ICANN
Transcription
EPDP - Data Elements Workbook
Thursday, 31 January 2019 at 17:30 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. Adobe Connect recording: https://participate.icann.org/p96pzmsc83r/

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/uJsWBg
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Terri Agnew: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening, and welcome to the EPDP small team on data elements taking place on Thursday the 31st of January, 2019 at 1730 UTC. In the interest of time, there'll be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect. If you're only on the telephone bridge, could you please let yourself be known now?

Hearing no one, I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for recording purpose, and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this, I'll turn it back over to (Kurt). I'll go ahead and turn it over to you to see if you're still here. If not, I'll throw it back to Berry Cobb.

(Kurt):   No, it's Berry's meeting. So go ahead, please, Berry. Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Great. Thanks all. Berry Cobb. For the record, (Alex) is joining. I suspect we won't get Stephanie today. As Alan mentioned, we'll only be on for about the next 25 minutes or so. Hopefully we can kind of get through this in an hour and give (Pete) some time back to take continued feedback on the list. And of course we'll be working on this document. Just to confirm again, can I be heard okay, Terri?

Terri Agnew: Currently, yes, Berry. If it changes, we'll certainly interrupt and let you know.

Berry Cobb: Thank you. All right. So for the agenda today, we're just going to do a quick review of the redline, quickly just talk about 1a and 1b that Alan Woods had submitted earlier in the week. Then we'll probably spend more of our time on purposes two and three, discussing those changes.

If we do get some agreements about what those first three purposes really four, are getting closer to our thought process and our logic process, then I'll go to apply those to purposes four through six next. In doing so, I'll try to get the next draft out as soon as possible so that we can hopefully work over the weekend and on the list up to Tuesday.

I do think, regardless of how far we get, that we should be prepared to present at least 20 or 30 minutes or so for next week's Tuesday meeting with the plenary. But we can talk more about it. So I'm going to maintain control in the Adobe Connect room.

And what you see here is the full redline version of Annex D. I'm mostly posting this to scare you. And I'll - all of the redlines are being trapped. And the document is becoming almost near impossible to work with in redline form. But the primary reason that I'm doing this is so that there's a true chain of custody back to our initial report from what we produce for the final report.

But for the purposes of what we'll be doing, we'll continue to work from a cleaner version of this document. But I just wanted to touch upon some of the high level changes that we may - well, that I made coming from our discussion on Tuesday. And then after that, we'll revert over to the clean one so you're not as scared with what you're seeing now.

So the first couple of pages are still kind of just some introduction. Of course there's a table of contents. We'll fill that out once we're done. The statements are a few paragraphs below the table of contents. It's kind of

reserved for global statements that we need to make in regards to the workbooks.

So as an example, the language that we had about how we were labeling our purpose statements as ICANN purpose, I've removed ICANN from those purpose titles, but the message is still the same, that the intent of the workbooks is to help guide our policy recommendations, ultimately that these become consensus policies down the road in which ICANN would enforce.

And again, you know, it's trying to draw this bright line between what can be enforced versus other purposes that registries or registrars may have for which ICANN wouldn't necessarily enforce. So again, that bright line is still necessary.

The second little section is, I imported our draft definitions for collection, transfer and publication. The last edits received Alan had sent earlier in the week. So those are in there. And then the subsequent page of that, I believe on page three and four, or maybe just three - I'm sorry, yes, three for the redline is, instead of maintaining sidebar comments, I did a post in here.

This page will be deleted once we've talked about each of the issues. But again, there are some questions from ICANN Org, as well as just a shopping list or a check list of things that we need to confirm globally across the workbooks once we finalize the logic structure across the workbooks, most of which are really just do try to make rationale statements and other aspects as consistent as possible across those.

So, now getting back in, or getting down into the workbooks, what you'll see is that the old purpose one was deleted, and I manually recreated purpose 1a and purpose 1b per the input supplied by - through the registry stakeholder groups, specifically through Alan.

So where you see a redline edit, it's attributed to me, but what I did is, went

line by line through those registry submissions to make sure that I captured everything as appropriate. And so, Alan, you know, when you have time over the weekend, may just want to do a quick compare between your version versus this Annex D full version, just to make sure that I captured everything correctly. I think I did but, you know, a sanity check is always nice to have.

I'm not going to talk about any of the details of 1a or 1b about the text of the processing activity. I do want to highlight that though for 1a and 1b, as we briefly discussed on Thursday that the responsible party sections that were showing up in the 1a, 1b versions from the registries, were from an old version. And I didn't apply creative licensing.

So I went ahead and carried those over. However, since then, as Alan has mentioned, I'm going to remove those based on the email dialogue so that we can move on. So those will just be replaced with since - a simple version of just the responsible parties for the processing activities, either ICANN register registries or registrants/data subject or escrow provider, et cetera.

If it is somewhat resolved in the plenary, we can circle back and update these or this can more likely be updated and more deep (unintelligible) when the legal instruments around all of this are being decided on.

The second biggest change that I wanted to let you be aware of, and I mentioned it briefly on our call on Tuesday, and we'll circle back to this, but one of the things that you'll see changed for the data elements table specifically, is that I deleted the column for retention.

And up to this point, the rationale for doing that is that the processing activity of retention will still be a row up in our processing activities table. But I'm removing it from the data elements table because I think that it's - it was just being duplicative in applying a designation for a data element that was going to be retained, when I think that it's implied that any processing that occurs, whether it be through collection, transmission or disclosure, those things are

going to be retained, whatever the retention policy recommendation is that we work on.

So the desire was to try to just make it a little bit simpler in terms of viewing the flow of data elements as they traverse the processing activities, and retention just kind of seemed to confuse that. And we'll come back again to it when we look through the cleaner version. And if there are any objections to that approach, I can easily add them back in, but I just wanted to highlight that there.

The second item I'm going to bring up is on purpose 1b. And again, we'll talk through this in the clean version. And it may be helpful when you're looking at these offline, to compare the original document that Alan Woods had sent versus, you know, what we have loaded in the Annex D.

and specifically, I'm going to be pointing to the transmission processing activity for 1b that especially when we get into the non-public type data where that's listed as optional, we - that compared back to the version we had in our initial report, also had shown that there was the transmission of the generated data elements up above.

So there's a slight logic disconnect there that we'll want to discuss about. So you start to see it in 1b. I think it's not an issue for purpose 2. But for sure, Purpose 3, there's another logic disconnect there, as we also made the decision that when we're talking about - well, really the plenary hasn't talked much about it at all. But when we're talking about the concept of some publicly available directory, we did agree on Tuesday's meeting that that didn't really seem to fit under purpose 2.

So I've now shifted that down to Purpose 3. But in doing so, there is a breakdown under the collection and transmission processing activities that you'll see. And, (Alex) to your comment in the chat, when we get to Purpose 3, that's - I know that Alan had mentioned disclosure publication, delineation

and purpose 1a. We can start to talk about it there, but I think it becomes more relevant to have that discussion under Purpose 3 when we're talking about what's going to be disclosed publicly or redacted, et cetera, et cetera.

