

**ICANN
Transcription
Next-Gen RDS PDP Working group call
Tuesday, 12 December 2017 at 17:00 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. The audio is also available at: <https://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-nextgen-rds-pdp-12dec17-en.mp3>

AC recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p867ldqw664/>

Attendance is located on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/MgByB>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Operator: Excuse me, the recording has started.

Julie Bisland: All right, thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone, welcome to the Next Generation RDS PDP Working Group call on the 12th of December, 2017. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. If you're only on the audio bridge would you please let yourself be known now?

Sara Marcolla: Sara Marcolla on audio bridge.

Michael Palage: Michael Palage is on the bridge as well.

Evan Smith: Evan Smith also.

Julie Bisland: All right, so thank you. All right, and I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise.

And then with this I'll turn it back over to our chair, Chuck Gomes.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Julie and welcome, everyone to the working group call today. Sound like there may be three people who are on audio only. I think all of you know what to do if you want to speak so let us know and we'll get you in the queue; everyone else can raise their hand in Adobe.

So you can see the agenda in Adobe, if you're in Adobe, if not it was sent around. Does anyone an update to your statement of interest? Okay, then let's go ahead and jump right in. You can see in Adobe, if you're in Adobe, again if you're not in Adobe the link to the presentation was sent around to the working group so I hope you have it in front of you.

The first thing we're going to do is look at our poll results. They were quite definitive this week, or last week. So we'll complete deliberation on the poll results and move into the data elements for domain name management as well as some talking about the definition continuing from last week and on list.

So if you take a look at Slide 3, you can see a quick summary of the results from the poll. And one of the things we can do, I think safely this time, is finalize another rough consensus working group agreement. In this case, at least for those who participated in the poll, it was unanimous. Everybody that took the poll agreed that domain name management is a legitimate purpose for collecting some registration data. So we will add that to our list of tentative working group agreements. And that'll be the first action item from this meeting.

And what we're going to do next is look at the definition of the domain name management purpose, we had quite a bit of discussion on that last week, and have a little bit more this week, although we're not going to spend a lot of time on that. You'll notice in the results on Slide 3. That's a little over 70% of those taking the poll supported the definition that's given there in Item B from the poll. And so that was pretty strong.

But if we look at the comments, and particularly I want to call your attention to the first comment from Stephanie, because she suggested a little bit different approach and so would like to get a sense from those on the call whether you support Stephanie's approach – there's a couple things we could do, we could merge it with the definition in Item B, or we could maybe redo the definition. But again, we don't want to spend a lot of time on the definition, a lot more time, because quite a bit has already been spent.

So take a look. And for those that aren't in Adobe, let me read the definition in Item B for you in case you don't have it in front of you. It's the one we created on the call last week which is "Information collected to create a new domain name registration, enabling management of the domain name registration, and ensuring that the domain name registration records are under the control of the authorized party and that no unauthorized changes, transfers are made in the record."

And again, for those who may not be in Adobe, let me read Stephanie's suggested definition. She said, "Creating, managing and monitoring a registrant's own domain name," excuse me, "for the beneficial interest of that registrant including creating the domain name, updating information about the domain name, transferring the domain name, renewing the domain name, deleting the domain name, maintaining a domain name portfolio and detecting fraudulent use of the registrant's own contact information."

Now, the – just to set the stage a little bit, the drafting team for domain name management took a little bit different approach, they left the definition at a fairly high level and then in their document that they submitted to the working group, they listed the various tasks. What Stephanie did here, is she actually included the various tasks in the definition. Either way, we will look at the tasks individually when we're looking at what data elements should be collected for this purpose.

But I'm curious if there's any discussion. And the – about this, do people support Stephanie's approach over the one in Item B of the poll? Or you okay with Item B? And we can even maybe merge the two and we'll put up one way to do that in a little bit. But first let me just open it up for discussion, anybody have any strong feelings about this? Let's go to – if you go to Slide 4 you'll see both of the suggestions.

So Comment 1 is the first thing that's shown on Slide 4. And then if you combine that with Option B, we could go – we could do something like that. Just want to get a sense of those in the – on the call about this. And let's start with Andrew. Andrew, go ahead.

Andrew Sullivan: Hi, it's Andrew Sullivan. Thank you. Just to make this a little more complicated, because of course we didn't have that problem already, there was also a discussion on the list this week that raised an interesting wrinkle in this definition, and that is that it's somewhat circular. So the registrant of course is the contact that's associated with the domain name in its registration record. The problem with that is that if somebody manages to create a change in the registration record such that the registrant has changed, then the original, you know, presumably legitimate registrant is no longer the registrant and any of these definitions have this problem.

I don't know how to fix that but as long as we're going to spend a lot of time, you know, working the text over, we'll need to fix that as well if this is going to be a formal definition that is going to be useful in that sense.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Andrew. This is Chuck. So everybody, keep in mind how we might be able to fix any one of these definitions or what final definition we end up with while I go now to Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I'm talking about the first one. Two points. Number 1 the reference for the "beneficial interest of the registrant," I have a – some trouble with that if I'm understanding it correctly. If someone has registered a domain

name for malicious perhaps illegal use, I'm not sure I want to only use that information for the benefit of that registrant. So I think we have a little bit of a problem there.

And the second question – the second thing I have is a question, what does “detecting fraudulent use of the registry’s own contact information” mean in the context of data? How does data detect things?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. This is Chuck again. Does – looks like Michele may want to respond to that. Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Chuck. Michele for the record. Just to Alan’s query there, I think it’s because what a – what registrants can do and I know that some definitely do is making sure that people and, you know, generally third parties, aren't either using their contact details without their permission or the changes to their contact details aren't made without their permission. I mean, the classic example that I was given a few years ago was I think it was – it was one of the big brands, it was like Louis Vuitton or one of those, and a lot of fraudulent domain names are registered where all the contact details are Louis Vuitton except for the email address.

Now somebody else could correct me if I'm wrong on what that reference was in relation to, but I believe it was that. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Michele.

Michael Palage: Chuck, can I get in the queue as well?

Chuck Gomes: Alan, a question – go ahead – Alan, go ahead.

Michael Palage: No, it was Mike Palage.

Chuck Gomes: Oh it was Mike. Okay, I thought it was...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Sorry, I didn't hear very well. Mike, go ahead.

