

ICANN Transcription
Next Generation gTLD Registry Directory Services to Replace Whois
Wednesday, 16 August 2017 at 05:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording Next Generation gTLD Registry Directory Services to Replace Whois Call on the Wednesday, 16 August 2017 at 05:00 UTC. 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.

Attendance may be found at: <https://community.icann.org/x/WmfwAw>

Recordings may be found at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-nextgen-rds-pdp-16aug17-en.mp3> AND
<https://participate.icann.org/p51uddrvk3b/>

Coordinator: The recording has started. You may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you ever so much, Sam. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everybody. And welcome to the Next Generation gTLD Registry Directory Services to Replace Whois call on Wednesday the 16th of August, 2017.

In the interest of time there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken on the Adobe Connect room only. If you're on the audio bridge could you please let yourselves be known now? I know we have Daniel Nanghaka on the call. Has anyone else joined? Hearing no further names, I'd like to remind you all to please remember to state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Please also keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

With this I'd like to send it over to Chuck Gomes. Thank you, Chuck. Please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Nathalie. Does anyone have a statement of interest update? Okay. Moving right along to Agenda Item 2, one we've been on several weeks now, and again, the charter question is, "What data should be collected, stored and disclosed?" But really – the only portion of that we've really been focusing on is collected, and continuing on our development of some key concepts.

So let's look at the poll results. Thanks for putting those up. And we have the participants on there. Everyone has scrolling possibilities there. And you can see we have 30 people. We had one person that came in late so that's not included in here because he missed the deadline, although, you know, I know I personally took a look at what was said and it kind of – it didn't really change any of the results but it was taken into consideration even though not officially because of missing the deadline.

So there you can see the results. Nothing particularly conclusive in terms of the results. You can see A and C were pretty strong, and there were some interesting comments. So what I'd like to do first is open it up. And I know we don't have very many people on the call but I think there's a couple that took the poll, two or three it looks like that took the poll. If you made a comment and would like to give it here on the call or if you didn't make a comment and you'd still like to comment on this particular poll question, which is really our only one this past week, please feel free to do so now, just raise your hand or in the case of Daniel, he can – if you just let me know and you can have the queue, Daniel. Anybody who'd like to share a comment?

Whether you put something in the queue or not. Alex, good, you're one of the people who responded. Please go ahead.

Alex Deacon: Thank you, Chuck. Yes, so I figured I might as well jump in here and just make the comment that I made in the poll. My preference was for C because I think it reflects existing (unintelligible) requires the collection of email, phone and physical address that I believe is outlined in the RAA if I'm not mistaken.

But I think the way I interpreted choice A I think that would work also because it seems to imply that there's one mandatory to collect contact method, the two alternative contact methods that themselves are also amended to (unintelligible) which would mean three in total. I may be misinterpreting that. But so from my read I think C is – would be my preference and A could also work. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alex. This is Chuck. And that's kind of the way the leadership team analyzed the results, very similar to what you just said, A and C aren't terribly different. Now one of the things I want to clarify though, because in some of the comments it – and even I think there was some discussion on email too – there seemed to be some confusion and people were thinking that Concept 29 that we already agreed on was being put aside. We didn't intend that, sorry if it came across that way. So – and I think Steve Metalitz may have addressed that, if not in his comment in somewhere else.

But we weren't making any changes to Comment 29 or Concept 29 that we already had rough consensus on and that email – there should be an email address collected. So there was no intent to change that with these options. These are in addition to that conclusion so I hope that clarifies any confusion that there might have been on that.

Okay, anybody else like to comment? Okay. Go ahead, Michele.

Michele Neylon: Good morning, Chuck. How are you?

Chuck Gomes: I'm good.

Michele Neylon: Yes, this is crack of dawn and my coffee is still not fully working but it will be – start working shortly. No just looking at some of the comments on this one, I think some people may have interpreted this slightly out of context. I mean, the discussions we've had around this initial – this initially was, you know, if somebody – if the only email address that somebody had provided was linked to a domain name and the domain name was offline, how the hell do you contact them? Or the scenario that I would have thought of initially would be person signs up to register a domain name using their freebie email, switches over to their – using their domain name but doesn't update the details or – and there's – there was no kind of easy way to collect that second email address.

Or another option that we had discussed in a few places was that as (unintelligible) change, there might be other methods of communicating with people that the current system doesn't support so this is where this alternative thing came from. And we (unintelligible) really suggested that it was going to replace the standard contact details that we were already getting. It was more to allow for that kind of flexibility around supporting other communication methods.

The one area I think that I personally do have some kind of reservations, which is why I think I opted more for C than I would for A, is that I would be a little bit concerned about trying to load everything into some kind of centralized system whereas as the registrar we probably have quite a few bits of information about a client/registrar. So which is why I would kind of be looking at more in terms of hey, if people would like to do this, let them do it but let's not make it mandatory. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Michele. Anyone else like to comment? You'll notice that Marika put in the chat a statement, and we can modify that a little bit if you like or whatever, we kind of worked it over a little bit as a leadership team yesterday, or on Monday, that's yesterday for me, I'm like Alex so this started at 10 o'clock at night on Tuesday for me. But the – so I'd like everybody to look at

that statement, okay? What we're proposing, and we're opening that up for discussion right now, as a possible key concept the statement that Marika put there. And Lisa did a first cut in developing that. For personal reasons she couldn't be with us today.

But you can read that and see what you think about that, see if you have any questions or comments or adjustments. I'll read it for the sake of Daniel who's not on the call – not in Adobe, excuse me. "In order to provide resiliency to overcome communication failure, at least one alternative contact method," and then in parentheses, "possibly multiple alternative contact methods must be supported by the RDS as an optional field or optional fields."

