18) Much obliged.

Brenda Brewer: (10:20) Yes, Carlton, please stand by.

Alice Jansen: (10:21) You now have scroll control

Carlton SAMUELS: (10:21) @Brenda: Thanks very much

Carlton SAMUELS: (10:22) Woe is me. The audio on this notebook crapped out! Less than 2 y-o too!!

Lili SUN: (10:24) I'll revise a bit about the slides of Data Accuracy subgroup.

Lisa Phifer: (10:26) @Thanks Lili - if you change the text of a recommendation or issue please apply the same change to the subgroup report

Lili SUN: (10:27) OK

Carlton SAMUELS: (10:29) Thanks Brenda. Now on!

Carlton SAMUELS: (10:31) I have my ears....and eyes now. @Alan: To the question, I think we should include this recommendation with an additional piece that explicitly recommend monitoring of interactions from such groups

Lisa Phifer: (10:34) In light of GDPR, it seems that outreach may be needed to data subjects regarding purpose(s) for which their data may be used. Does this fall into outreach or future policy development?

Carlton SAMUELS: (10:36) @Lisa Yes, I quite agree as a general rule!

Lisa Phifer: (10:36) data subjects may include registrants, admin/tech contacts, etc

Carlton SAMUELS: (10:37) @Volker: Low on efficiency, high on cost. I so too agree with that!

Volker Greimann: (10:38) Maybe we can tie funding to actual demonstrable results.

Dmitry Belyavskiy: (10:40) Please apologize, I have to leave in 10 minutes :(

Dmitry Belyavskiy: (10:47) Bye!

Volker Greimann: (10:49) making referencer does not mean adopting

Carlton SAMUELS: (10:50) . The disconnect appears between what is considered accurate (the definition) and how it is delivered and who is on the hook for delivery.

Volker Greimann: (10:52) Partly, Carlton. It is a responsibility of the registrant. and the registrant is on the hook for delivery. ICANN and contracted parties only serve to enforce that registrant obligation when notified of a registrant not being in compliance

Carlton SAMUELS: (10:53) @Lisa: Thanks for that reflection! Because this was always a point of contention in the At-Large; namely, should we not take the 3 stages of the WHOIS ARS as the full definition of implementaiton of the accuracy safeguard!

Lisa Phifer: (10:53) Agree Phase 3 was envisioned but it has proven difficult. I believe this was covered in the briefings?

Volker Greimann: (10:54) It was. It is very invasive on registrants.

Volker Greimann: (10:54) therefore the current reactive approach is the most sensible

Alice Jansen: (10:54) https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_download_attachments_71604714_Written-2520Implementation-2520Request-2520for-2520Recommendation-25205-5F6-5F7-5F8-5F9.pdf-3Fversion-3D1-26modificationDate-3D1522255930000-26api-3Dv2&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=kbiQDH54980u4nTPfwdloDLY6-6F24x0ArAvhdeDvvc&m=X473Vsw3-Glmm5Ax1BuaYoYu0qzDNLU5QirOOrWT-nI&s=10PKsmdKKGd9BZqSQw-hS5pUAXA2l_0-k6ASS-xtdlw&e= - see link to implementation briefing on recs 5-9

Carlton SAMUELS: (10:56) @Volker: Meaning the evidence of inaccurate data when delivered - either from loss of contactability or alleged syntax errors -are the best opporutnities to make the data accurate?

Carlton SAMUELS: (10:58) @Lili: +1; accept a defintion of accuracy, acknowledge the operational difficulty those who must respond as a practical matter and finally, accept a less invasive operational response to implementation?