Michael Palage: Yes, I just would want to confirm what Michele has said. Prior to the use of the SMD files, I could attest that during previous sunrises in connection with the 2004 round there were some individuals that would seek to use the credentials, everything except the email address, to masquerade themselves as a trademark owner. So I would just want to confirm what Michele has said.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Mike. Greg, Greg Shatan, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. A couple of thing. First, it might be a little more clear or maybe not, on that very last point in Paul Comment 1 to say maybe use such information to detect fraudulent use or something like that because it's clearly not the data that is – the data is being used by an actor or an algorithm or something to detect the fraudulent use. But that's kind of wordsmithing level comment. And I think the meaning is probably clear enough the way it is.

I have a couple of other problems or comments on Paul Comment 1. I'm not sure why it says "a registry's own domain name." If the distinction is just between that and monitoring third party domain names for which you have no responsibility, then that makes sense, but if this is somehow meant to distinguish between kind of self-management and management for clients or others who retain you to do that then that doesn't make sense.

And the beneficial interests, you know, beneficial interests is a legal term of art, and I don't know that we necessarily want to get into using terms that have legal meaning under at least, you know, certain legal regimes unless we know exactly what it means and why that is being used and what it's

intending to include and what it's intending to exclude or if it's just, you know, handy borrowing of something that sounds about right.

But I would caution against that unless we want to, you know, really understand what beneficial interest means and how that differs from title and legal interest and other such things. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Greg. Jim Galvin, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: Thanks, Chuck. James Galvin for the record. The one particular point that struck me that I wanted to bring up is I question the phrase, you know, "detecting fraudulent use of the registrant's own contact information." I'm having trouble jumping to how that's relevant in a definition and how the registry system is going to achieve that. So I guess I don't really agree with that particular additional phrase that Stephanie is proposing there.

I'm actually much more aligned with exactly what's in D at the moment, I like the definition that's there, I think that it encompasses everything that at least has always been the points that I think are important. So – and I actually agree with all the questions that have been raised about the different phrases, the use of the word "owned," the use of the word "beneficial interests" in what Stephanie wrote there so I just want to support other questions that have been raised about the suggested alternate words and put my vote in for the definition which is already there in B. thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jim. And thanks, everyone, for the good input. What I'd like to do is call everyone's attention to the middle paragraph on Slide 4, and again for those that aren't on the Adobe I'll read in just a few seconds. And see if that addresses some of the concerns, and if not, how could it be modified maybe to address the concerns that have been raised?

So for those not in Adobe, it says this, "Domain name management is a legitimate purpose for collecting some registration data based on the

extended definition.” Now we’ve already agreed that there’s already a working group agreement that we will record, after this meeting on the first part of that, but here’s the definition – the extended definition which is kind of a combination of what Stephanie’s suggestion and Option B in the poll.

So it says this, “Information collected to create a new domain name registration enabling management of the domain name registration and ensuring that the domain name registration records are under the control of the authorized party and that no unauthorized changes or transfers are made in the record.” I think there should be an “or” in there – “or transfers are made in the record.”

So what do you think about that? Is that a way that we can kind of address the concerns? Now we still haven’t addressed Andrew’s concern, I don’t think, so keep that in mind as well. But it – did we address some of the other concerns that were raised if we were to accept this formulation of the definition? Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thank you, Chuck. Actually what you just read was Option B as it appears in the poll.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, I’m sorry. Okay.

Lisa Phifer: So it is not merged. But I have put in chat a potential merged version.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, and I had advance knowledge that that was coming and I forgot that we were going to propose that if it seemed to fit what people were saying. So and let me call everybody’s attention to what Lisa just put in the chat is a merging of Stephanie’s input with Option B from the poll. And, Lisa, would you read that one for those who are not in Adobe, please?

Lisa Phifer: Sure. This is Lisa Phifer for the transcript. So one possible way to merge the concepts in Stephanie’s comment with Option B, which was the favorite

option from the poll would be, “Information collected for the benefit of the registrant to create a new domain name registration, enable management of the registrant’s own domain name registration, ensure that the domain name records are under the control of the authorized party and no unauthorized changes or transfers are made in the record. This includes performing tasks that include creating the domain name, updating information about the domain name, transferring the domain name, renewing the domain name, deleting the domain name, maintaining a domain name portfolio and detecting fraudulent use of a registrant’s own contact information.”

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Lisa. And if I can just suggest one thing, if we were to take out from that “for the benefit of the registrant” to deal with one of the issues that was raised, would anybody object to that? See a problem with that? So you might put that in parentheses for now or however it’s easy, Lisa, just to show that one clause at the beginning of that definition.

And let’s open it up to discussion. Rod.

Rod Rasmussen: Thanks. Rod Rasmussen. So a couple of things, I think Andrew’s raised an interesting semantics issue with the circularity. I think you could say something like “the legal registrant” or something like that or “legitimate registrant” because that would – that you could at least tie to something, some sort of definition versus necessarily the current registrant, which get you into that...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Rod, before you continue, and I will let you continue what you wanted to say, but so in other words maybe instead of “deleting for the benefit of the registrant” saying “for the benefit of the legitimate registrant,” is that what you’re suggesting there?

Rod Rasmussen: Correct.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Rod Rasmussen: And I'd like – unfortunately it doesn't look like Stephanie's on the call. But I found her change – that further language intriguing as in what she did was basically just take the EWG definition and add in some information around to the benefit of the registrant. I'm assuming that is in order to fit that purpose better and to what privacy legislation would require something like that.

So I'd really like to know the genesis of that, but if that's the case I think that's a fairly easy add because you are, in this particular instance, worried about who's actually registered this domain name.

There may be other use cases where you have thing where it might be somebody else's benefit, but this is about control and management of your own domain name (unintelligible). So that gets to the other point, I was kind of addressing something Jim brought up a minute or two ago around that monitoring of your information that – and I put this in the chat but if I remember right this – that phrase, which is in the EWG definition, was put in here because it was the best fit for where it was without creating some totally new category of stuff. And we already had plenty of categories of stuff.

And while that stuff is right this is done for expediency sake so your slides don't have, you know, too many little bubbles on them and things like that. The – I could certainly see splitting that one off as a totally different type of use case because I may not have any domain names registered but I want to make sure my information, let's say my home address or me as a company, does not appear somewhere as being associated with any domain names. I want to be able to do that if possible. And in theory you could do that with an open public database. And people do do that all the time in the current system.

But that doesn't have anything necessarily to do with controlling my own domain name. It really has to do with controlling my information being used for any domain name. So I could see splitting that off into a totally different category of purpose. And in fact I think part of it would be – would be logical to do so since it doesn't really fit here necessarily and you don't – and again as I said, it doesn't – doing that doesn't require you to own any domain names, it's just a matter of nobody who's registering domain names better be using my information to do so.