And just so you don't think that I'm lying to you, I'll just quickly browse down to Purpose 3 and you're going to start to see what I'm talking about. The far right column, which is labeled as redaction, and per the initial report or in our draft final report, we've highlighted which specific fields would be redacted, yes or no.

And you'll see that some of these fields are populated as yes or no on the far right, but based on what we had listed under Purpose 3 for enabling communication with the RNH, that several of those fields are now blank. And so we need to reconfirm our logic, which I believe directly connects to our overarching principle that each purpose workbook needs to be viewed in isolation.

So we need to correctly identify what data is necessarily - necessary to be collected to achieve the purpose, as well as transmission and disclosure, et cetera. So we'll come back to that.

Okay. So those are the things I just wanted to scare you with or demonstrate from the redline. I'm going to stop sharing that one and move over to the clean version, which is a little less scary. So what this clean version is trying - is attempting to show is essentially I've accepted all of the redline changes in this document, but I still wanted to maintain the sidebar comments so that they can be referenced when we're walking through the workbooks.

So for today, we're not going to bother with any of the introduction section, the first three, four pages, but let's go ahead and move on down to Purpose 1a. You know, as I mentioned, in the next version I am going to go through

and clean up responsible party and some of the - within that column for each of purpose 1a and 1b.

And in fact, we can probably go ahead and start this discussion now about disclosure versus publication. The notion of listing publication again was suggested in the version 1a that Alan had supplied, but I noticed that the use of that term publication wasn't redlined in the purpose 1b.

And so (Alex) did mention this. And while Alan Woods is still on the call, why don't we go and have that discussion now? I think in general the original intent here was to try to remain as true to language used in GDPR. So I think originally the disclosure processing activity at first was - I don't even think we were using the term disclosure, but somewhere near or after LA, we converted the title for this processing activity to just be purely disclosure in a generic sense that, you know, this data would - regardless of the purpose itself, that there was some kind of disclosure of data elements, whether it be third party, some sort of publicly available directory or some legitimate interests, third party type of disclosure based on some of our other processes.

So I'm going to stop there. Let's have a quick discussion around disclosure publication, whether it's necessary to include that specific - to be that specific. And if it is, then we should probably understand how we need to apply that across the other workbooks. So, (Alex), please go ahead.

(Alex):   Thanks, Berry. Yes, I think, you know, when I think about disclosure versus publication, it seems to me that disclosure is - the difference is with regard to scope. So if one individual requests disclosure of a non-public data element and they are granted that access, it's - you know, that element is still not public. It's just disclosed to a single person.

Publication to me indicates that it's available to a larger group. I wouldn't say the world, but perhaps that's a distinction we could discuss. So that's the

reason why when I saw the question on whether this is disclosure or publication, that's kind of what first popped into my mind.

So maybe we could one, try to stick with GDPR language, which I think is a good idea. You mentioned that. But two, just agree amongst ourselves what the difference between the two is, perhaps first degree that there is a difference and then determine what it is. Thanks.

Berry Cobb: Thank you (Alex). And I'll just note what I've, you know, put in the chat is, you know, to me, even if there are publicly available data elements, you know, in reality someone that queries a registry or a registrar for RDES, you know, for registration data, that to me is a disclosure, but (unintelligible). (Sarah), please.

(Sarah): Yes. Thank you. Hi. I think I agree with (Alex), what you're saying that disclosure and publication do seem to be different. Disclosure could be to an individual third party, where publication makes it accessible to all. The way I see it, disclosure is a subset of publication.

So whether it's being published to one individual user via like an authenticated RDAP lookup, versus too many users via perhaps a public WHOIS type of opt-in situation, those are both publication and disclosure is a type of publication.

Berry Cobb: Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Woods: Great. Thank you. Yes. So, (Sarah), I think you possibly got a bit turned around in just your last sentence there. Publication is a disclosure. So in like all data protection legislation, disclosure is considered to a blanket term of anywhere where that - the data is provided to somebody who is not within the processing sphere as I would say.

So anytime a processor or a controller receives or and somehow gets access

to the data, that is the disclosure of the data. So again, this was more kind of the difficulty of getting our head around how do we get this and how do we parse what was in the workbooks to start with.

What really probably should be there for 1a PA2 and 1a PA3 is disclosure at publication because it's outside. And then the transfer, which is internal, it's technically a disclosure because - and again, this is why it's so difficult for us because we are technically in the same sphere, the data processing sphere, be it controller box or whatever we are.

So technically not a disclosure, but is it a disclosure because we're a separate entities, and it's so convoluted the way that we deal with that it in our industry. So I think it's easier to consider also as a transfer, even though a transfer is technically a disclosure as well.

But in the instance of publication, publication as (Sarah) completely rightly said, is a subset of disclosure of a general umbrella legal term. Does that make sense?

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Alan. Yes, it does. So if I understood correctly though, that - and I guess that's part of what we need to talk through the work - the data elements selves. I get the sense that use of the term publication could probably only be used for Purpose 3 if we think that that's the final home for this publicly available data directory or whatever we call it.

Whereas the disclosures that we're really talking about here are more - you know, or they should be associated directly to this purpose. But again, I think our original intent was, or not intent, but our original direction was that we were classifying, you know, the disclosure column as a - in a general sense and not necessarily very targeted.

So we're going to stay on this topic, but let's move down to the workbook itself - I'm sorry, the data elements table itself. So, based on what the

registries had submitted, so column one again is in general starting off with the collection from the registrar. And we've highlighted particular data elements here that are either required or considered optional. And I'll talk about the optional data element there under registrar registration expiration date in a minute.

And that really goes to some of the comments that (Francisco) had supplied to us for recommendation seven, I believe, which in general just talked about the transfer of data. And he was making note that things like registry domain ID or registrar expiration date, some of those aren't generated at - they aren't generated or collected at the registrar, but they are generated/collected at the registry level. Therefore, they start to show up under the transfer processing activity. And we'll get back to that.

So, but the point here for a purpose 1a is that when we're getting into disclosure under column PA3, the original idea that in terms of satisfying the purpose of activating and allocating the domain name, that the only thing that would ever be disclosed to satisfy this purpose, is the domain name itself, and if I recall correctly, the name servers.

And as we discussed in prior calls, maybe name server IP addresses as Alan had mentioned, which was for end zone types of things. And I still not - I didn't get a clear understanding of that, but I'll take your word for it that that occurs.

So in effect, and I mean one can probably argue that the three data elements that we have listed here under the disclosure column, technically probably aren't even disclosed or published in any RDS directory whatsoever. They're really being populated in the DNS. And the disclosure that's really occurring is that, because they are populated in the DNS, I can do a NS lookup or ping a particular domain name and get those results.

But as I understood under generation one of the workbooks, that was what -

why only those very limited fields were being disclosed, are listed as disclosed because they needed to be populated somewhere to complete the allocation and activation of the domain name.

So I'm going to stop there, welcome comments about if that logic, or at least the disclosure part seems appropriate. (Sarah), please go ahead.

(Sarah): Yes. That disclosure part does seem appropriate. Thank you.

Berry Cobb: All right. Easy enough. Oh, Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Wood: Yes, no problem. It's just a question. I'm actually just going to direct this at the tech people in the room. So, (Alex) and Marc (unintelligible). So I understand that it's loaded in the publication. So technically when, you know, it goes into the registry, when we have a registered name, there's the IP address for the name servers.