And so I mean, what do you think of that? Is that something that anybody objects to? If so, what are your objections? Do you have any suggestions for edits? Let's talk about that for a little bit. Okay, good, Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Yes, I don't know, I just feel like throwing something in here I suppose. Michele for the record. Yes, the I mean, the reason I like the statement that Marika has put in there it's dealing with two aspects, one, that the system itself has to support the extra fields, but, two, that the fields, the data, are – they're optional, they're not mandatory. So again, you know, best of both words; system will support it but nobody is putting a gun to your head forcing you to collect or provide the extra bits of information. So I personally have no issue with that. I think that's – it makes perfect sense to me. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Michele. Appreciate that. Any other thoughts? Does anybody on the call object to this statement? Sam, go ahead. And you don't necessarily have to object but if you are, please explain why.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay, can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Sam Lanfranco: Am I coming through? Okay. The way Marika's thing is written now it seems to me it's very similar to what B was in the A-F choices. It does combine the two issues we have to deal with. Multiple and optional or not, I like it, but the questionnaire, B only got 16% out of the – so what was being objected to in B is compared to A and C.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Sam. Hang on a second, I'm rereading B and if somebody else wants to respond feel free to jump in. A lot of these had just kind of subtle differences. One difference I think – well let's see, maybe there's not. Somebody help me out here. I keep jumping to the wrong line.

Michele Neylon: Marika?

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Marika. Sorry, I was concentrating here.

Marika Konings: Yes. Yes, thank you. This is Marika. I think the way the working group agreement is currently written is indeed recognizing that there was no clear support for either, you know, having this as optional or having this as mandatory so at least it's kind of in the middle for now and it may be something that may be need to be decided at a later stage. At this stage it just notes that it must be supported by the RDS as an optional field. But it doesn't go into further detail on the – whether it must be mandatory or optional as I understood from our discussions.

Chuck Gomes: The more I look at it, Sam, this is Chuck, the more I think you're right except that one didn't get very much support and yet now we're apparently – Sam, are you okay with the wording of – that Marika put in the chat?

Sam Lanfranco: Yes, I'm okay with that. What I think we should guard against is- and that I didn't like about C was kicking too much of the discussion down the road, kicking the can down the road. You know, to be determined through further deliberation, I think the way Marika has it we're now saying that, you know, what may be there is what should the multiple alternative contact methods be

that is supported by RDS. But everything else is pretty much in line with – I mean, it's not inconsistent with what's in A or C so it's just, you know, we're basically – we're kind of finessing down the middle, which is good. And the only thing left open is how many of those alternative contact methods should be supported.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, and if we look at A, B and C together, and the amount of support, now it's possible that people pick more than one so you can't just add them up, but that's pretty strong support for the three of them understanding that they have some subtle differences, minimal but subtle. So thank you, appreciate that.

So if anybody objects to us declaring in this meeting rough consensus on the statement that Marika put in the chat, please put a red X in the Adobe room otherwise we'll assume that it's – at least as far as this working group meeting – there was pretty strong support for – certainly no objection. Okay?

And we will – and then we'll test that with a poll question just to confirm it especially since we have so few people on the call today, so that we can provide opportunity not only for each of you to confirm your agreement in the poll but for others to participate that weren't on the call at this time. So okay...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Marc Anderson: Sorry to interrupt. This is Marc Anderson. I just wanted to note I think I lost my Internet connection so I'm not...

Chuck Gomes: Oh it looks like you're not there anymore.

Marc Anderson: ...in Adobe chat.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, go ahead and speak up, Marc. Please do. Sorry about that.

Marc Anderson: No worries, I've just been trying to get Internet back and haven't been successful so I'm on phone only at the moment, sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, did you want to comment or you just wanted to let us know that?

Marc Anderson: No I was just letting you know that. I don't have a comment.

Chuck Gomes: Okay that's fine. Thanks. And you know what to do if you do want to say something, just speak up so that we know that you want to get in the queue and we'll get you in there right away. Alex, go ahead.

Alex Deacon: Yes, thanks, Chuck. It's Alex. Just thinking about your last question, I think what I had to do is go back to the key concepts doc and kind of look at Marika's (unintelligible) in the context of disagreement Number 27, 28 and 29. I think it's important that – and I think this was Michele's point earlier on that, you know, this question that we're debating now, which I think will be 30, it's important to keep in mind that it really has to be considered in the context of the previous three agreement.

I don't think I have any objection here, although if you look at the comment I think, you know, that I had made I think it's important that we continue to collect things like email address, postal address and telephone number. So I just wanted to make that comment as it was helpful for me to go back and reread the previous three agreements, kind of put things in context and makes better sense. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alex. This is Chuck. And we as leaders talked about what you just said, especially talking about the other types of contacts like postal address and telephone that were mentioned in the comments like you pointed out. We decided not to go down that route on those specific contacts in this meeting, mainly because we thought it would probably take more time than we have.

But we will have to get there, okay? And we will get there, okay, and talk about those.

Any other comments on the poll, the poll results, our tentative conclusion at this time before we go to the next agenda item? Okay, our numbers are going up a little bit as we continue. Thanks for those who have joined. So in case any of you were not on previously, we did agree as – on a tentative conclusion that there were no objections to and that tentative conclusion, if you scroll up in the chat to Marika's – two comments back from Marika, not the one about school, okay, you'll see the tentative conclusion that we accepted as rough consensus at least and no objections on this call. And we'll do a poll on that.

All right, moving on then to the next agenda item. And you can see there that it's to start deliberation on contact roles. Now you know, I should have asked for this in advance. Marika, do we have handy a list of the different contact roles that were talked about in the EWG report or that we have talked about? If so it'd be great to put those up. And I won't be surprised at all if you have them ready. And thank you for putting that up.

