

ROW13 Q&A Zoom Window June 4th, 2024, 13:00 – 17:00 UTC

Jim Gould (Guest) 6:53AM

I would like to know how "No double data collection" requirement is being addressed with the number of registrars and registries.

Timo Vöhmar (Guest) 7:36AM

this is a really tricky one. In our approach we see no worries in that department. By aiming at the LoA substantial there should be no problems to any registries to accept the identity data from the eeID service - so the user does not have to go through the similar process with the same registrar for each tld they are interested in. We are speaking with different registries and registrars to make sure this is actually the case.

Polina Malaja (Guest) 7:37AM

Hey Jim! I believe our speakers touched upon this also in their presentations. In general, there are a few ways to comply with "no double collection" obligation: e.g., to leave verification to one entity only (and not require additional verification data transfer from one entity to another), or divide datasets' verification between entities, or share verification tags across TLDs. According to the European Commission, the no double collection obligation is in the Directive to make sure that individuals share their personal data only once.

Oleksandr Sobko (.eu, EURid) (Guest) 6:56AM

Question to Timo: Why did you decide to use the LoA 'substantial'? Should be the LoA 'Low' enough to identify the registrant?

This question has been answered live

Joacim Sørheim (.no) (Guest) 6:56AM

@Timo - Regarding passkeys, does your system support adding more than one per person?

This question has been answered live

Jim Gould (Guest) 7:03AM

For Alex, it's not clear how the registry would determine what domains require verification. What percentage of the domains do you anticipate the registry requesting for the verification information?

This question has been answered live

Jody Kolker (Guest) 7:07AM

Will the registrar be able to verify the information indently without verifying with another entity?

This question has been answered live

Daniela Stubbs (Guest) 7:14AM

Hi Alex, can I ask if you verify the RANT when the application is submitted?

Do you request a proof of ID, etc?

This question has been answered live

Olivier Guerdan / TIG (Guest) 7:20AM

@nic.at and @DENIC: When submitting verification data, In which case it would made sense to send a result „failed“?

This question has been answered live

Patrick Mevzek (Guest) 7:44AM

Did you do only one extract per domain+protocol or multiple ones during time? As discrepancies can be temporary flukes due to ongoing changes, a given request can see a discrepancy but same one 1 hour later may see no problems as values got synchronized.

This question has been answered live

Olivier Guerdan / TIG (Guest) 7:46AM

In regards to data mismatch. Did you take in account that most whois serves delay information?

This question has been answered live

Roger Carney (Guest) 7:51AM

@Simon, Just a comment, I think assuming DNS is "right" could be a perspective issue. This is how things are functioning technically but it may not be what the domain owner/registrant would consider "right".

This question has been answered live

Marc Blanchet (Guest) 8:16AM

@Gavin: FYI, RDAP Browser is written in Swift for iOS and in Kotlin for Android. (from the author ;-).

This question has been answered live

Marc Blanchet (Guest) 8:24AM

what you define as Stealth RDAP server is not just an RDAP server in some phases of testing, pre-production or not ready for scaling, before being published (and given they are ccTLDs, they have no « incentive »/contractual deadline to be « faster »)? Given that many are actually operated by registry operators that for the gTLDs already have implemented RDAP, they may « just » offer the ccTLDs version for the ccTLDs they manage, but since they are obligated, they just not publish it. Maybe this is « just » a cctld-gtld policy issue?

This question has been answered live

Patrick Mevzek (Guest) 8:25AM

More a remark than a real question, but for discovery, each "registry" (in fact any source) should be able to rely on SRV records to publish the fact they have an RDAP server available, and clients relying on that. It is used by at least one registry for whois. That would allow any public suffix to have a properly advertised RDAP server (cf `com` vs `uk.com`), and I don't remember if that was discussed in IETF WEIRDS/REGEXT WG.

This question has been answered live

Olivier Hureau (Guest) 8:32AM

Which kind of rdapConformance do the Stealth server have ?

"icann_rdap_technical_implementation_guide_0" and

"icann_rdap_response_profile_0" or only "rdap_level_0" ?

This question has been answered live

Marc Blanchet (Guest) 8:32AM

we had that discussion in weirds. There were pros and cons on each approach (in DNS, ...), which worked for both IP and domains. The consensus was an IANA bootstrap registry.

This question has been answered live

Marc Blanchet (Guest) 8:36AM

<comment for previous presentation> @Gavin @Patrick: slides that were used for comparing and converging to IANA bootstrap: <https://www.ietf.org/proceedings/88/slides/slides-88-weirds-1.pdf>

This question has been answered live

Jim Gould (Guest) 8:55AM

Could this be leveraged to setup a trust list of verification providers in support for NIS2?

This question has been answered live

Patrick Mevzek (Guest) 9:22AM

Suggestion: "Subject-Verb-Object" seems very similar to -if not the same as- RDF and the whole W3C ontology project. Not possible to reuse pieces of it instead of redefining everything? Also I don't think this should be in TXT records at all YMMV FWIW

This question has been answered live

Anonymous attendee 9:23AM

how will this handle a registration change? If sportaccord.sport changes registrants, or stv-fsg.ch does?

This question has been answered live

Patrick Mevzek (Guest) 9:52AM

Or allow mixed hostObj/hostAttr model? Converting hostObj to delete to hostAttr?

This question has been answered live

Jim Gould (Guest) 9:56AM

I believe it's one or the other, but not both.

This question has been answered live