So I think that's an important distinction. It's the one kind of odd duck in that list but I do want to point out that managing a portfolio of domain names is important because large corporations tend to own, you know, thousands, tens of thousands of domain names and want to manage them in a way so that it's as efficient as possible (unintelligible) and if there's a change of control it happens easily. So that's – I would not get rid of "portfolio" because of that but that particular use case. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Rod. So just a follow up question, this is Chuck, so do I understand you overall that you like the approach that Stephanie took, and probably would support some variation of the merge that Lisa put in chat? Did I conclude right from that?

Rod Rasmussen: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. That's what I thought.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I didn't want to – I wanted to confirm that I was hearing you correctly and Stephanie's not on to respond but thank you for doing that. Greg Shatan, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. Rod said about 3/4 of what I wanted to say so maybe I'll be a little shorter than I would be normally so I agree with everything Rod said. I would just note that "for the benefit of" and "beneficial interest of" are two different things. So they actually, you know, are meaningful different so we need to, again, watch language here. I hate to be lawyerly but it's going to get interpreted by lawyers, so we may as well think about it now.

There are a couple of other awkwardness's in what Lisa posted...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Hey, Greg, before you go to those, let me interrupt you because I want to follow up on what you just said. So would the same issue that you're raising with regard to "benefit of the registrant" apply if it said "benefit of the legitimate registrant"? And then maybe a different question, would you prefer just leaving out that clause, "for the benefit of the registrant" or for the – have it "for the benefit of a legitimate registrant"? Could you respond to those questions before you go on to the other things?

Greg Shatan: And I'll also answer Lisa's question in the chat. Overall I would probably be more comfortable taking that language out. From my point of view it doesn't add anything but as Rod knows, we need to kind of know why it's there and if it's serving a purpose, what it is. If I was choosing between "benefit of" and "beneficial interest of" I would go with "benefit of" because "beneficial interest of" creates more definitional problems and issues.

And I don't like that "legitimate registrant" thing. That kind of just takes us way down a rabbit hole. Maybe we need to deal with that issue somehow of, you know, essentially domain management by squatters and other illegitimate third parties. I don't know where we get to that. That's kind of a very odd abuse case, domain name mismanagement or something. But it just kind of gets us in an odd place.

I understand why it's being said but it really kind of relates to that fraudulent use issue which as I agree with Rod, is – it maybe something that domain name managers do but it doesn't make it domain name management as a classification issue; it probably goes somewhere else into the kind of fraud and abuse sub category and not into the domain name management issue.

Which is not, again, to say that domain name managers don't do it, but we can't say that everything that somebody who calls themselves a domain name manager does is, per se, domain name management, because clearly they're taking a lot of actions on behalf of the domain name owner, which may be themselves or a third party or a client or a employer or whatever it maybe, they can't all be domain name management because they're probably taking every action that a domain name owner is taking and probably would fall under a lot of categories.

So we just have to kind of deal with that as a classification issue. I'll keep the comments on the second sentence includes issue for another time. Just to say that – but I will say that we need to be clear whether it includes names including without limitation or including only the following, is it meant to be an exclusive list or is it meant to be an open ended list of which we're getting example, that's one of the kind of classic problems with using the word "includes" or one of the classic ambiguities. And we do need to deal with that. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Greg. Lisa, could I ask you to take that formulation that you put in the chat and put it – maybe it's already there, I haven't looked at the notes real closely, if it's already there then just let us know where it's – put that formulation in the notes so that it doesn't disappear in the chat as people add new comments. Looks like maybe you put another formulation in. Let me look at that.

Okay, so there's a new formulation in there now. We're not going to do a lot of wordsmithing on this call because that doesn't work very effectively in a group this size. But let's just take a few more minutes to see if we're close to a formulation that people would accept. And I'm – forgive me for pausing but I'm trying to keep up with a lot of comments in the chat. So notice the alternative combination is in the notes now.

And there's been several things in the chat that I'll try to catch up with. A couple people, I think it was Marc and Jim, liked the formulation that – the Formulation B in the poll better than this merged formulation. And I wonder if I could ask one or both of you to explain that verbally on the call here rather than people having to go back and look through chat. Jim, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: So thanks, Chuck. James Galvin for the record. You know, I actually – aside from the one comment I made about the way we were – Stephanie was phrasing the – let me say, I'm sorry, let me start again. I don't have an issue really. I'm mostly neutral with Lisa's proposed change. I would make the observation that while it's nice to add the examples of what the definition of tasks is, you know, now that we start getting into – once you add more sentences you just add other questions that come up.

You know, it was Greg who raised the question of now we're saying "includes performing," you know, these tasks are include creating well, is that intended to be the complete inclusion or is it an open ended inclusion? So are those just examples? I just think that simplicity is always better and I believe that the additional sentences and changes we're suggesting are covered by the proposed definition in D so that's why I wouldn't add them although I'll reiterate, as I started, you know, I'm not opposed to adding that extra – that change in formulation. I'm really kind of neutral on it so except for the other questions that others have raised. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jim. Let's do a – I'm going to do a quick poll in Adobe and for those that aren't in Adobe, if you would speak up at some point in this little diversion

here that would be helpful. How many – put a green checkmark in Adobe if you like – you support the idea of listing the specific tasks in the definition. If you don't care you can – you don't need to respond. If you oppose that put a red X in the Adobe, if you can.

And for those who may still not be in Adobe, if you'd like to just speak out right now and say whether you oppose it or support it. Again, let me repeat what I'm asking is, excuse me, do you support adding the specific tasks as part of the definition or do you think that it's better that the definition be at a higher level as in Option B in the poll.

Again, we're going to look at the specific tasks when we're looking at data elements so either way we're going to end up the same, it's just a matter of which definition. So I'm seeing some red Xs in there. I'm not seeing anybody that – and I see one green checkmark. Okay. And then a lot of people don't care either way is okay.

So I can do one of two things here, we can just accept what 70% of the people in the poll supported, the definition there realizing that we're going to look at the different use cases or tasks when we look at data elements. Or we could create a – ask a couple people to go back and come back with a different definition, I guess I'm kind of leaning for just towards accepting the definition in B in the poll if there are no big objections.

Is there -- and you can remove your Xs and checkmarks now please. Is there anybody that opposes just going with Definition B from the poll and then we'll look at the tasks themselves when we look at data elements. Anybody opposed to going that approach?