I'm assuming in order to read that correctly, that the registry must have the note pair that this name equals this name server equals potentially this IP address. So there is some sort of a public requirement to how that out there. Is that correct? Because if that's the case, then publications seems to work perfectly for me.

Berry Cobb: Please, Marc.

Marc Anderson: Thanks. Marc Anderson for the transcript. Yes. In fact, you know, when - it is required and is necessary. When you talk about like the activation of a domain name, you know, when you buy a domain name, you know, one of the main things or, you know, I should say when you get a domain name registration to be more precise, one of the main - the main service you're getting is unlimited DNS resolution.

What that really means is, you know, behind the scenes, you're purchasing

the service of having, you know, the string you purchased translated into an IP address. And that's done via a lookup to a name server. And so, you know, it is absolutely necessary. It's necessary that it be published in the DNS and it's integral, you know, it's a disservice you're purchasing when you get a domain registration.

Berry Cobb: Right. Thank you, Marc. So, I know that we're still kind of on the disclosure topic. So let's keep that in mind, but my statement's not going to be specific. So let's kind of just real quickly start at the top of the data elements table, and we're going to start under the collection column.

So again, all the ones that are listed with ours as required, were part of the 1a that Alan had submitted. Now, I did take a hint of creative license, and I also put optional for registrar registration expiration date, and optional for reseller, meaning that - so again, feedback specifically from (Francisco) was that the registrar registration expiration date, some registrars refused to do that. Others don't.

If they do, they are then required to process that data, which would in effect need to be transmitted to the registry. I'm not saying that that actually occurs or not. We can have that discussion, but it doesn't really matter for the purpose of 1a because it's not necessary to fulfill the purpose.

We're just highlighting that these data elements are being collected by the registrar as they start to activate and allocate the domain name. And that we're noting again that only the minimum three data elements here, domain name, name servers and name servers IP addresses, are transferred from the registrar to the registry.

And in almost near nanosecond, the registry is collecting that information. But then ultimately, whether it's in a directory service or nothing else, the disclosure of these three data elements are occurring because again, it's just

reinforcing the activation or allocation of the domain name. I'm sure it's not or and allocation of the domain name. So, Marc, please go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Berry. I think I agree with what you just said there. A couple of notes. I want to say, I greatly appreciate the change from the ones and ones in brackets to Rs and Os. That makes it much more readable for me.

So quick note on optional. I think here. You know, we've had this conversation briefly in the plenary. And I think it's - you know, I think it's just worth noting, you know, the word optional by itself isn't sufficient.

So your explanation about registrar registration expiration date in that it's optional for the registrars to offer that is accurate, right? And so that's optional for the registrar. But then using another example, if you scroll down to D in a sec. That one is not optional for the registrar to - or the registry for that matter. Most probably a discrepancy.

So, you know, that needs to go to the registry if it exists, right? And so on those, you know - so on that field, it's optional for the registrant to provide, but it's not optional for the registry and the registrar to support it. Whereas the registrar expiration date is optional for the registry and registrar to support.

And so there I just think, you know, the word optional by itself isn't sufficient to describe what is required for those fields. I think we need to specify sort of optional for who.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Marc. And I agree. So, just touching back on DNSSEC, the original intent of why it was marked optional, which used to be the bracketed one, was just like you mentioned, is ultimately it's up to the registrant whether they enable DNSSEC or not. If they choose to, then yes, then it becomes a requirement for the registrar and the registry to process that data to enable DNSSEC to occur.

And just so it's clear though, the reason why there's not a designation in column two is because if I understand correctly or maybe it does need to be updated, should - for the purpose of 1a, should we also note that the DNSSEC field should be listed under transfer as required, and should it also be disclosed as required?

And so I do agree that we probably need to come up with two different designations of optional because they don't - it doesn't apply the same for each and every field. But then secondarily, in terms of completing our logic process just for 1a, should DNSSEC also include two Rs to the right of that O? Marc, please go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Berry. You know, yes and yes. For DNSSEC to work, the DNSSEC key has to be published in the zone, you know, for the TLD, and that has to be done by the registry. So I think that was an oversight on our part that, you know, if it's provided by the registrant, you know, it has to be passed to the registry and it has to be published in the DNS or it won't work.

Berry Cobb: All right. Thank you, Marc. And while we're talking, I'm trying to make changes in the background. So I did add Rs for transfer and disclosure here. So now that we're talking about it though, let's try to figure out a delineation between a DNSSEC optional versus the registrar registration expiration date as optional.

To me, I think the same concept still applies is that if the registrar is choosing to populate a registrar registration expiration date, then they are required to pass that information on to the registry or the registrar. I'm not sure - Marc, please go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Hey Berry, Marc Anderson again. I guess, so I guess you're touching - you're talking about, you know, how - what do we mean by optional for the registrar registration expiration date? And it's optional. I believe - I have to double

check, I believe it's optional at both the registrar and the registry levels, which means that the - it could - you know, it's optional for the registrar if they want to support it, but if they do support it, it's also optional if the registry supports it.

So they would only pass it on if the registrar - if the registry supports it and asks for it. You know, I'm a solid 50% sure on that one. I can - you know, and that goes back to sort of the consistent labeling and display policy discussions. So that's not to say we couldn't change it. And, you know, I suspect that, you know, under our new policies, there's not a lot of reason to require a registrar to pass that on to the registry if that's a field they support.

So even if it's, you know, even if that is a legacy of the consistent labeling and display policy, that doesn't mean we can't change it. So that's something we have to think of - think about. But I actually raised my hand in response to what (Sarah) asked in chat, which she sort of raises a good point. She sort of - she definitely raises a good point. Sorry, (Sarah).

You know, she asks if, you know, if DNSSEC is necessary to fill the purpose of activating and allocating the domain name. That's a great question because, you know, strictly speaking, it's not, right? It's, you know, certainly, you know, the vast majority of registrations occur without it and are activated and allocated, without it.

You know, however, I think that that's one that's, you know, one, it's optional for the registrant to provide that data. It's not personally identifiable information. But also, you know, I think, you know, there, I think that's - you know, I think the thing on that one is it's - you could argue that it's necessary to deliver the, you know, a secure and stable DNS solution, right?

So DNSSEC key there is there for the specific purpose of forwarding a certain man in the middle attack, right? It's there to address a very specific potential vulnerability. And so, you know, providing it is optional, you know.

So sort of by providing that information, you know, that is completely up to the registrant. You know, that's not required for them in order to obtain the service.

But in order for the registry to deliver sort of on their, you know, sort of the entire service that they're providing, you know, I think it is necessary. So, I would look at it sort of like the name server, right? You can get a domain name. You can register a domain name, but not provide a name server and it's still a domain name registration. Providing a name server is only necessary if you want to activate it in the DNS.

Likewise, I'd look at the DNSSEC key as sort of the same way. You know, you can make the registration and you can choose not to provide a DNSSEC key. But if you want to avail yourself for that service, then it's there for you. So I would argue that it's part of the service that the registry is providing, and therefore it is necessary, even though it's optional for the registrant to provide. So that's a little winding way to get to an answer, but it's a great question. So hopefully the aside was worth the time.