And okay, so you can see the contract roles here. And the admin and technical are contacts we're familiar with. The abuse contact is a new one that's come into play in the last few years. And privacy proxy really is a new one. Business and legal are brand new proposed in the EWG report. So first of all, let me ask if anybody has any serious problems with the definitions? Now the definitions probably aren't perfect, but as long as they give us a reasonable sense of what we're talking about or the – for these contact roles, okay, that's probably sufficient for our discussion at this point. Any questions or comments on the potential responsibilities that are listed for these six contact roles?

Now we're – okay, go ahead, Michele.

Michele Neylon: Sorry, Michele for the record and all that. Why am I talking so much this morning? Just one little comment, I suppose. The concept of the roles is fine, I mean, there's absolutely no issue with that. I suppose the thing is that in the current system it doesn't really matter what role you label a contact with. People just tend to ignore that completely. And so for – in the case of abuse contacts, when the 2013 RAA came out, it mandated that registrars provide an abuse contact and that would be an email address, which was to be placed towards the top of the Whois output which was altered in registrars finding their abuse desk being flooded with all sorts of completely irrelevant crud.

I mean, for – on our side we've tried to put out particular contact points for various things and once you kind of go outside the obvious sales contact points and a couple of others you just discover that people ignore it and will just use whichever contact point they come across just to send in anything that they feel like sending in. But that's in the current system.

In a hypothetical RDS, then the way that people currently kind of scrape those email address and contact points and abuse them, I would hope would kind of disappear because the contact point would be more clearly defined and would hopefully be presented in such a fashion that that wouldn't happen. So I think that's something just to bear in mind before people reject out of hand some of these bucket concepts. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Michele. This is Chuck again. Marc, your turn.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...back in.

Marc Anderson: Yes, I seem to have Internet again. I guess I just want to remind everybody that, you know, these are roles and not necessarily individual unique contacts. So, you know, Stephanie is pointing out in chat, these are really

only useful in large organizations, you know, I think it's, you know, true that, you know, maybe large organizations are the only ones who will have different people assigned to these roles. You know, here an individual registrant without your own technical, abuse, or legal staff, you know, you may assign yourself all the roles and that may be the default behavior. But I think the roles approach does allow a lot of flexibility.

And, Chuck, your original question was on whether there were concerns with the definitions provided, and I don't have concerns myself, certainly not as a starting point. But I think I just want to remind you that working group agreement Number 26 was that RDS policy must include a definition for every gTLD registration data element, both a semantic definition and syntax definition. And that working group agreement, as I recall sort of came out of the initial discussion on these definitions.

And I think there was some concern in our deliberations that some of these definitions weren't as clear as they could be. So I think this is something we talked a little bit about already and led to key concept 26. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: I'm not sure why, Marc, but your – and I think we were able to understand most of what you said but it was getting a little bit garbled for some reason so not sure what's going on on your side. But I myself was able to I think get what you said. And thanks for pointing that out because it's good that you reminded us of the discussion we had I think two or three weeks ago on this particular slide and the descriptions of the potential responsibilities as well as working group agreement 27 where we said – and we will eventually need to refine the definitions to make sure we get rid of any ambiguity and make them as accurate as possible, understanding that we'll probably never get them perfect, but thanks for pointing that out, appreciate that.

And keep in mind, a couple points to keep in mind and I don't know if I identified myself, but this is Chuck speaking. I think most of you recognize my voice by now but for somebody looking at a transcript they don't hear my

voice. So the – these don't necessarily – these roles don't have to be filled by individuals either. An organization, a registrant could have a, you know, technical contact at whatever, you know, and that role could be filled maybe by multiple individuals in the organization so they don't necessarily have to be filled by an individual.

And the other important thing to remind people of, we're not talking about yet what we're – what we will do with these roles in terms of collection for the RDS even, we haven't gotten to that point yet. And to a point that Stephanie made in the chat, she's right that a large organization may be able – if they wanted to – to provide different contact email addresses, for example, for each one of these or different individuals.

But as the EWG report said, I mean, they can all be the same person if that's the way a registrant wants to operate. And if they're a small organization that could happen. But all these are good points and thanks for pointing that out, Stephanie. Yes, the – and Kal, I think – I assume you're referring to the slide. It does kind of talk to them about like their contacts; in fact it's titled that way, it would probably be more accurate if we actually said roles. But this was taken from the EWG report and that's the way they referred to it, so that's why it's as it says.

Kal, go ahead.

Kal Feher: Thanks, Chuck. This is Kal speaking. I was simply making an observation that perhaps the EWG we're using the old paradigm that we have today of contacts in Whois, and if we are truly reimagining we would put in an RDS, we may not structure it in the same way, that is where we have separate contacts for those, we might make certain things (unintelligible) of a contact and for example I would still probably consider a privacy or proxy provider contact as a separate contact, but a legal or abuse contact may be a role type or attribute of (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Kal.

Kal Feher: ...something that needs...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Good point. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. I kind of sort of have to disagree with that because if you're using a – if there's a privacy or proxy at play, then the privacy or proxy is replacing some if not all of the other contact points. Now the privacy proxy service itself would have a contact point but, you know, in any system that has – what would be a replacement for the public Whois, all of these – of the underlying data is just not going to be there, it's going to be replacing the privacy proxy.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. This is Chuck. And I'm not sure you're totally disagreeing with Kal, but let's let Kal talk.