And if we do, I guess the corollary, please raise your hand or speak up if you can't raise your hand in Adobe, if you oppose what I just suggested, in other words, we'll accept maybe with one more look at it, the definition in Option B of the poll which is, again, for those in Adobe, "Information collected to create

a new domain name registration.” I’m going to come back to that word “new” in a minute – “enabling management of the domain name registration and ensuring that the domain registration records are under the control of the authorized party and o unauthorized changes or transfers are made in the record,” so we’d insert an “or” there.

Anybody opposed to just accepting that one for now realizing we can always come back and change the definition later and we don't need to let the definition overly restrict us in our deliberation going forward. Not seeing anybody that – no hands raised or anybody speaking up.

Now let’s just briefly talk about do we need the word “new” in – “a new domain name registration”? Several people in the chat – and I’m sure I haven't kept up with all the chat - I know I haven't, but we could – any problem with deleting the word “new”? So just say, “create a domain name registration.” And I’m sure – others that have kept up with the chat better than I have, if you want to suggest any other fairly minor edits to this.

So Option B, Maxim, is on Slide 4, the middle paragraph there, the definitions in that paragraph, if that’s what you were asking. Okay, then let’s – so no objections to moving the word “new” for new domain name registration? Trying to accommodate what a couple people discussed in the chat and if there are other things that somebody else noted in the chat I haven't please speak up now.

So – and I’m going to talk to the leadership team members on this, you think it’d be a good idea to put this definition into our poll for this week just to give other people a chance to see it, do we need a poll or do we just document it as the definition that we’re going with for now? Any on the leadership team have an opinion on that, a suggestion?

I can – I myself – I can go either way, just documenting it as a definition or if you think it’s useful for those not on the call especially as well as to confirm

those who are on the call, their feelings, anybody want to venture your opinion on the leadership team?

Or even somebody not on the leadership team if you think it's beneficial to put this definition with a couple modifications into a poll, just speak up and we'll do that, otherwise we'll just document it. If anybody supports a poll we'll do that, otherwise we'll just accept it and declare it as the definition that we're using going forward until such time as we might change it.

Okay, then let's not spend any more time on this. I agree with Lisa that the changes were, I think fairly minor in what we did to it. And she listed those in the chat.

Okay, very good. Let's keep moving then and thanks for the good participation in that. So looking at I guess we should – Slide 5 if would look at Slide 5 if you're in Adobe, and for those not in Adobe, Slide 5 lists the data that the drafting team for domain name management listed as necessary for this purpose, in other words, necessary – I'm going to conclude from that that it's necessary to collect for this purpose.

Okay, now we're going to look at that data relative to the different tasks for domain name management, not just as one whole group so keep that in mind. And again, call your attention to the criteria on Slide 5, "Why is each data element necessary? What are the consequences of not collecting it? Is the use proportional to strike a fair balance between all interests concerned and the data subject rights and freedoms?" and so forth.

So focus on those – on those data elements. I'm not going to read through the data elements for – sorry, for those not in Adobe, but it is in the handout if you can look at the handout on Slide 5. And let me go to Marc.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Chuck. Marc Anderson. I have a request, I guess, for an additional consideration. You know, we've just spent some time, you know, deliberating

domain name management and I think, you know, the working group you know, strongly agreed that this is a legitimate purpose and we deliberated on a definition of what domain name management means. And, you know, came to pretty good consensus on what that means.

But something has been bugging me, and I think what's bugging me is we need to – we need to provide sort of the because. So we agree that domain name management is a legitimate purpose and we agree on the definition of domain name management, but I think we should – I think we should state, you know, as a working group I think we need to state why we think it's a legitimate purpose.

And I think based on our deliberations we're really very close to doing that, we just haven't taken it sort of the extra yard there and saying, you know, information collected to create a domain name registration and so forth, is a legitimate purpose, you know, because.

And, you know, I'm just spit balling here maybe it's, you know, because collecting this information is necessary to ensure the security of the domain name registration or something like that.

You know, I'm not proposing anything major but I think you know, I'm thinking of it for two purposes, I think it'll help our working group if we have that definition captured somewhere, and I think it would also, you know, thinking in terms of, you know, GDPR and other privacy regimes I think it would really help if we had, you know, if we didn't say our reason is because we deliberated and agreed that it's a legitimate purpose.

I think it would really help if we were able to provide a – provide the because, you know, we think it's a legitimate purpose because these things are necessary.

((Crosstalk))

Marc Anderson: That make sense?

Chuck Gomes: So Marc this is Chuck. I have a follow up question for you. So isn't the because implicit in some of the tasks? For example, isn't the because to create a domain name registration, that is the because for somebody who wants to create a – and we have to decide which data elements, but isn't that the because?

Now in some cases, in some of the tasks, it may be better if we were – we added a little bit to the because. But it seems to me that in some cases the because is kind of implicit in the task itself. To...

Marc Anderson: Chuck, I agree entirely. I think it is implicit and we've really kind of, you know, and that's why I think you know, most of the work is done; it's sort of implicit in the definition. But I'm asking we go the extra yard and instead of leaving it as implicit we go ahead and create a definition that makes it explicit so that there's no question later when we come back to it or when somebody else is reviewing or critiquing our work.

Chuck Gomes: So, Marc, I'm going to give you a task, if you will accept it. What I'd like you to do – not on the call, okay but after the call if you would come up with some modifications to the definition that accomplishes that you're talking about and put that out to the list this week so that people can comment on that, I would appreciate that very much. Would you accept that task?

Marc Anderson: I would but I think there are probably, you know, if nobody else will volunteer to do that I'll do it. But I think there are probably some people more qualified than I am particularly people that were on this particular subgroup, if one of them who are more qualified and willing to take this up, I think that would be great, but if nobody else is willing to I will certainly do it.

Chuck Gomes: Does anybody want to join Marc, including people who are the drafting team, if you would identify yourself then he'll know who to communicate with. Everybody is going to leave it to Marc all alone.

Well, Marc, put it to the list and they'll have a chance to comment, and if it's something that you really want input from somebody else who has different expertise, just identify that and what you're doing. Jim, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: New topic, Chuck, so finish your thought there.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, so Marc, if you'll do that and sorry we didn't get any other volunteers, but – and then just put it out the list so that we can have discussion on the list is week before our meeting next week and hopefully get a point where we can see whether there's support for that and maybe have something formulated that people can consider a little bit further.

Okay, let's move on. Jim, your turn.

Jim Galvin: Thanks, Chuck. James Galvin for the record. So you were asking for – you're looking for discussion on these list of elements for this purpose. And I'm going to assume that's where you're at and so I want to make two comments if that's okay.

Chuck Gomes: Are they high level comments, because we're going to break it down into tasks before we look at specific data elements. For example, what I'm going to do, Jim...