Alan Woods: This is Alan. Can I jump in for a second?

Berry Cobb: Yes. Go ahead Alan.

Alan Woods: Great. Thank you. Sorry, I was very (unintelligible). But yes, I think what Marc has said there was absolutely perfect. I'm sorry, would be. It was perfect, but let's - it's probably another issue that we need to think of, that obviously this is not personal data. And we're really concerned with what (unintelligible) and the context of this.

So I think (unintelligible), we should phrase (unintelligible) then absolutely everything. But we probably should be adding an extra layer where we're flagging and slicing sort of an indicator that something is personal data or not, because when we're having these conversations, (unintelligible).

It's not the end of the world if we don't come to a conclusion for DNSSEC because the DNSSEC is not personal data. If we can come up with a rationale like minimum data, that's great, but we don't necessarily need it. So (unintelligible) ones where we can confirm really that this is (unintelligible) data that we need to (unintelligible) that we thought into.

So I don't think - I think he's absolutely right and I think that's a note. And I think we can probably move on just accepting that it's a difficult one, but it's not really one that we need to focus on.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Alan. And (Alex), please go ahead.

(Alex):   Thanks, Berry. So just to get specific, so Marc, are you suggesting that we need to add some value in the DNSSEC column for - sorry, I can't scroll, for transmission and disclosure? An R or a qualified R based on what the registry may or may not support DNSSEC wise?

Marc Anderson: Yes.

(Alex):   Okay.

Marc Anderson: Yes. Similar - I think it's similar to name servers. It's optional to provide, but if it is provided, it's required to be supported by the registrar and the registry. So yes. So it's optional in the same sense that name servers are optional.

(Alex):   Right.

Berry Cobb: All right. Thank you all. I definitely agree with Alan's point that we shouldn't lose sleep over this, and Marc said in the chat. So at least we're now - at least with DNSSEC, I think I have that filled out in the next week. And we'll go with that for the next iteration.

But again in general, just a quick thumbs up, thumbs down, at least in terms of any transmission or any disclosure processing activity, we're happy that domain name, name servers, DNSSEC and name server IP address for end zone TLDs, those would need to be transferred or disclosed to satisfy the activation and allocation of the name.

Hearing or seeing nothing, so let's move on to 1b. Again, I'm not going to focus so much on the processing activities. Again, Alan, just read through those to make sure that I captured your changes appropriately. And we can we can circle back to that.

But what I did want to focus on now is the suggested changes as it relates to what was proposed for 1b. And I think, again the purpose for 1b is that it's establishing the rights of the registered name holder. And I think for the most part, for 1b, the collection processing activity, column one, essentially mimics what we had listed for 1a.

But where we start to depart is the submission or the change that Alan had suggested that in terms of the transmission/collection of this data by the registry, is listed as optional. And then of course we'll come to the disclosure column in a minute.

So what I do want to refer back to people's - or refer back to what we originally had in the consolidated original Purpose 1, which was consolidated. It didn't have the breakout. There was still this requirement - I'm trying to pull up my document. Hold on just one second, please. Give me one minute please.

Actually, while I'm trying to search for the original workbook as it looked, Alan Woods, if you are still on the call …

Alan Woods: I am

Berry Cobb: … I'd typically like you to speak to how you had designated under processing activity to the transfer/collection to the registry, why all of those fields were marked as optional. And then secondarily, I'd like to note that for the original version that we had from the initial report, items like phone extension, fax, fax extension, were not marked as being required to be collected by the registrar, but yet you still have optional designations in that third column under processing activity too.

Alan Woods: Okay. So pardon me if there's again feedback. Yes. So the first one I think there's no need to answer. The reason why it's now done as optional, and this was kind of the basis of the discussion that we were having internally with the registrar or registries, and that's why it's so difficult is because depending on the business model and the terms and conditions, specifically you've heard the different type of registry.

So I'm loathe to use the term thick and thin, bus that is a good delineation. There are registries who, given them the minimum data set, will not interpret their obligations as requiring the transfer of data, of the registrant data. So it's as simple as that. But in certain situations, the registrant might say, I don't want that data because (unintelligible) and my business model does not require that data set.

Whereas for other registries, it's perfectly okay for them to justify under a 61f that they do need the data in order to maintain that. So that would be the basic simple way. It is a requirement for many, but it is also not a requirement for others. Therefore, it would be optional to be transferred because certain registries just don't want it.

For the second point, the second point was the fax and the phone. Again, given some of the - this is the, I suppose the extension of one necessity, and are we saying that something has to be a minimal data set? You can always

suggest - and again, with 61f, can you justify asking somebody to provide the fax or the phone extension?

It is not a requirement because somebody could provide just a phone number and that could be enough. But again, optionally speaking, it's not something that I would ever lose sleep over if it was an additional. I don't think that we require it from the registrant. However, it is possible for them to provide it.

So again, this is one of the things where I think it's up to the individual registrar. And I know people might have issue with that, but I think it's up to the individual registrar whether or not they want it. And then it's up to the individual registry whether or not they want to transfer to them as well. I mean it's not your club case. There might be perfectly good reasons why it's necessary in different countries for the fax, those two things, but it is possible. So I hope that answers both of them.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Alan. Before I turn it over to Marc, I'll just make a couple of comments. So, it sounds to me, based on our bad use or multiple uses for the term optional, this is definitely a different to where we need to come up with another optional for our legend.

You know, so again, there's something that's optional that a registrant may or may not provide. There's an optional about whether it's required or not by a contracted party to do so. I'm not sure what the new - maybe it's an O2, for lack of a better word, that belongs in our legend that will help us better distinguish that.

But I would just like to point out that what - you know, what I'm viewing in the screen now, which is specifically around the registrant fields for purpose 1b is that, based on our recommendation for the - from the plenary about the organization field, it seems like there needs to be an O placed in the collection area.

But secondarily, that where there's the phone, fax, those optional fields that we should delete, the Os that are listed in the transmission, just because we're not requiring that that be collected per se in terms of meeting the purpose for establishing the rights. So, Marc, please go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Berry. I mean I'm largely raising my hand to agree with what you and Alan said. And I have nothing to add to what Alan said for the first part. You know, he's spot on there. On the second part, you know, I agree with what you said. You know, basically this is yet another flavor of the word optional. And you know, I'll read from chat for Alan's benefit.

What (Alex) said is, I wonder if the German language has different words for all the flavors of the word optional we seem to need, you know, and I think he's right, because this is really - you know, I think the intent here is to have a different flavor of optional, right?

So take a phone extension for example. You know, that's optional for the registrar to collect. Obviously it's - you know, not everybody has a phone extension, right? So it's optional. But if it does exist, then, you know, and if a registrar or registry does have a need for this data and it does exist, then it would be required for the registrar to pass it to the registry.

So yes, I mean I - yes, I guess I just agree this is a slightly different flavor of optional. It's optional for it to exist, but if it does exist, it needs to be transmitted to the registry so the registry can, you know, contact the registrant. So, you know, another flavor of optional.

Alan Woods: Can I just jump in one second as well for my last intervention on the break?

Berry Cobb: Yes, please.