Kal Feher: Yes, well continuing my theme of reimagining how you would provide this, there's no reason why you wouldn't simply provide a blank or empty response or some kind of form response for a registrant if it's under privacy or proxy and provide the privacy or proxy provider contact only. So today we have that situation where you have to provide dummy data or (place) data for Whois because of its system design, but the next system may not have that restriction. So it's probably true today but it may not be true in the technology that we offer for tomorrow.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Kal. Michele, you can respond.

Michele Neylon: Michele again disagreeing. That's actually not how it works today. At the moment the – what happens today is you get display data which could be something from a proxy privacy provider, but the email address is while it's

going to appear as something completely random or something obfuscated or something which isn't obviously tied back to anybody, it will send the email through to the underlying contact in some way or other or it could send – or it can send the email through to some kind of system or something like that.

I mean, just simply putting in the privacy proxy provider's details is not going to – is not what the current situation does at all, I mean, it's making it sound like at the moment privacy proxy is in place, there is no way to contact the registrant, which is simply not true.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. And I want to go back to something that I think Marc said and one of the advantages of using the term "role" instead of contact it I think allows some flexibility not only with what we have today but what we may have in the future or if things change. So it's – it probably has a little broader application if we use the term "role" instead of "contact" so I kind of like that. I hope I didn't misstate what you said, Marc, but that's what I thought I heard.

So now let – at the risk probably huge risk – of generating some lively discussion, is there any of these contacts that any of you think shouldn't be collected for the RDS? Now keep in mind, and this has come up I think the last couple weeks, we're not talking about things collected by the registrar necessarily so every one of these may be good for registrars to collect, and some of you may disagree with that, and that's okay.

But for the RDS, are there any of these contacts that anyone thinks shouldn't be collected for the RDS? Now we haven't talked about display yet, okay? So we're still just on collection. Obviously we probably wouldn't – I don't think we would want to collect anything if it wasn't displayed to someone, however restricted that might be. So there's probably no need to collect it if you're not going to display it in some way, but we're not talking about display right now. Marc, go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Hey, Chuck. Can you hear me better now?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, that's better.

Marc Anderson: Okay. Excellent. I just want to ask a point of clarification, you asked if there were issues with collecting any of this contact information and I just want to clarify that we're talking about roles, not contacts?

Chuck Gomes: But as has been pointed out, I think Michele is the one that did it, maybe others did too, associated with each role will have to be some sort of contact otherwise the role is not functioning. Now that contact could be a role account itself, so we're not – we just don't want to assume that it has to be a named individual is one of the risks with the contacts, and I apologize for using the word "contact" again, but just does that make sense, Marc?

Marc Anderson: I think so. And I think I agree with you, I just want to make sure I understand it correctly.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Marc Anderson: You know, I think there's six contacts, sorry, there's six roles, now I've done it. You know, so there's six roles listed here on the screen. And if we're talking about now expanding RDS so that every registration will have six contacts, you know, I don't support that. But if we're talking about, you know, having a future RDS where you have six roles, which may be one person or may be six persons, or as you pointed out, organizations or contact points, then I support that. So I mean, I think we're in agreement but I just want to make sure.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I thought you said that very well at least from my point of view and of course it's not my point of view that matters. But that's good. And I think the EWG report actually did that. I mean, they made it very clear, as I recall, that, you know, it could be six different contacts associated with these roles, or it could be one or it could be three or, you know, there was quite a bit of

flexibility from what I recall and what they proposed. So and I should look at the – so we'll – hopefully when we get to the point when we're past the hard stuff we can clean up the definitions for the differences will be clarified and will be less confusing.

The – and I don't think there's a lot of value right now talking about why some of them are confusing. I think we're better off seeing, you know, getting a sense of the roles. I'm not – so I haven't heard anybody object to any of the roles being, you know, collecting information associated with those roles, again we're going to have to define what information, but some information associated with all six roles in the RDS. Am I correct in that? There are no objections to the possibility of collecting some data, yet to be defined, associated with each of these roles for the RDS.

Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, thank you, Chuck. This is Marika. I just want to note that in the comments I think both Stephanie and Kal have noted that in certain cases it may not make sense to ask people to follow up information for roles that don't exist within their environment. And I think you're specifically referring to individual registrants. I just wanted to note that, I don't think it's necessarily an objection but I think a concern of whether all those roles would apply similarly to all types of registrants.

Chuck Gomes: Well let me ask a question, Marika. What role here maybe the – would not apply to an individual? Now they may not be a business, I can get that. But there still could be consumer requests for information about them. Now maybe that could be handled by another contact. But what role would you say, before I go to Alan and Michele, do you think might not apply to an individual, the one that sticks out to me might be business, but even that one could be used. Probably with an individual it'd probably – it'd probably all be the same but go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. And I just want to make clear that wasn't a personal position I was putting forward, I just wanted to make sure that the comments of Stephanie and Kal were reflected. And indeed looking through as business is an obvious one but I'll leave it to them to indicate which other ones they might put in the category of maybe not applying to all types of registrants.

Chuck Gomes: Oh – and that's a really important point, like privacy proxy if you don't have a privacy or proxy service, that one's going to not make sense, okay? That's good. Let's go to Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Well that was part of that I was going to say. Obviously an individual is not a proxy service so they don't have to say who's going to handle reveals. However, I have absolutely no problem saying all the fields are going to be there and they default, you know, whether the registrar decides how they default or whether ICANN specifies how they default, that is I don't want to specify an abuse one then it defaults to admin or legal or whatever, you know, whatever way we choose to order them.

So the fields are there should they be queried at some time in the future, but we're not putting an onerous task on someone to have to fill in all the fields when they're registering their personal name as a domain name. thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. I think you know, the key thing here is that this be optional. So in the case of a large corporate or say a domain investor somebody either as an individual or an organization that is doing you know, particularly things with domain names, it makes sense to have some of these contacts. So for example, a business contact would make perfect sense if I was registering domain names in the hope of selling them on or something like that.