Jim Galvin: Okay, then I'll...

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Jim Galvin: Yes, I'll make one comment and then if it doesn't fit you can set it aside.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Jim Galvin: So I was going to ask for discussion on the inclusion of technical contact and administrative contact because I was going to question whether those particular sets of information fit the definition of management of the domain name from the point of view of the registrant. I appreciate that those things might come into play in other purposes, but I'm – I wanted some discussion on how they're relevant with respect to this particular purpose. And I leave it to you, Chuck, to either set that aside or take that on. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, let's move ahead but let's not forget it, okay? So let's now look at the – now keep this – you may want to refer back and forth to Slide 5 and then Slide 6. Okay?

The Slide 6, if you look at that or if you can't look at it I'll go over it, are the six tasks that the drafting team listed in the document they presented to the working group with the domain name definition – or domain management definition. And we're going to look at each of those individually.

Okay so the first one is "Create registrant ID, create a domain name, add DNS data for a domain name." Okay, those are tasks lumped into one category by the drafting team, and you can see that's also included in Stephanie's list of tasks. Now for that – those tasks, "creating a registrant ID, creating a domain name, adding DNS data for a domain name."

Going back to Slide 5 are there any of those data elements that the drafting team identified as necessary for domain name management, that you think are not necessary to collect for those specific tasks basically related to creating a domain name.

And, Jim, it's coming back to you and we'll do this several times, but I'm guessing that you probably think we don't need to collect technical contact

and administrative contact for this particular set of tasks, related to creating a domain name, is that correct, Jim?

Jim Galvin: Yes, that's correct, Chuck. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Now, a question for you, Jim, the – if a technical contact is required, and actually I think we've decided that if it's not required the registrant contact, but if they want to provide a technical contact, wouldn't that be – need to be collected if they want to provide one for creating a domain registration? Why do you think that wouldn't be necessary?

Now we've given them the option that they – go ahead.

Jim Galvin: So – yes, so what I was going to say, Chuck, is I'm answering the question in a very hard line kind of way, but I'm actually trying to motivate some discussion on this point. So first point is coming from a clean slate, so I'm totally ignoring anything we've done historically, okay?

So that's off the table, I have none of that to depend on. So the question that I would ask is the purpose as we've described it seems to talk about managing the registration of the domain name and registration information.

With that in mind, I'm focused on the answer to the question, "What do we have to have in order to accomplish what it is we're trying to do?" And so technical and administrative might be optional, that's fine, that's a down the road discussion.

In terms of what must be present in order to accomplish the purpose at hand, I'm questioning whether they need to be there and asking for some discussion on that point. Does that help? Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Very much. I thought you said that very well, Jim. This is Chuck again. And let me put it out to the rest of the group, I thought Jim made a pretty good

case for the fact that – to create a domain name we don't necessarily have to collect technical contact and administrative contact as part of that management purpose. Does anybody disagree with Jim on that? Andrew.

Andrew Sullivan: Hi, it's Andrew. And I was part of the – this design team and I don't speak for the others but I don't think there's a problem with what Jim is saying. There are other purposes that give us reasons why those contacts are necessary but this purpose does not.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thank you, Andrew. And it looks like, Maxim, do you – is that an old red check – red X or do you disagree with Jim on this? Go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. My thinking is, administration of where a domain is registered – domain name is registered...

Chuck Gomes: No, hold on...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Hold on, let me correct you there. Just a second, Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: All we're talking about right now is one set of tasks under domain name management, and that's to create a registrant ID, create a domain name, and add DNS data for the domain name. And Jim is saying he doesn't think that it's necessary to create – to collect a tech contact and an admin contact for just those purposes.

Forget the other parts of domain name management right now. Do you think that it's necessary to collect technical contact and administrative contact specifically for creating a domain name?

Maxim Alzoba: I think there is a reason for collecting\ at least technical contact.

Chuck Gomes: For creating a domain name?

((Crosstalk))

Maxim Alzoba: If it's put into use in four hours and something goes wrong, and the technical data – contact data is not there, what do we do?

Chuck Gomes: You're right, Maxim, that we need that technical contact for other tasks, but do we need it to create a domain name? Now obviously if the name servers are incorrect, we'll need it for that, but we've covered that kind of already with regard to tech contact. So you haven't convinced me that we necessarily need it to create the domain name. Let's go to Marc, he may be able to add some clarity here.

Marc Anderson: No, I was going to move onto a new point you know, I agree with Jim said, I don't think for this purpose, technical and administrative contacts are necessary.

Looking at this list, you know, I have a couple other thoughts, you know, I think that the dates listed here are good, the domain name status is good, I think that fits well within you know, the purpose of this.

I also question, you know, registrar abuse contact. You know, I...

Chuck Gomes: Okay, Marc.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Let me stop you there. Okay? I want to close on these two. What I'm sensing right now is that there's no strong disagreement, assuming Maxim agrees with my statements there, on eliminating technical contact and administrative

contact as domain name elements that you necessarily need to collect for creating the domain name, the one task of creating a domain name. Okay, I see a green checkmark and, Maxim, you want to say more? I'm coming back to you, Marc, so leave your hand up, please.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. I think if the domain name cannot be put into use then technical information is not necessarily at that moment of time. So domain name is registered but no name servers, nothing. Then we don't need to have it.

I have an example, the Internet regulator in Russia, they have a bad habit of applying some special ISP filters to some domain names they don't like and we experience situation where bogus domain names were registered on purpose listing our DNS servers, which has nothing to do with it. And we had issues like talking to regulator because of this, just as an example.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks.

Marc Anderson: Chuck, can I respond to that?

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, yes.

Marc Anderson: So setting aside my other point for now, just to respond to Maxim, I don't disagree with his point, I just think it's a different purpose that he's describing, it's not – so I don't disagree that it's a legitimate purpose, I just not sure it's a domain name management purpose, it seems more like in an abuse purpose. Just my two cents there.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, thanks. And Maxim, please understand we're not saying that technical contact isn't important, or even that administrative contact isn't important, we're just saying that it's not an absolute requirement for registering a domain name. Okay? For that specific purpose of registering, okay.

We're not saying it's not important and won't be collected for other reasons. Okay. So let's go ahead and conclude that out of this list on Slide 5, technical contact and administrative contact are not essential to collect for that first task.

And now let's go to Marc and he wants to identify another element in that category.

Marc Anderson: So thanks, Chuck. Marc Anderson for the record. Two points, you know, the one is the registrar abuse contact. Again, I think this is a perfectly legitimate field and so I'm not arguing against its inclusion, I just don't think it's, you know, it fits in with this particular use case, domain name management.