Alan Woods: Great. Thank you. There's just one other thing that occurred to me there. So when we're talking about this purpose specifically as well, it's not just about establishing the rights of the registrant as well. A very important line in this and again, another one longer conversation is that it is subject to the terms and conditions of the registry and the registrar.

It is important that that's there because it also represents that we would ultimately want to use that data for the delimiting of the benefits that a registrant would have. So again, the application of the AEP or the application of the terms and conditions of the registry.

So it's actually a two way street. I don't know if that adds to the conversation. I just want to make sure people are reminding that it is a two way street. It's establishing the benefits, absolutely and rights, but also it's limiting them out for the terms and conditions in AEP, and that's why the transfer is necessary so we can use it at the registry level, because otherwise it just doesn't make a lot of sense. On that, I'm afraid I'm going to have to go. So, thank you and sorry.

Berry Cobb: All right. Alan, before you go, just listen to this. So I posted into the chat kind of three generic definitions that we can work on. But optional for a registrant to fill in, but if they supply it, it must be processed. There's also optional for registrars to provide, but if it is supplied, and I guess I should add, and if it's supply - or filled out by the registrant, then it must be processed.

And then there's a third flavor of optional, which is optional for contracted parties subject to terms and conditions. So just stew on that since you're dropping. But maybe that's kind of where we need to head about further defining optional. So thank you for joining, Alan.

Alan Woods: No problem. And for what it's worth, just listen to it. It seems definitely on the right path. Absolutely. I was referring to Marc a bit on it, but it seems right in

my head. It was ticking boxes as opposed to (unintelligible). So thank you for that and I will talk to you all soon.

Berry Cobb: Great. Thank you. Alan. All right. So I've - I agree, (Sarah). We can maybe take this for an email thread. But what I would like to at least state is, so we at least have three different flavors of optional and those were on the slide definition. So more than welcome to receive input on that. I guess the question to ponder is, how do we define these in our data elements matrix?

Is it O1, O2, O3, just for shorthand code? Or do we need to have different sizes and colors of the letter? So I'm open to suggestions on that one. And (Sarah) has put into the chat that ORNH or O registrar or O contracted party. So, all right.

I'll take the action to put that to the list so that we can try to further define that, because I think as we start to apply this change, it will make the workbooks look a little bit different, which is not a bad thing. And at some point, we've got to deliver this back to the plenary so that we can prove that we're clear about that.

Okay. So, let's move beyond the differences here, but now let's kind of get into the logic. And unfortunately, Alan did have to drop. But if I understood what was supplied, it seems to me that still for what is considered or listed as optional under column two for the transmission, the 1b PA2, that we should still have the optional fields listed above the registrant fields.

Basically that they would correspond or coincide with what is listed that is being collected by the registrar. So that kind of gets to the - a more complete data set of what a - I'm not sure I follow my logic. Again, so purpose 1b is about establishing the rights of the name holder.

And so I guess really the first question is, in terms of what Alan Woods had provided about the different business models of registries, does it even make

sense that the optional fields are designated here? How does a registry receiving this information and as noted in the lawful basis that, you know, some registries are acting on specification 11 to mitigate and to mitigate abuses in their TLD.

Therefore, they're saying that they need access to this information. But I guess I further then, we need to clarify how that type of activity is associated back to the registrant establishing their rights for the registered names. And again, I don't question Alan's logic about the business models, and the need for this particular data, but I am wondering if 1b is the right home for that.

And then lastly, kind of the secondary question is, whether I was right or wrong with what I just said. You know, do the data field designations that we have start to make sense in terms of achieving this purpose? So I'll stop there. Maybe Marc or somebody can speak to see whether I'm on track or not. Please go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Hey, Berry. It's Marc. I - yes, I think it's - yes, I think, you know, yes, it's confusing. I think I get where you're going, because optional just isn't a great word for us because for registries that require the data, it's not optional, you know.

For them to meet their contracts and fulfill the service that they're delivering, that data is required, you know. But that's not the case for all registries, you know. So we ended up with this optional language because it's not the same for all registries, but for registries that do require it, it is in fact, you know, just that, required. It's not optional for them.

And so I think that gets to the heart of the - what you're struggling with. And I'm not sure I have a great answer. You know, we - as you well know, like just trying to hash this out just among registries, you know, we struggled with this question a lot, and trying to figure out how to represent it in a way that

took into account the various business models, and this is what we ended up with.

But, you know, you're - you know, I think - so I think that's a long way of me sort of agreeing with you that, you know, it's not completely clear the way it's documented in that, you know, optional is not - again, just the word optional isn't sufficient for what we're trying to describe here in these worksheets.

Berry Cobb: All right. Thank you, Marc. I think what I'll propose for the next version is, at least I still have questions about whether this optional for contracted parties to space on subject to terms and conditions is still the right home under 1b, but that's not for me to decide.

I think what I'll suggest or recommend is we continue to go with what we have. But I would suggest that in PA2, column 1b PA2, that I still supply Os where there are Rs and Os under column PA1, because that seems disconnected to me.

And I'll just close by saying that, you know, in terms of this optional for contracted parties subject to terms and conditions, it kind of takes me back in terms of finding the home, that it seems really to me, Purpose 2 is more the appropriate home because that does get into more of the SSR aspects of policing a registry or those kinds of items versus necessarily, you know, this belonging to establishing the rights of the registrant. But I'm not going to carry that forward. Marc, please go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Hey, Berry. I disagree with you on that last point. Purpose 2 is about access to the data. It's not in and of itself, you know, an SSR purpose, right? And I think, you know, the language does have SSR, but to categorize that Purpose 2 as for SSR, I think is - it's something we discussed, you know, long and hard in Toronto, right, the fact that it's not SSR.

It's sort of - you know, part of that is to meet the needs of SSR, right? But

Purpose 2 is really about access to the data. And so I wanted to make that clarification. Also like this purpose, you know, the subject terms and conditions for that, that's also not about security and stability either.

You know, one of the reasons why you would just establish - you know, one of the reasons for why registrars, sorry, registries would need this data is to keep their zone clean, you know, and do the necessary abuse protection. But that's also not necessarily SSR, and it's certainly not limited to SSR.

So there's other reasons why registries would want that data and would need to have it in order to fulfill their contract. So, you know, I think this is the right place for it and, you know, want to be careful about tying that too closely to SSR.

Berry Cobb: Understood. And so yes, like I said, I'll just kind of fill in the blanks up above in the generated table thing aspect to make that logic a little bit more sound. (Alex), please go ahead.

(Alex):   Yes, thanks. Yes, I agree, Marc. I think that's right. And I think also - and you have this as a comment, Berry, that there were some wording changes made at the end of not the call today, but the last one, which I think will help clarify kind of the point that Marc was just making. Thanks.

Berry Cobb: Great. Thank you all. All right. Let's go ahead and jump onto Purpose 2 now. And I'm going to stop at the purpose statement so that (Sarah) can memorize it real quick. I'm joking. The - so you know, this Purpose 2, again what we've been discussing is in the maintenance of SSR, which is about providing enabling responses to lawful data disclosure requests.

So the main thing again I want to talk about with Purpose 2 is really again just to clarify the thought process here and hopefully - and maybe we should have started with this one, but hopefully this starts to make a little bit more sense. Before I start, (Sarah), please go ahead.