But, you know, I think as Stephanie and others have pointed out, having all of these as separate contacts will just lead to all sorts of confusion for your average punter who is just registering a domain name so that they can have a blog or an email address or whatever because if you look at a lot of domains that are currently registered, you'll see things like say where the technical contact has been set to be – always be the hosting provider unless the registrant overrides it.

The admin contact and registrant contact are nearly always the same person or entity. An abuse contact I think this seems to be causing a little bit of confusion, I think some people are assuming that the abuse contact is somehow related to the registrant but if you actually look at the Whois output at the moment, you see there is an abuse contact specified for every single registration and the abuse contact is with the registrar. I think you know, that seems to have caused some bit of confusion.

But I mean, again, you know, if you're adding a legal contact in the case of a personal registration, I mean, what are you going to do, put in your lawyer's contact details and then have to pay a few hundred euro for every single spurious email they get? I mean, you're not going to do that unless you're a large corporate. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. Marc.

Marc Anderson: Hey, Chuck. This is Marc. I guess the way, you know, I understand – understood it to work or the way it was envisioned is, you know, I guess I'll draw our attention to working group agreement Number 27 that says, "At least one element identifying the domain name registrant must be collected and included in the RDS." So that's one – to me that's one minimum contact that must be there.

And so at a minimum, you know, I assume that that contact assumes all these roles, the admin, legal, technical, abuse and so forth roles. But then as

Michele pointed out, maybe, you know, in a lot of cases the registrar by default takes on the technical role.

So, you know, by default you have this registrant, this identified registrant as having all the roles by default, but then the registrant has the option of specifying somebody else to contact if, you know, if the registrant is just a single person registering their name, then they can have all the roles, but if they want to specify somebody else to talk to for abuse or somebody else to talk to for technical or hire a lawyer to handle any legal inquiries, then that registrant has the option of specifying these different roles for that. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Marc. I thought that was well said. This is Chuck speaking again. And it seems to me in the chat and what all of you are saying, that key word in all of this is the optional – is the word “option” okay, in other words, how these roles would be filled would be optional. Now what I want us to do, and word is going to be a little bit challenging, I don't want to spend forever word-smithing and it's really easy to do that.

But it seems to me that we should be able to come up with some sort of a tentative conclusion with regard to the discussion we've been having on this. And a lot of them – I like what – who was it, it was Sam I think and Tapani plussed it in words and that is that the fields could be mandatory to be there, but optional to fill. That seems pretty good. And that seems to capture a lot of the sense of what I've heard a lot of you saying in chat and verbally.

What – how could – can somebody help me out here, how might we frame a tentative conclusion from what we've been talking about? Because I'm hearing lots of agreement on what we're talking about here, but I confess, I'm not sure I have the best wording to what a tentative conclusion might be, a key concept that we might agree on here. Sam, go ahead.

Sam Lanfranco: Thank you, Chuck. Just to follow up on something I put in the chat, and that's that we have these roles but the purpose of the identifiers for the roles is really to say where to send a particular kind of query. So if we think of this as much as the query destinations as we do individuals with a responsibility for that, I think we see this a little more flexible than thinking that legal needs to point to somebody with legal expertise or a small company's lawyer, who as you said, somebody said might end up with billings just from trivial requests.

So in my mind I think of these six things not just as roles but basically where the, you know, where the query goes. And it's the nature of the query that determines where it goes. And so and if these are optional and one of them isn't filled in the person would just go to the next best, you know, send their query to the next best destination.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Sam. Well said. Now Stephanie, you're raising some issues that are really important. And it's going to be hard; authentication is going to be hard. You guys ran into that in the EWG, I know that. And you spent a lot of time and made I think did a lot of work that will be helpful in that. There's probably more work that has to be done.

What I'm going to suggest – Stephanie is absolutely right. And obviously if we go to a gated access system, and if we require purpose-based approach like the EWG request, like we're seeing also I think in the European data protection regulation, the authentication is going to be a huge challenge. I don't think anybody would disagree with that. If we try to do that now, we could get hung up for a year. Okay? It will have to be done if we go that approach.

But what I'd like to suggest, and you're welcome to disagree with me, but what I'd like to suggest is that all we're talking about at this stage is going to be based on assumptions that we'll be able to work out the authentication challenges. That won't happen overnight, but – and just to use that as an example, since Stephanie brought it up, if we get down the road many

months from now and find that we can't, for a particular set of users, develop a reliable authentication system, maybe a credentialing system, whatever we may want to call it, then we may have to back up – back off of some of the recommendations that we made earlier.

So what – I hope what I'm saying makes sense in that yes, we're going to, you know, if we're going to allow certain users access to certain information, we're going to have to authenticate that they should have access and also that they will use it appropriately and protect the privacy and so forth, those sorts of things, and those kind of things were dealt with in the EWG report.

That will be a big job but for now, let's assume and we can kind of condition everything we're concluding now is if we're able to solve problems like that in the future, then our recommendations will hold. If we're not, then we'll probably back up and have to revisit some of the recommendations we make. I hope that made a little bit of sense, I'm not sure it did, but and Alex, I don't think we're talking so much – well I don't know what Stephanie was talking about, I shouldn't speak for her. But we're not talking about authentication of contact information at this stage. I think we're talking more about access credentialing or at least that's what I understood.