So, you know, again not opposed to that particular field, I'm supportive of it in fact, I just don't think it fits under this purpose.

And then one other point, registrant organization and name servers, neither of those are required fields. So you can create a domain name registration without name servers and certainly there are plenty of registrants that are not affiliated with any organization. So my thinking there is, you know, these are – these fields are necessary if they exist. So you know, maybe – if exists or, you know, a little asterisk, if exists or if applicable or something along those lines. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Marc, this is Chuck again. So would you agree with me that if they do exist they need to be collected, right?

Marc Anderson: Absolutely, which is why I...

Chuck Gomes: Yes, okay.

((Crosstalk))

Marc Anderson: I didn't say they should be removed just I don't want to – I don't want it to be construed that we're saying they're required.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Well they're required if they exist, right?

Marc Anderson: Absolutely, but...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...maybe we can just qualify – we can maybe put qualifiers by them. Let me jump to Lisa before I go to Jim. Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. Just for consistency, I remind you that when we did our previous purpose we tried to focus on the data that was absolutely required and leave the optionality and the conditions for optionality to kind of a next pass on data elements.

Chuck Gomes: I'm missing your point, Lisa.

Lisa Phifer: My point is we don't need to worry about whether – at this stage of our deliberation whether something is, you know, always there and always populated, if it's needed that's what we're trying to identify in this pass.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, got it. Thanks. Sorry, I was a little slow on that. So Marc, my – I'll go to Jim and then I'll comment. Jim, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: Thanks, Chuck. James Galvin for the record. A – to build on what Marc was saying, I want to raise a point of distinction here, Marc commented about registrar name and registrar abuse contact, well he only said abuse contact, I'm going to lump registrar in there.

Again, if this is intended to represent data to be collected and it's needed for the registrant's registration management purposes, I agree with Marc that

those are not things to be collected, however, one distinction I would make is, there's collection by the registrar and there's collection by the registry.

Registrar name and abuse contact are not collected by a registrar, they are derived by a registrar or provided, depending on how you want to put that category. They might be collected by a registry, but one could also argue that they're not really collected by the registry either because a registry would have knowledge of who's providing the information and they could derive that data and stick it in there.

So I just want to make that point also that it's not clear to me that registrar name and registrar abuse contact are at all data elements that should be in the category of collected. And so I'd appreciate some discussion about what collection really means because I think that those could be derived data elements. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jim. And let me go back, and I know the word "collected" has haunted us for months, right? When we say "collected" let's accept the fact that in some cases it's not literally collected, it is derived or even created as part of the process. If everyone can just kind of accept that so that we don't get hung up – continue to get hung up on the word "collected." We realize that everything isn't literally collected.

It's collected in a sense from the registry who creates something or from the registrar who creates something rather than collected from the registrant. So in that sense I think it's okay but rather than get hung – continue to get hung up on that if we could accept that I'd appreciate it.

Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Yes, thanks. Just following up on that. Michele for the record. This came up in – guys on the Eco meeting and all this about the playbook, and there's a number of data fields that are associated with domain names and it's not

even a question of them being even derived, as James is saying, I mean, we specifically are asked at the time of signing up with a registry operator to provide various contact points.

So there's – various data points so the abuse contact is one, there's the – if I get this wrong – the referral URL, the Whois server, and there's a few other items like that that are collected at the time that we execute a contract with the registry operator.

In light of some changes made by – during ICANN policy updates and what have you, and I think possibly stemming from some obligations in the base Registry Agreement, there's a few other bits and pieces that registries now are asking of – asking registrars to provide.

But again, the term “collection” is very, very confusing because it's not collected at the time of registration, it's associated with the registrar account as it were. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. So to use the term shared by Jim and starting from a clean slate, okay, is there anybody that disagrees with Marc in the sense that to create a domain name registration you don't have to collect a registrar abuse contact for that purpose; you may have to collect it for other purposes, and that's fine, we'll get there, but any disagreement with Marc on that?

So in other words, we would add registrar abuse contact to technical contact and administrative contact that's not being absolutely essential for creating a domain name and the things that go with that task. Anybody disagree with that?

Michael Palage: Chuck this is – Chuck, this is Palage, can I raise my hand about that?

Chuck Gomes: Sure, Mike, go ahead.

Michael Palage: Yes, the only word of – the only bit of caution I would raise here is as Michele said, in the Eco framework proposal that's been – that has been discussed over the last two weeks, there's been a recognition that there are some registry operators that actually have an interest in vetting the registrant even prior to them going to the registrar, for example, the (unintelligible) proposal by Amazon.

So I just want us to be careful that there could be some business models that are still evolving in the marketplace and I just want to put that out there that there are some restricted TLDs where they ask some additional PII or credentialing information from the registrant, and that could actually take place even before they go to the registrar itself. So I'm not disagreeing with Marc, I just want us to go into this eyes wide open as to some emerging business models in the marketplace. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Mike. That's appreciated. But from a point of view of collecting data or deriving data for the purpose of the RDS, not in any way restricting what a registry or a registrar might collect or derive for their own purposes, it sounds like there's no strong disagreement with Marc with regard to registrar abuse contact. Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Chuck. Yes, well first off to Mike Palage's comments, totally agree. But I think the question, Chuck, you were asking was around what you know, what is absolutely necessary in order for a domain create to occur. I think that's what you were asking. I mean, the fact that you might be required to add other bits of data is neither here nor there because that's – it's not specific to the purpose of creating the domain name.

So, I mean, if you want to reduce it right down and be completely minimalistic for this specific purpose of just creating the domain, realistically you just need the domain name. There's very little else that you need, you don't need the name servers, you don't need – you don't need the registrant details at all. You just need the domain name.

Chuck Gomes: You don't need a phone number or email or...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: If you're just – if you're just – if it's just to create the domain name, with nothing else, and not associating it with anything else, then yes. But once you start actually adding you know, associating with it registrants and everything else, then obviously you do need to add more data.

But I mean, just looking at it terms of what a lot of the registrars would do during a land rush is that they would often create the domain with the absolute bare minimum of data, absolute bare minimum and then they would go back in afterwards and populate it with both, you know, with all the extra bits and pieces.

So, you know, if you wanted to be very, very minimalistic, and I see on the chat somebody is asking, "Can you create a gTLD domain name without a registrar?" No, but you're not actually collecting that, the registrar is assigned, I mean, the registrar with the user name of X and the password Y coming from the IP Z with the SSL cert whatever, is known to the registry, they know exactly who it is.