(Sarah):   Thank you. Sorry. I was not yet done with 1b. There were a lot of Rs under the disclosure column for 1b. Maybe we talked about that and I missed it, but I'm not clear on why disclosure is required under this purpose. Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, (Sarah). Let me …

(Sarah):   Actually if I could rephrase, I would say I don't think that disclosure should be required under this purpose.

Berry Cobb: Right. And you're right. I didn't even get to finish a question about the logic here. What is presented here is what was submitted by the registries, that those would need to be disclosed and they were marked as ones or being required. Of course I changed those to required now. I see Marc has raised his hand. So hopefully you can …

Marc Anderson: Thanks Berry. I sort of - yes, I raised it, lowered it and raised it. I feel like I've done way too much talking today. But I'll just say, like I think the intent here, you know, we talk about disclosure versus publishing, right? And so I think the intent here is that this particular disclosure processing step would be disclosure from the registrar to the registry where it's required, and that it's not meant to be a publishing step, either in DNS or RDS or anything like that.

                  So, you know, maybe that's a little nuance, but if I remember the conversation on the registry side, I think the intent there was to show disclosure from the registrar to the registry. And, you know, boy, we make things nuanced here, don't we?

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Marc. And I did scroll up into the screen, which goes back to the processing activity of disclosure publication. And there was a statement listed there about establishing the rights of the RNH, ensuring subject to (10s), that the RNH may exercise such benefits, may require disclosure of

certain data elements, namely registrant details, IP addresses, domain names and name servers.

The lawful basis would be 61f should personal data be involved. I think, Marc, maybe you can take as a homework assignment to better explain why that disclosure publication is necessary, because as (Sarah) noted, you know, it is highlighted there. And so I think we need to be clear about that as it's listed down below. (Alex), please go ahead.

(Alex):   Thanks, Berry. And I think I may have confused myself. We're back on 1a, right? I think …

Berry Cobb: 1b.

(Alex):   Oh, we're on 1b now. Okay. Then I am confused. I thought we went back to 1a. So let me pin it. Thanks.

Berry Cobb: Thank you. So I think what I'll - as I mentioned, you know, I'll complete the Os in the non-public data, just so that that makes sense for BPA2. And I will highlight in the side comment about the disclosure Rs, just as a reminder that we need to get some clarity around why that data would be disclosed, and whether it needs to be an O or an R. Either one should probably require a little bit more definition in the processing activity steps. So I'll highlight that. Any opposition to that approach?

(Alex):   Berry, just real quick, it's (Alex) again. there's no opposition, but it seems maybe this is what's confused me is that we probably need to revisit the data flow map to ensure that, you know, for both 1a and 1b, when we're talking about disclosure, it's really clear as to who we are disclosing to, right?

The current flows - and I'm now seeing that you have a note saying that you're going to update these, but the current flows the disclosures to internet

users, but it sounds like we wanted that disclosure to be registries and one of those cases is not relevant.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, (Alex). And so that is certainly one of the deficiencies to the little data flow diagrams. Again, these were created shortly after LA, mostly in response to a few members stating that we needed to have data flow maps. So what you see here is we kind of pulled out of thin air.

And at the time, my general understanding was that again the disclosure in the general sense was probably to some sort of publicly available directory. But obviously there are more nuanced details about exactly what is being disclosed and who it's being disclosed to.

So I will also highlight that as an action item for the registries to come back and make clear that that disclosure is actually occurring through the registries only. And therefore the data flow diagram would - the one - what is now listed as 1PA3 would be nested close to the registry icon, and then we would remove internet users altogether.

All right. Any last comments about 1b? Okay, let's move on down back to Purpose 2 to then. Again Purpose 2 is enabling lawful data disclosures, or you know, the "access purpose". So what I wanted to explain here, I think this one is - I guess for the first part of the moment, assume that the use of optional that I've made some changes that we've discussed here that we need to further define optional.

But I did want to explain how there are some blanks under collection when we see required under transmission or disclosure. And the rationale for that is to better delineate the input provided from (Francisco) that some of these data elements either aren't generated at the registrar, or not collected by the registrar, but in fact either are collected or generated by the registry as there - as that data is transferred to them.

And of course in nanoseconds apart, also collected by them. So for example, registry, domain ID, updated date, creation date, registry expire date, all of those are left blank because one way or another, that is actually being established in EPP by the registry when that domain is getting activated in (unintelligible).

For example, just kind of stepping down as we discussed earlier, registrar registration expiration date, the intent was optional, but if a registrar and as Marc explained earlier, if the registry allows it and it's populated, then of course it then becomes required.

So, you know, that one subject to change based on our new delineations of optional. But again, my primary motive here was to better explain why some of those data elements were blank at the collection processing activity, but that they're showing up for transmission or disclosure.

And so I think what you'll see now is a little bit more uniformity in terms of this purpose of enabling lawful disclosures that we I think properly defined what data elements do need to be collected, whether it be optional or not and again, subject to change.

But at the same time, that data is not only collected at the registrar, but eventually it is transferred to the registry, i.e., that they're collecting that data. And then in a general sense, the disclosure of that data mimics what had been processed prior to that based on a lawful, legitimate interest request for that information to be disclosed.

And so I think that it goes all the way down to the very last fields. So I'll stop there. Is there anything of looking at Purpose 2 that seems odd? Again, noting that we're going to fix the optional stuff in the next version. (Sarah), please go ahead.

(Sarah):   Yes, thank you. Just thinking, and I'm sorry, I was pulled away for a moment, so I might have missed something, but some of these data that are listed as required for disclosure, might only be disclosed - only a subset of these elements might be disclosed depending on the requester's legal basis to access the data, right?

                  So like is there some way to indicate that here, or is it kind of understood that although they are required, they might not all actually be disclosed? Do you know what I mean? You think that's just understood?

Berry Cobb: I do understand what you mean. I suspect we won't have greater clarity around that until there are some phase two type discussions. And as I alluded, for sure I think it all depends on, you know, what is being - actually being requested and then of course, you know, what's the balancing - again, 61f that would dictate what some of these are being, disclosed or not.

                  And I'll remind you that prior to our discussions on Tuesday, that the reason why so many of these are still listed as R under disclosure, is because the concept of what fields are going to be redacted or not, and our ill attempt at properly documenting it in the initial report about some kind of publicly available directory, that's where the connection was made.

                  So I think it would behoove us now that the possibility of including or documenting some sort of publicly available directory and denoting which fields are going to be redacted or not, now that that's been moved the Purpose 3, it will require us to recheck whether this logic makes sense, that all of these fields would be disclosed.

                  And so I'll - that is kind of our next homework assignment for this one. But I will kind of remind - before I turn it over to Marc, I will remind us that we are getting into the limitations of what these workbooks can do for us in reality. And in reality, and again as I understand, there is going to be some sort of publicly available directory to look up registration data, but it really all falls

around about what exactly is going to be disclosed that is non-public as it relates to this.

And so I'm not sure we're ever going to get to that detail until we have those more in depth discussions about what access looks like, how it's going to work, what's going to happen, who's going to do it and all of those things. Marc, please go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Berry. You covered that pretty well. I'm not sure I can add a whole lot here. Let me just carve - this is - we're looking at data for Purpose 2 now?