But that doesn't – keep in mind, we have a question – I think it's Question Number 5, in our charter, that has to do with accuracy. And we will get to that. So sorry I'm reading something in a message from Marika. Okay. To me. Marika, just to keep things flowing, probably it would be helpful, I'll let you use your own best judgment, probably be good to raise the questions or the points you made in the chat with me to the whole working group. But again, use your own best judgment of whether you want to do that or not, but I think it would be helpful.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika and I've raised my hand it may be easier to do so. So the question I asked Chuck in relation to the tentative working group agreement we're discussing now which will presumably lead into a poll question. My

question was whether as part of that tentative conclusion we also need to consider the question of indeed if fields are optional to be filled in by registrants, what happens if they're not filled in?

I've heard some people referring to that they would just remain blank, I've heard others referring that they would just default then to either information that's provided for one type of contact or potentially I guess the registrant email address. So my question was is that something we should also test in the poll to see which view people have in that regard? Or whether that's something that doesn't need to be considered yet?

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks. And if somebody wants to respond to that please jump into the queue. Let's go to Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I want to comment on Stephanie's last message that says the only reason she can see to segregate contact points is to differentiate the requestors and I think that – I don't think that's the case at all. I think we're – we segregate contact points as we do in the current Whois because different people have different capabilities to address certain issues. So the person that you're going to call to report abuse may not be the same one as to solve a technical problem or to address a legal issue.

So I don't think it has anything to do with differentiating the requestors from the requestor's point of view, you know, if – rather from the authentication and deciding who can get access to what, I'm not sure there's going to be a huge difference, I'm sure we will set up rules, but I don't think there's a huge difference to differentiate those who can get which address. But I think the only reason that we started doing it is because of different capabilities of the different contacts, not to deal with segregating requestors. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Alan. Chuck again. Alex, your turn.

Alex Deacon: Yes, thank you. This is Alex. Yes, I think I agree what Alan just said. I think I was confused in this conversation because we went very quickly from discussing roles for contacts to I guess accreditation and authentication of requestors, right, which people that will eventually access this data.

And I don't think we're there yet, right? So I think we should probably put that off to the side -- put a pin in it, as they say -- and continue to focus on the topic at hand, which is, you know, role or purpose-based contacts and the roles that have defined what policies we want around us.

Chuck Gomes: So we may actually coin a new term, and that's purpose-based roles, huh? And anyway, so now I really would like us to see if we can come up with a tentative wording and we have to be careful in doing, whether we use the word role or contacts or both or whatever.

But anybody - I was hoping someone on the working group would propose something that kind of captures what we've been saying over the last half hour probably about these six roles.

I'll throw something out, I'm not necessarily that pleased with it, but if I don't see something from somebody else - oh, wait a second, there's one -- Marika from the chat, it looks like -- and I missed it probably. It could be the purpose-based contact types identified must be provided for by the RDS but optional for registrants to fill out. That's a good start, I think.

Now, I think I would maybe instead of saying - maybe we could say must be supported by the RDS but optional for registrants. I don't know if that's better or not, but just a suggestion on that.

What do you think of that? Anybody want to improve on that? Do you see any problems with that? This is something that we could test in a poll this coming week in the few days ahead of us here so that everybody gets a

chance to confirm it or suggest changes. And then of course, the people on the call get a chance to participate as well.

And to deal with (Maxim's) comment there, obviously we're going to have to get back -- hopefully not too far in the future -- back to what we deem to be purposes of anything we collect so that we will get back to that. And hopefully a lot of the key concepts we've been coming up with will actually speed that up a little bit.

Okay, okay, so what about that statement? Does anybody object to what Marika picked up from the chat there, that purpose-based contact types? Do we want to use the word roles? Or the six of them there must be supported or provided by -- I don't care which one we use -- by the RDS, but would be optional for registrants to provide.

Now another -- just while you're thinking about that -- registrants could be required to provide all six with the understanding that all six could be the same. That's another way of probably approaching the problem, and I think optional is fine the way it is there.

So if you look at the notes, it's the next to last bullet. In the notes, you can see this. Does anybody object to that?

Just a minor editorial thing, it might be better too to say to - for registrants to provide - I don't know, I think that's a little bit better than fill out, but fill out is okay too.

And that's what I was trying to do, Sam -- thanks for reinforcing that -- is to kind of just capture the sense of what we've been talking about.

Don't know whether blank entries will work. I think it's funny that that will depend on where we go with some of this. We're probably - it's probably a little bit early to tell, because if we find that there's - for example, if someone

has a - uses a privacy or proxy service -- and that could be an individual as well -- would it be okay to leave that blank? Maybe not, but we can deal with that. But I get your point.

Okay, any objections to that statement or close variation of it? Okay, so that would be another tentative conclusion. This has been a really good discussion and it's been pleasing to see the amount of agreement, especially on the optional nature of these roles being supported by the RDS in an optional manner.

Okay, all right, let's go then to agenda item -- what is it -- 2D, I think -- deliberate on RDS versus registrar data. We had some pretty good discussion on that, on the list, for a few days and then it died off. In fact, I think I raised some questions and never saw any responses to them on the list.

It's kind of hard to jump back into that now, but hopefully all of you read some of that discussion. There was some really good points made. One of the questions I raised is, what term should we be using -- RDS, RDDS? And this came out in the discussion on the list.

I think we interchanged those terms -- and several of you pointed that out -- what do we mean when we say RDS? What do we mean when we say RDDS? And can we standardize our understanding and use of those terms in our work? Any thoughts on that? Sam, go ahead.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay, I may be completely off base here, but I'll at least see the discussion, and that's that, for me, RDS is the services that the registrar's providing to the community. And registrar data is what it needs to conduct its - what it needs to conduct its business is probably larger than what RDS is, but and it can vary depending upon where they are, what jurisdiction they operate under.

So I think we're focused on RDS and we're basically setting the minimum set of data that we're expecting registrars to provide in a particular format. At least that's how I understand it. I'm prepared to be eaten alive on that.