So it's not a matter of, I mean, you're not collecting anything, it's already you know, the fact that that user is able to log in and send a command means that that is registrar X. So, you know, it's not, you know, you don't need to collect that as it were. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: And if – thanks, Michele. Chuck again. And so I don't disagree with you, if we want to be real picky on this that all you need a domain name, but I'm not sure that's helpful for us to take that approach. Jim, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: Thanks, Chuck. James Galvin for the record. Actually I'll challenge Michele in the following way. I don't believe our goal here is absolute minimization, or minimization because the definition actually says managing the domain name and I think that that requires being able to interact with a registrant, it's not just to create, it's about the management after the create of that registration.

And so I would argue that given the purpose as specified you do need contact information for the registrant. You know, if our purpose was just about creating a name, you know, then I would agree with you completely. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jim. So I'm going to jump maybe unfairly ahead here a little bit, but before I do that, Maxim, go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba. Just small note, registry needs information about registrar for billing purposes. That's it.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Maxim. So so far we have I think eliminated from this list on Slide 5 technical contact, administrative contact, registrar abuse contact, for the purpose of registering the domain name. Okay?

And the things that go with as listed by the design team on Slide 6 – or was it Slide 5, which am I going backwards the wrong – no, Slide 6, okay. The – are there any other data elements here that we would include with those? Jim.

Jim Galvin: Yes, Chuck, registrar name. And, yes the registrar name to go with the registry abuse contact. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: So registrar name would be automatically assigned, right, because they have to use a registrar to – so in essence it's one of those derived things, is it not?

Jim Galvin: Yes, and I would, I mean, it could be and I would argue that registrar abuse contact could also be derived. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: How would registrar abuse contact be derived?

Jim Galvin: Because keep in mind that in the – in the system as a whole registrars have to register with a registry, right, they have to be accredited, and they have to have a relationship, a contractual legal relationship with the registry.

And as part of all of that setup all information could be known and passed on in exchange between the registry and registrar, and of course the registrar has a certain communication path with the registry and all of that could be a known quantity so that none of this actually has to be passed. I mean, it's collected in a very broad definition and understanding of collection, but it doesn't have to be provided part of the transaction. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thanks, Jim. Maxim, your turn.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba. I have a hard feeling about name servers and technical contact. I meant if we collect name servers, then we might need technical contact. If we at the registration phase do not collect name servers, then we do not need technical contacts because we don't have something to ask them. Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Maxim. Greg Aaron. Greg Aaron, are you on – it looks like you're on mute according to Adobe. There we go.

Greg Aaron: Chuck, can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Greg Aaron: Okay. One of the things we're not distinguishing between is whether something is technically required or is required by policy. For example, you can create a domain name without providing a technical contact.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, well we've already...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: We've already decided Greg that technical contact is...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Aaron: But is that a good idea? One of the problems you have with domain names is you collect a set of information but then you need something else later how do you ensure that you get it. The other problem is when you're talking about collection, yes, you are collecting the different source, but you've already gotten it from the registrar.

So, I mean, we're arguing about semantics at this point. We really are collecting that information, we're bringing it in from somebody at some point and we're storing it.

So I think it's a fine – too fine a distinction here. Registrar identity is not only necessary but it is collected. And if you're going to have a domain name in the gTLD world, where we have registrars who collect it, period.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. So I'm starting to wonder, now based on what happened in our meeting last week, we decided to – and look at Slide 6 for me, with me, the different tasks associated with domain name management. To look at these individually with regard to data elements, I'm starting to question whether we need to approach it that way.

Could we look at these data elements as a block? That would be much faster, rather taking all six of them one by one. Is there value in looking at each one, because they are a little bit different and that was pointed out many times in our call last week, would it be possible to look at all of these tasks as a group and do what we just did for just the first task and look at the data

elements? That would be much faster. Does anybody see a problem with that?

Okay. So let me broaden this then, okay wait a second. Marc, go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Sorry, Chuck. It's Marc Anderson. I'm not quite sure I follow that you're suggesting. Are you suggesting that we look at just the first task and use that as a – and use that to apply to each of the data elements as a proxy for all six tasks?

Chuck Gomes: No, not really. What we – what the plan was is to take each task one at a time and see which data elements are essential to collect for that specific task. And then where we're going to go to Task 2 and do the same and Task 3 and Task 4, etcetera. Okay? What I'm asking now, is it possible for us instead of taking the tasks one by one, to look at them as a whole and consider the data elements?

Now that still leaves the option that if certain data elements are not needed for one but are needed for two, we would include that data element for collection so it wouldn't – it would still leave that flexibility. It'd just be a lot faster if we looked at it as a whole but if that doesn't work, we'll go one by one.

Marc Anderson: All right, thanks...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: And that's what I was doing going one by one.

Marc Anderson: Got you, Chuck. Thanks for your – thanks. That helps.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So does anybody oppose going – looking at it as a whole instead of the tasks one by one? Okay, so then let's go back to those data elements,

keeping in mind all of the tasks that were listed by Stephanie and were listed by the drafting team.

Let's first of all focus on technical contact, administrative contact and registrar abuse contact, which we, I think have pretty much agreed aren't essential for the first task. Are they needed for other tasks under domain name management?

For example, Task 3, manage set of domain names to keep them under same administrative control. Would we need the administrative contact there? I'm not suggesting one way or another, I'm just trying to give an example. Jim, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: Thanks, Chuck. James Galvin for the record. I have a concern with Task Number 6 because in the – assuming we're starting with a blank slate, then I don't think that's a relevant task because that can be present in all cases and it's always true and for every purpose it needs to be there.

One presumes that the point of our exercise is creating the policy which is going to make all of this relevant. So I don't think that Item 6, I hope that's clear – I don't think that Item 6 is actually a relevant task because that's a – something which comes next. It doesn't apply now in a clean slate scenario. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Jim, do you think that would come under the regulatory control purpose?

Jim Galvin: It could, it might. I have to look at that purpose definition again to be sure, but, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So that aside, since you spoke here, Jim, put that one aside, Number 6. Do you think that – since you brought it up first, the tech contact and the admin contact are necessary to collect for any of Purposes 2, 3, 4 and 5?

Jim Galvin: And I would say no, I don't think that they're absolutely essential.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And Marc, I'll pick on you now for domain abuse contact, do you think that it is necessary to collect in the RDS for Tasks 2, 3, 4 and 5?