Berry Cobb: Yes.

Marc Anderson: Okay, because I mean, the short answer on the disclosure is, right, it depends on disclosure to who. But I think under Purpose 2, I think what we've agreed generally is that any data collected for any of the other purposes, ultimately is sort of in scope for a Purpose 2 disclosure request, right?

And so, you know, I don't know - there, you know, I don't know how much time we want to spend defining terms, right? But under disclosure, right, it's all of it, you know, really. Any - I think our discussions have been any data that's collected for any other purpose, you know, could be disclosed under Purpose 2.

You know, of course, as (Alex) notes here, under 61f there has to be - you know, there's this balance that occurs, right? But I think sort of the intent that any of this data could be disclosed, you know, if proper justification exists.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Marc. And that's kind of what I've struggled with as well. You know, I think that that was the general understanding when we started forming and norming this particular purpose. And you know, almost or near some sort of agreement for it being a purpose in our documentation.

In so far, or as specifically as you stated that, you know, whatever data is collected, it's - for any of the other purposes, it's kind of fair game that if it's a lawful disclosure, it's past the balancing test, then likely they would all be disclosed.

The problem that we have here, and we're going to run into this again when we get to Purpose 4, is that we're supposed to be looking at each one of these purposes in isolation as though it's the only purpose. So then it begs the question, do we need to properly document that the collection and transmission columns essentially are designated or, you know, are filled out based on all the other data elements that are being collected or transmitted across purposes?

I probably didn't do a good job explaining myself there, but for example, we know that another purpose has optional for phone, fax or fax extension and set aside the variabilities of our use of the term optional. But we don't have it listed here, but in another purpose, they are designated as an optional. So why shouldn't they be showing up here?

So, you know, I guess we're kind of in a conundrum that, you know, we're not supposed to refer to other purposes and look at these in isolation. But again, in reality what we're running into is that, you know, chances are if it is collected and processed, it's probably - and as long as it's lawful, it's probably fair game that it's disclosed. Marc, and then (Sarah), please.

Marc Anderson: Marc again. Yes, I mean I think you got to the heart of it. I mean, you know, I think also we're not collecting for this purpose and we're not - and we wouldn't transmit for this purpose, right? And so the disclosure requests would go to whoever is authoritative for the data.

So, you know, I think we all agree. We don't collect for the data. And, you know, just disclosure. You know, I think your initial comment is that we're

sort of limited - you know, we're running up against the limitations of the workbook model, I think.

And I think, you know, you said that's sort of at the top of this discussion. I think you're sort of spot on there and that, you know, we're trying to make this fit where maybe it's not a great fit. But, you know, I think basically what we're trying to say is, you know, a disclosure request under Purpose 2 can occur for any data that's collected for other purposes.

You know, we're trying to take what's generally a straightforward concept and map it to this data elements worksheet, which, you know, we might be - in this case, we might be spending a lot of time for - trying to make that work with maybe limited value. And just sort of stating what we're trying to accomplish might get the job done there.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Marc. (Sarah), please go ahead.

(Sarah):   Thank you. Yes, and honestly at this point, I'm not sure if I'm agreeing or disagreeing with what you're saying. But I'm not sure that disclosure under this purpose is legitimate for data that's collected under other purposes. Like if - I mean we said this is something we've talked about in ICANN compliance, specifically that if they obtained data for - in terms of data retention, right?

The data that's retained for a specific purpose, can't be used for another purpose. We have to understand the purposes upfront and then only use data for the purpose that we have documented and disclosed. Right? So if we are collecting data here for the purpose of, for example operationalizing policies for resolution of dispute, if we're collecting the data for that, but then we're disclosing it for this purpose of security and stability, I don't think that works. I think we do have to look at them in isolation.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, (Sarah). And before I go to (Alex), that's kind of what I'm contemplating. It seems to me that, while not trying to violate the principle of looking at these in isolation, that it might behoove that the - for lack of a better word, the - you know, kind of the authoritative column here is about what data could potentially be disclosed in a lawful request and identify that.

                But in - for the purpose of our conceptual aspect of our workbooks, that that would also dictate that we would need to fill in the columns for collection or transmission just so that it squares up. Again, we're looking in - at these in isolation.

                And so the example here would be that, you know, phone extension - you know, one way or another that is an optional field for a registrant to provide. The registrar provides the - can provide that option. One way or another, if it does get filled in, it is likely to be transferred to the registry, and then ultimately can be a candidate for being disclosed down the road.

                So, you know, again, I think it's more about just reaffirming the fact that we're trying to look at this in isolation, and it will probably force us to add more designations to data elements that would potentially be collected to satisfy this particular purpose. (Alex), please go ahead.

(Alex):   Thanks, Berry. Yes, I think we're all on the same page here. If we are going to make sure these - each purpose of each workbook for - associated with each purpose, stands alone, then I think what we have - what's currently documented is correct.

                I just - I'll note a few things. One is, you know, the description of 2PA3, disclosure of non-public already cut through registration data and third parties, you know, references kind of long debates, discussion and compromises that we had I think, (Sarah), before you joined.

                So I would just be super wary of making changes to that assumption. But if

we could describe what we're doing here and the importance of thinking about each of these in isolation, you know, with the common understanding of the data that is available.

But I think we'll be okay. But if we start kind of renegotiating or changing, you know, wording and agreements here, then I think we're on a slippery slope and I would just try to avoid that. Thanks.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, (Alex). Marc. Marc, I thought you dropped.

Marc Anderson: I think - yes, I think if I could suggest - you know, (Alex) makes a good point and I think we're maybe, you know, mincing words a little bit here. I think we just - you know, as long as we make it clear that it's not an automatic disclosure under that column, you know, and I think (Alex) had some terms there for earlier in the chat. I think as long as that's clear, I think we're, you know, we're fine. So it's - yes, I think I'll just stop there before I talk too much longer.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Marc. So I think I have a path forward here. And like I said, I'll make some suggested edits just to clear up the data elements table, but it really seems to me what we're truly talking about probably is more applicable in the processing activities table and us accurately documenting what is really going on here, more so than just necessarily the logic of what's occurring in the data elements table.

But I think we are fairly close to here. So for the sake of time, we've got about 24 minutes left. I want to go ahead and move on to Purpose 3. And what you're going to find here is that this continues our discussion around some of the logic changes that we had.

And so just as a reminder, this purpose is to enable communication with the RNH on matters relating to the registered names. So as a reminder from what we talked about last Tuesday, is that the first - there's two primary

things that are going on that have changed this data elements table quite dramatically.

The first again is the discussion we've had about a publicly accessible directory. And then secondarily is, what's the appropriate home or how that's disclosed or published? I'm still unsure which term we should use. But then more importantly, if it is published, you know, what fields are going to be redacted.

So you'll see in the processing activities table here on page 21, that I've tried to be more precise, especially as it gets to the disclosures. So PA3 is about disclosure of this registration data to enable the communication with the RNH. And I'm - even though it's not filled out yet, my understanding is that essentially this is the disclosure that is taking place with either a registry or registrar so that they can enable that communication with the registered name holder.