Chuck Gomes: Well I don't think you'll be eaten alive, Sam. I think that the reality of the matter is, all of us, including myself, kind of use these terms fairly freely and we may not have - we may not be exactly on the same page, although I don't think we're probably too far off.

But so hopefully nobody will eat you alive. I don't think there's cause for that. Alan Greenberg, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I'm going to be radical and I say I don't think it matters. I think we simply have to decide what the words are that we're going to use and the D in RDS, RDDS, has a variety of meanings. It could be data, it could be directory. The S could be system or services. Registration is probably not negotiable.

I think once we decide what we call it, we define it and it is. We could be purists and argue over the subtle differences between the various words and then we can define the Ds to have different meanings or in a different order as we go through it. But I really think it's just an arbitrary choice that we have to make and then live with it. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Alan Greenberg. Anybody disagree with that, that it's somewhat arbitrary in terms of what we do? Are we missing something? Because several people made points that they thought that maybe part of our confusion was is that we weren't clear on those terms, so I'm just giving a chance for somebody.

I'm not disagreeing with Alan Greenberg. He may be right. But let's hear. Now Kal, is that a new hand? I guess so, go ahead.

Kal Feher: Yes, thank you Chuck. I raised my hand initially to talk - to maybe give a bit of my recollection regarding RDDS, but I would agree...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead and do that, in addition to what was just asked. That's fine.

Kal Feher: Well, if I recall correctly -- and my memory's a little bit fuzzy on this -- that it started to appear around the time that the new GTLD registry agreement was being drafted. It appeared in several 2011 drafts and then (unintelligible) made it into the version that everyone signed.

And I think at the time, I and my colleagues took it to mean the publication service. And I think that was the point that I wanted to make when I put my hand up, that it's the - the acronym itself is not important, but I think it is important to differentiate the bits that the public talks to and everything that sits behind it, collecting the information and storing the information.

So whatever acronyms or names we ultimately settle on, I think differentiating those two -- at least from a function point of view -- will still be useful and important for our corporations including policies, because you can place limitations or manner of requirements on collecting information and validating that (unintelligible) may not be the same sorts of things that you would require of a publication service.

So keeping that distinction clear I think is most important. The acronym itself, I think it's actually very good to not use the RDDS...

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Kal.

Kal Feher: ...and RDS acronyms because...

Chuck Gomes: And certainly we're going to have to define them if we use them. And that goes back to a key concept we've already agreed on, at least tentatively so far, so thanks for that. Marc, go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Thanks Chuck, it's Marc. You know, as one of the people that raised this, I feel obligated to speak. And, you know, I agree with what Kal and Alan Greenberg said. You know, I think one of the points I made in raising it was, it was my observation in listening to some of the deliberations of the working group that, you know, as Kal pointed out, sometimes, you know, there's a distinction between, you know, the system and all the underlying policies and infrastructure. And, you know, the term I use is ecosystem -- the entire ecosystem behind it.

And my observation was, sometimes people were referring to the system and sometimes they were referring to the, you know, the entire ecosystem. And it wasn't always clear which.

And I, you know, I think it does, you know, as I pointed out, you know, it maybe doesn't matter what term we use as long as everybody is in agreement as to which we're talking about. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Marc. Chuck again. And so coming back to the registrar data versus RDS data issue, is there anybody on the call that doesn't understand that registrars collect information that's not going to go in the RDS? That's kind of a basic concept. I think Michele Neylon is one that did a pretty good job of talking about that on the list and probably in meetings too.

So in our working group, though, it's important, what our focus is, is not on what registrars collect, unless we need them - odd way to say it, I guess -- unless we need them to collect it for purposes of the RDS, okay?

So it's not our job to define what registrars do above and beyond what's needed for the RDS, okay? Is anybody not clear on that? Do you have any questions on that, or comments? Marc?

Marc Anderson: Sorry, Chuck, old hand.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, Stephanie? You're on mute, Stephanie. There you go. You're still on mute. There we are.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, thanks. Can you hear me now?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Stephanie Perrin: Good. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I think I may even have raised this last week -- and I think it's an important point -- because from a data protection perspective in terms of how ICANN acts as a data controller, ICANN basically tells registrars what they will collect, what they put into the WHOIS, what they escrow, and what they are obliged to retain for law enforcement purposes.

So that's a big job and role as ICANN the data controllers. And our remit is to look at the registration data service and consider a replacement for who is. And in considering that replacement for WHOIS, I see no reason why some of the data as is currently found in the WHOIS, I would consider to be more sensitive data, could not be managed and held by the registrars and compelled to be collected just as some of this other data is compelled to be collected and retained in the RAA, but it doesn't find its way into the WHOIS - - financial data for instance.

So I think that it's an important distinction to keep in mind and it's not really outside our arena if we're reinventing how the WHOIS is constructed.
Thanks.

But yes, I think I understand the differences between what's in WHOIS now and what is obliged to be retained as (unintelligible), etcetera, under the RAA.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Stephanie. Any other comments on that? Alan Greenberg?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I think we really have to stop thinking about what's in the RAA. The RAA is what is specified for today's WHOIS. We're defining a new system or a new something and what will be in the future RAA will be dependent on what we say the registrars must collect on ICANN's behalf. Or that might be the wrong phrase, but whatever it is.

So it's not what's in the RAA right now. Ultimately we have to decide what needs to be in a registration data service or a system and instruct the registrars to collect and do, you know, whatever other massaging. And that will end up going into the RAA and the registry agreement and whatever.