Lisa Phifer: (10:59) that's operability not identity

Lisa Phifer: (11:00) Refer to SAC058, Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation (2

Lisa Phifer: (11:01) <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https->

[3A www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-2D058-](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-2D058-)

[2Den.pdf&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=kbiQDH54980u4nTPfwd](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-2D058-2Den.pdf&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=kbiQDH54980u4nTPfwd)

[loDLY6-6F24x0ArAvhdeDvvc&m=X473Vsw3-Glmm5Ax1BuaYoYu0qzDNLU5QirOOrWT-](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-2D058-2Den.pdf&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=kbiQDH54980u4nTPfwd)

[nI&s=AWvzHu_btRnr7anK-vC-tW31XK-NISIRVZUXhgMHRFo&e=](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-2D058-2Den.pdf&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=kbiQDH54980u4nTPfwd)

Volker Greimann: (11:03) @Carlton: Correct: Evidence of inaccurate data is the best basis for improving accuracy

Lisa Phifer: (11:05) isn't that policy

Lisa Phifer: (11:06) @Alan, that was the EWG's proposal as well - but it's a policy not a recommendation to make a policy

Alice Jansen: (11:07) Reminder - please state your name before speaking for the transcript - thanks!

Carlton SAMUELS: (11:09) @Lisa: Good catch!!

Carlton SAMUELS: (11:11) At the minute, the WDRP kind of imposes a n operational requirement on the registrar to collect and keep data on when they contact the registrant and the result for audit purposes. No need to reinvent the wheel.

Lisa Phifer: (11:11) I suggest the subgroup try to identify the problem(s) more specifically - for example, that there are many definitions of accuracy but that a policy-defined definition is needed. Etc

Lisa Phifer: (11:12) If the problems are not enumerated clearly, it will be difficult to formulate a recommendation that clearly addressed those problems

Lisa Phifer: (11:13) From this discussion, I hear the above problem, as well as the problem that identity theft is still an issue that hasn't been addressed yet by ARS

Lisa Phifer: (11:14) And the problem that WHOIS users cannot tell to what level data has been validated or when

Volker Greimann: (11:15) Just as an example, our data regarding validation of an email address:

Volker Greimann: (11:15) contact_verification_auth_index 344298contact_index
icann_transfer_auth_index 2230414claims_notices_id registrar dd24domain [redacted]
registrycontact zone source_type activateTransfersource_address ICANNTRANSFERstatus
VERIFIEDverified_by Form of authorization emailtrigger_code 2365575trigger_date 2015-
10-02 12:07:56contact_email v.a.g@gmx.de

Carlton SAMUELS: (11:19) @Alan: Almost all modern Data Privacy laws require breach notification to the data subject and the regulator. I agree the inclusion in contract by the Data Controller here would close the circle.

Lisa Phifer: (11:20) Note that GDPR requirements do not apply to all registrations - if the RT wants the requirement to apply to ALL registrations it must say so

Volker Greimann: (11:20) Lisa: that is what I think we are aiming for

Volker Greimann: (11:21) they can act through the processor

Carlton SAMUELS: (11:21) @Lisa: True enough. Lets make it a requirement for breach notification to ICANN specifically for WHOIS/RDS data

Volker Greimann: (11:22) no objection to that

Volker Greimann: (11:24) btw: Such a requirement may be in the picket fence, e.g. an issue relegated to the contract outside the scope of policy

Volker Greimann: (11:25) And of course, it is already in the RAA:

Volker Greimann: (11:25) 3.20 Notice of Bankruptcy, Convictions and Security Breaches. Registrar will give ICANN notice within seven (7) days of (i) the commencement of any of the proceedings referenced in Section 5.5.8. (ii) the occurrence of any of the matters specified in Section 5.5.2 or Section 5.5.3 or (iii) any unauthorized access to or disclosure of registrant account information or registration data. The notice required pursuant to Subsection (iii) shall include a detailed description of the type of unauthorized access, how it occurred, the number of registrants affected, and any action taken by Registrar in response.

Carlton SAMUELS: (11:25) @Alan: I wanted to bring the Escrow Providers into the argument as well!

Lisa Phifer: (11:29) You mean what happened at ICANN62 not what happened at the F2F

Carlton SAMUELS: (11:31) Thank you all. Take care all

Lili SUN 2: (11:31) Thanks