But then secondarily is, and I should note that this is where the recommendation about the email field, and as I understand, the recommendation set is still mimicking what was in the temp spec, but there's some sort of web form or anonymized email address that would be made available, that any internet user could click on and try to connect or communicate with the registered name holder.

But it wouldn't be - no publicly identifiable information would be made available in that communication method. So that's PA3. Then PA4 is getting to the notion of this publicly available directory. And I'm trying to be specific here again. Disposure of public already collected registration data to internet users. And you'll see over to the right that I've at least put the initial mention of this minimum public set of registration data.

And then lastly, PA5, which is about the redaction of this data to internet users. So how you see that translated is now down in the data elements

table, and where you're going to start to see the logic breakdown is when I transferred PA5, which had a highlight of which fields would be redacted and which ones don't.

You know, it shows a yes no indication of what you're going to see is that that doesn't square with the previous processing activities of collection and transmission. And because at the original time or at when Purpose 3 was created and we started to build these workbooks, there was very thin data elements discovered that would be needed to facilitate this purpose.

And so you can start to see on column five, especially in the registrant fields where there's a sort of disconnect that's occurring about what would be classified as being redacted or not. and I do apologize, you're going to start to see that this table looks destroyed and that my registrant fields and my admin fields, I've lost the 10 solid bar going across. So I need to fix that so that it displays correctly.

But I think again the main takeaway here is first, can we find agreement amongst us that this is, can be the home of where we try attempt to document what a publicly available directory might display or publish I should say. And then secondarily, does it still make sense - or I should say, back to the first part, of what can be publicly displayed or published in that it still supports the purpose of enabling contact with the registered name holder.

And then secondarily, does it make sense that this is - because this is where a publicly available directory will show up in our documentation, does it still make sense that the proper home to document the redaction of those fields occurs here in this purpose? So I'll stop there. Marc, please go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Berry. It's Marc. The answer to all your questions is yes. You know, I think this is the right home for it. I think that does make sense. I think we can come to agreement on this. So, you know, you might have asked

another question in there that I think my answer was also yes as you were going through it.

you know, for me, I'm drawing a little bit on my experience from Next Gen RDS, but you know, I think for me, contactability is, with the registered name holder or their designated agent, like that is the reason for a public RDS. You know, without this justification or without this purpose, you know, probably RDS goes away, right?

And so this is sort of the linchpin purpose for having an RDS system. I think this is the right place for it to live. And I think we can come to an agreement on there. Probably, you know, as you were going through the explanation, you know, just to echo what (Sarah) said, we appreciate your efforts on this one. And the fact that you lost the bars on the admin field tables, we're not going to hold against you.

But I think probably the only thing I disagreed with you on, as you were going through all that is, you indicated that this would be for data collected only for other purposes. And there I found myself disagreeing with you, because I think you would collect data, or I think data would be processed for this particular purpose.

So to use an example, you know, if you - we've talked a lot about, you know, we'll take the tech contact. We'd have tech contact on here. You might designate a technical contact, you know, really to give a different contact point for your registrar.

But chances are, you know, if you're providing a technical contact that's different from yourself, you're doing that, you know, for purposes of publishing in the RDS. So if there's a technical issue, somebody contacts your technical contact and not you.

And so, that was really - I was nodding to almost everything you said. You

know, I agreed with how you laid it out and that this is the purpose for RDS. So it's - you know, I'm glad we're having this conversation. I think it's a good conversation. But, you know, the one area I think you can justify collection for this purpose, and it's not just publication of data collected for other purposes. Otherwise, great job. Thanks, Berry.

Berry Cobb: Great. Thank you, Marc. So yes, I think we're close on this one. I just need to clean it up and make it pretty and complete the logic in terms of where some of the fields are listed as redaction. There needs to be a designate prior processing activities. So I'll take that on.

So that completes half of the agenda, mostly what I wanted to get through today. What I will do, since there are some changes for purposes 1a, b, two and three, I'm going to work on that this afternoon. I will get out a cleaner, clean - a more clean, less scary version of these top four purposes for you tonight.

Definitely please review them and I can hopefully use some feedback or at least a sanity check of a thumbs up, thumbs down that that's still the right approach because that will enable me to complete four through six Friday and part of the weekend.

Seven is pretty easy. There wasn't - other than just some tidying up of some of the language and the rationale statement, that one's easy. So it's really about getting this applied to three through six, which - I'm sorry, four through six which have their - I think four should go a little bit easier, which is dealing with escrow of registrars and registries.

Those were probably our most mature of our workbooks. But based on some of our small changes here, there'll be a few changes there. Purpose 5, we'll probably want to spend the most time on next Tuesday. I'm going to - I'll - over the weekend, I'll do a sanity check about adding a couple of other

disclosure steps to complete the end to end of what it looks like for like a UDRP or URS.

(Alex), I think you did mention that your IPC and BC colleagues were talking about some suggested changes for the workbook about six. So if you can maybe send me some of those over the list as well as what you've - what your group is looking at. But I will start to make those changes so that we have a good draft ready to review on Tuesday when we meet. I lost my train of thought here.

So as - in terms of purposes four through six, I'm not going to scroll through them here. Really the only changes that I made to those were to convert our ones and dashes to Rs and Os. Oh, I remember now. One thing that I will highlight for you when I send this out tonight again is to spend some brain power about our 3O or optional designations. And I'll try to provide some examples in one through three sites that are especially used, a sanity check on that before I transition that logic aspect over to the other workbooks.

Then, I guess last thing that I'd just like to talk about is in preparation for the plenary meeting on Tuesday, again it didn't happen today, Marc, but probably will be an agenda item for next Tuesday, at least about 20 minutes. I think we do owe the group a pretty healthy update with what we're doing.

I would maybe suggest that a decent part of that update should be to discuss the concept or the result of the split of purpose one into A and B so that the plenary is brought up to speed about what happened there. It didn't seem that there were many objections to that split. But we just need to finish that out.

But what I would recommend that the secondary topic fee is maybe around Purpose 3, because we did make a pretty substantial change in migrating that stuff from two to three. So I think it would help to inform the group that they understand that.

And more specifically, you know, that we hadn't really discussed this publicly available directory or minimum data public data se, that - I think that there are probably some different perceptions about what that really means. So I think it would help to discuss that with the plenary. (Desiro's) text. So in this document, or to answer your question, there are no other versions beyond Alan's redline, other than the fact that I did import it into this doc.

So if you do have suggestions or edits, you can make them to the doc that you already have, and I can pull those into my master version, if you want to do that over the list. There was also a separate document that was sent, I think back on Monday or Tuesday, where Alan had responded, and you're welcome to use that one. I can copy those over as well.

All right. So that's it for me. Any parting thoughts, complaints, gripes? And if not, then I'll see you over the mail list or hopefully through the weekend. And for sure, let's touch base on email on Monday to see where we're at. Like I said, expect something later tonight about a rework of our purposes one through three so we can chew on that over the weekend. And then we'll definitely see each other on Tuesday.

(Alex):   Thanks, Berry. Awesome.

Berry Cobb: All right. Thank you all. Take care. Have a good day. Good weekend.

(Sarah):   Thank you.

                              END