Marc Anderson: This is Marc. Yes, I don't think it's necessary for these tasks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you. Now let's go to the whole working group, again, just focusing on those three data elements for now; we're going to look at all of them. Jim, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: So I'm sorry, Chuck, just to add, you keep only saying abuse contact, but – and I keep trying to add registrar name in there. It falls into the same category or at least if we want to make it different then let's, you know, make that different and call on that one too.

Chuck Gomes: Well registrar name, Jim is derived; it doesn't make sense to me to say that it can't – it will be collected by default, by the process unless we change and don't use registrars anymore.

Jim Galvin: Why doesn't the registrar abuse contact – I'm just trying to tie it with that. Seems to me those two things go together. Anything you can say about one you say about the other. I mean, I'm happy to be...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I don't get that maybe somebody can help me get it. I don't see how they're tied together.

Jim Galvin: I assume Rod wants to answer that question, he's got his...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yes, Rod, go ahead. Rod, maybe you can...

((Crosstalk))

Rod Rasmussen: Yes, thanks. Rod Rasmussen. Yes, I'm with Jim on this one. The registrar abuse contact is determined by the registrar, not the registrant or anybody else. It is a set value, the registrar may change that over time, but that is completely a derived item or piece of data when you're creating or even modifying, what have you, a domain registration, it's whatever the registrar decides it is.

You know, the registrar has no influence on that other than choosing a different registrar which will have a different registrar contact derived by that registrar.

So this seems rather, you know, you pick a registrar that means you get along with that registrar that registrar's abuse contact. Ipso facto or whatever legal term you want to put on there. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: So is there support then for excluding registrar in addition to registrar abuse contact? Anybody disagree with that on the – on the call? Andrew, go ahead.

Andrew Sullivan: Hi, it's Andrew Sullivan. So I am okay with saying that all of the – all of the associated data having to do with the identity of the registrar is not collected as part of creating a registration. But the identity of the registrar as such is collected, that is you need to collect the registrar by virtue of the registrar creating the registration.

That is required because, to go back to what we said earlier, that is required because if you don't there is no path from the registry to the registrant. That path is through the registrar so you must know the identity of the registrar in order to – in order to manage the domain name – the domain name object. So if...

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Sullivan: ...none of the details, the names or anything like that, what you need actually is the registrar's identifier and there is in fact a registrar identifier that is established I think it's in an IANA registry. That's really what you're using.

Chuck Gomes: That's where – you're expressing where I was struggling, Andrew. Maxim, I agree with you, maybe “stored” is a better – stored in the RDS is a better word to use. But the fact that it – we're not – we don't care whether it has to be collected from the registrant or it's collected from the registrar or – I think that part is – isn't so significant. The fact that is it stored, I do like the use of the word “stored” maybe better than collected – collected continues to create problems. But I agree with Andrew that you have to store the registrant – the registrar name in there. Jim, go ahead. And we'll have to wrap it up with this one.

Jim Galvin: Right, so thank you. Having listened to Andrew, I realize now, yes, that's correct, you need to have a reference to the registrar and I was being triggered inappropriately by the – because we use registrar name it should simply say that the registrar identifier is really what that should be there and then I'm good with that staying and the abuse contact being removed as Marc was suggesting earlier. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: So just before we wrap it up then I think the one – here's what we've accomplished so far, I think, and we'll test it in a poll if there's no objections to that, is that of the data elements listed by the drafting team, we've identified three that are not absolutely necessary to collect for the purpose of domain name management. Is that a fair statement? Does anybody object to that? Because what we'll say in the poll is nobody objected to this or maybe one person objected or whatever. Jim, new hand?

Jim Galvin: Yes, so I'm sorry, Chuck, but I just wanted to call out to you that a question was raised in the chat room. I was scrolling back to see who said it. I can't find it but I do remember the question. They asked whether or not administrative contact is needed for Item 3. And so the question is...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I think I asked that.

Jim Galvin: ...know you're at the bottom of the hour and have to move on so I'll stop.
Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I asked that and didn't get anybody suggesting that it was. So I asked that as an example, but thanks, Jim. So if there are no objections then, we'll poll on that. Lisa, are you clear on – and Lisa or Marika, are you clear on the essence of the poll question?

Lisa Phifer: Chuck, this is Lisa. I've put in the notes on the right a proposed agreement to poll on, "That for the purpose of domain name management the following data listed on Slide 5 is not needed: tech contact, admin contact and registrar abuse contact." And we probably don't need to refer to Slide 5, you can probably just say the following data...

Chuck Gomes: Yes, right. Got it.

Lisa Phifer: ...is not needed.

Chuck Gomes: Got it. Thanks, Lisa. Okay. Steve, I assume your question is – has been answered, Steve Metalitz? If not, raise your hand or speak up. The – anyway all right so we're out of time, we're over time in fact. So we'll poll on that. For those that have more comments, you'll have a chance in the poll to comment. And we'll continue this discussion next week and look at the rest of the data

elements related to domain name management purpose. So Greg Shatan, what is that X for?

Greg Shatan: You were asking if there was any objection to that conclusion so I'm objecting.

Chuck Gomes: You're objecting to the poll question?

Greg Shatan: And Steve Metalitz did as well. To the idea that nobody objected to the – I think we should ask the question, but I'm just saying that my answer would not be that none of those things are required for domain name management.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, I'm totally confused, Greg. Are – do you think we should not ask the poll question as stated in the notes?

Greg Shatan: I'm saying we should ask the poll question but you asked whether anybody objected to – I thought you had asked whether anybody objected to the conclusion that the following three or four elements were not needed for domain name management.

Chuck Gomes: Okay all right, so...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...so it's okay to do the poll.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay, Lisa go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. Lisa Phifer for the record. Just as we did when we were discussing technical issue resolution, we'll list these three data elements and

we'll give, in the poll, everyone an opportunity to indicate whether they support those being required or not required for this purpose.

And if you think they are required we'd encourage you to include some rationale in the comment so we can seed next week's discussion where no doubt we'll continue this.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lisa. Hopefully that's clear. All right, we went over time, if my memory is correct, the meeting next week will be at our alternate time and we will be continuing on the agenda for this week including, you know, the poll. And if somebody can convince the rest of the group that one of those three elements are needed even if it's just for the small purpose, then we can change – we won't make a conclusion as stated in the poll.

So all right so anything else that we need to cover before I adjourn? Thanks, everybody. I think we made some progress and we'll keep plugging away. I'm looking for anything else in the chat. Okay, with that said, meeting adjourned. Thanks, everybody. Have a good rest of the week. The recording can stop.

Julie Bisland: Thank you, Chuck. (Jay), would you mind stopping the recordings please? And everyone else, have a good rest of your day.

END