So I don't think we should confuse the two of what's there today. We're starting, effectively, with a blank slate, other than we have some needs that we're going to have to transfer over from the old system to the new system. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Alan Greenberg, I think you said that well. Certainly what's in the RAA today can be used as areas that we can focus on. But he's absolutely right that if what we recommend is approved by the GNSO Council and the board ultimately, then that will define what's in the new RAA. Michele Neylon, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Michele Neylon for the record. You're both incorrect. The RAA specifies - the RAA is a contract. It specifies as specific data in relation to domain registrations as mandated under contract to be collected by registrars.

The GNSO Council can do whatever the hell it wants, but that is moving beyond the picket fence and will not - and cannot actually modify that -- it simply can't.

In order to make that change, that would require reopening the RAA negotiation and that cannot be done without the agreement of the chair of the registrar stakeholder group. And I sincerely doubt you're going to find any chair of the registrar stakeholder group opening that up for negotiation, simply on the basis that somebody want to have a blank slate around WHOIS.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: So Michele Neylon, I'm going to disagree strongly with what you said, and maybe it's because I didn't state what I said very clearly. That's probably the case here.

If we recommend consensus policy out of this working group with regard to what registrars collect for the RDS, that then has to be approved by the GNS Council. I'm not talking about individual contract changes. And then if it's approved by the GNSO Council, it would make its recommendations to the board. It doesn't become consensus policy until the board approves it.

But if the board approves it, then that will define what's in the RAA with regard to the recommendations being made.

I'm not at all suggesting that we should cover anything that's outside of the picket fence, or that we should - that the council negotiates the RAA -- not at all.

But if we recommend policy that becomes consensus policy after GNSO Council approval and the board approval, then that will have an impact on the RAA in areas that are applicable to that.

So I'm not sure we really disagree. But anyway, let's go to Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks, Stephanie Perrin for the record. I think the - I would argue that there's a very little chunk of the RAA that is based on consensus policy. And I would also argue that there's a chunk of material contained in the RAA that ought to be -- and I know (Magaly's) going to bite my head off but, you know, that's life -- that ought to be put through the consensus policy process, and that instead is basically bilaterally arranged between ICANN the corporation and the registrar, ostensibly, in terms of how they do their business as registrars.

But in fact, it is closely related to the registration data service and it is another layer of data that is not - that is being gathered but has not been discussed via consensus policy.

I believe (Milton) raised this way back in something like 2007, around the time the GAC presented its requirements. So things have been more or less off the rails in terms of consensus policy since then with respect to data collection and provisions.

Man: Okay, okay.

Stephanie Perrin: So the question is, if that's off our remit from a policy perspective, precisely why is it off our remit?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Well it's certainly off our remit as a working group, so I don't want to open that door right now, because that's not going to help us accomplish our objectives.

There are avenues to deal with those sorts of things and this working group's not the one. So let's not even discuss that further right now. I'm not saying it's not a valid discussion, it's just not part of our remit.

Alan Greenberg, I need you to be brief because we're at the end of our meeting.

Alan Greenberg: I will be very brief. Number one, I agree with you, you know, I have my laundry list of things I'd like to see us change in the RAA that is not within the picket fence. It ain't going to happen and certainly not within our scope.

When I said a blank, the RAA is a blank slate, I did not mean the whole RAA. I meant the laundry list of WHOIS items and some other details associated with it.

I'm presuming WHOIS is within the picket fence. If it isn't, we are all just treading water on this PDP, waiting for the sharks to come get us, because it's a futile effort.

So I'm assuming it is within the picket fence and we are not here wasting our time at what is 2:30 in the morning my time.

So if what I said implied to Michele Neylon that when I said a blank slate, I meant the whole RAA, it's not what I meant. Please.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, yes, I think I took it the way you meant it. But I assure you if it was not in the picket fence, then Michele Neylon already would've been screaming, and I probably would've too.

Alan Greenberg: If WHOIS is within the picket fence, tell me now and I won't bother doing this again.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, let's wrap it up. And Marika, can you quickly go over the action items?

Marika Konings: Yes, thank you, Chuck, this is Marika. So we noted two specific items in the notes for this call to test, first of all, the post working group agreement on the first issue we discussed in relation to the alternative contact information.

And then secondly, have another survey question to test support for a possible working group agreement in relation to the (unintelligible) types that have been identified in the EDLAG report.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. So we'll have - it looks like we'll have a two question poll. Hopefully we'll get that out - well this meeting's at a special time, so it shouldn't take very long to get that out. So hopefully it'll be on Wednesday. For those of you that it's already Wednesday, I guess it's going to be Wednesday for all of us, because some of us only have a half hour to go to get to Wednesday.

So, all right, thank you, Marika. Thanks everybody. It was a fun meeting and I think a constructive meeting, so thanks for your cooperation. Our meeting next week is at the regular time.

Just before we close, is there anybody - if you're on the call and you're from the Asia Pacific region - well I know (David) is, so (David), you don't need to raise your hand. But it doesn't look like we have very many from the region that this timeslot is especially designed for. Anybody besides (David)?

Kal, okay, I should've known that Kal, sorry. And Michele Neylon, brief comment?

Michele Neylon: Thanks Chuck, just very brief comment. I mean, it's not me specific -- and a lot of the Europeans obviously aren't either -- but in many respects, while I hate early mornings, the upside to this timeslot is, it gets the call out of the way before I have to do anything else. So in some ways I do find it useful.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, well that's good to hear from you, because you weren't too crazy about this slot early on. Thanks Michele Neylon, I appreciate that.

All right, we're a little bit over, so let's call it quits for tonight. Thanks again. Have a good rest of the week and we'll be meeting at our regular time next week. Meeting adjourned and the recording can stop.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much for joining, so you may disconnect your lines. And have a great remainder of your day. Goodbye, everyone.

END