Adobe Connect: 5 members

Alan Woods   Marc Anderson

Alex Deacon   Sarah Wyld

Fiona Asonga   Stephanie Perrin

on audio only: none

Apologies:

Kurt Pritz

Staff:

Marika Konings   Daniel Halloran

Caitlin Tubergen   Berry Cobb

Trang Nguyen   Terri Agnew

Terri Agnew: (2/5/2019 10:55) Welcome to the EPDP - Data Elements Workbook on Tuesday, 05 February 2019 at 17:30 UTC for 2 hours.

Terri Agnew: (10:55) agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/cp0WBg

Alan Woods (RYSG): (11:29) yay!!!

Alan Woods (RYSG): (11:29) hahahahaahahah

Berry Cobb: (11:30) No worries!

Sarah Wyld: (11:30) Made it!

Marc Anderson (RySG): (11:30) Berry, can you provide that link for the consolidated data elements list again?

Berry Cobb: (11:31) https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/96207076/Data%20Elements%20Matrix_v1.1.xlsx?version=1&modificationDate=1549334185442&api=v2

Marc Anderson (RySG): (11:31) thank you

Alan Woods (RYSG): (11:34) Back ... sorry

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (11:37) Yes! thank you!

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (11:39) I suspected as much....

Alan Woods (RYSG): (11:40) go ahead... :D

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (11:41) If in-zone hosts are supported, then it's optional for the RNH to provide but required for Ry to support

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (11:42) (quoting Mark)

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (11:42) (Marc, sorry)

Marc Anderson (RySG): (11:42) yup

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (11:42) what exactly does that mean, for us who dont recognize in zone hosts?

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (11:42) i think - nameservers based on the domain itself. I buy example.com and also provide the IP to create ns1.example.com. I think...

Alan Woods (RYSG): (11:43) ohhh really? hahha! oh my ... as I said ..ONIONS!!

Alex Deacon - IPC: (11:43) in zone nameserver hosts - to be clear...

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (11:43) It's zone hosts all the way down, Alan

Alan Woods (RYSG): (11:44) yes

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (11:44) Can't we just leave it at O for Optional, and put a footnote?

Berry Cobb: (11:44) @Sarah, that is what I have will present after Dan.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (11:44) and the risk to the individual is....if I am using stephanieperrin.com as a nameserver, then my name is being released?

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (11:45) Dan - I was wondering this also, creating the hostname is kind of a separate thign than registering the domain anyways?

Alex Deacon - IPC: (11:45) i don't see any risk - we are talking about the IP addres of the nameserver.

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (11:45) Steph - I think this is about the IP address that is being used - example.com is not PD but the IP could be PD

Alex Deacon - IPC: (11:45) without it the name doesn't resolve. that is the risk.

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (11:46) because the IP could be PD then it has to be on this list. But creating the hostname/linking it to the IP is separate action from registering the domain so I'm not quite sure why it's here...

Alex Deacon - IPC: (11:48) the DNS protocol is authoritative for domain name to IP address mapping, WHOIS (or RDDS) is not.

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (11:48) Alex - right

Alan Woods (RYSG): (11:49) LOL

Berry Cobb: (11:49) In zone NameServer IP Address – if in zone hosts are supported, it is optional for the Registrant to provide it, but required for the Registry to support it if it is supplied.

Alan Woods (RYSG): (11:49) that seems good to me

Alex Deacon - IPC: (11:49) that sounds right...

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (11:50) Yep sounds good

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (11:50) you mean published, right?

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (11:50) I think we should be careful to distinguish between published and disclosed, now that we have defined the terms...

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (11:52) Should we include a 61a for publication (in case the RNH consents to publication of their data)?

Berry Cobb: (11:53) So third parties sufficent?

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (11:53) oh - not for from the registrar to the registry, sorry, disregard my comment above

Marc Anderson (RySG): (11:57) for DNSSEC, yes, optional for RNH to provide, required for registry and support, but also REQUIRED for registry to publish.

Marc Anderson (RySG): (11:58) yes, required transmissiond and disclosure

Alan Woods (RYSG): (11:58) +1 Marc

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:00) if we want these to be standalone then it would mirror purpose 1 - it seems.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (12:01) Is there in fact any retention of data for ICANN related purposes?

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:02) Steph - ICANN only identified the TDRP as a policy that requires retained data

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:02) agree it would be confusing/misleading.

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:02) but for this purpose I dont think there is retention needed

Berry Cobb: (12:02) "This processing activity is not required for the Purpose of providing lawful disclosures and further relies on retention as documented in Purpose 1A & 1B."

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:03) I think Berry's text makes sense.

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:03) The data element matrices for 1a1b don't have a retention column, am I looking at an old version?

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (12:03) local law would be covered under the REgistrars/registries sole controllership....ie nothing to do with ICANN, right?

Alan Woods (RYSG): (12:05) exactly ... but again purpose 2 ... makes no legal sense .. so if we are squeezing in this "purpose" .... then .... we need to call a spade a spade .. no masic minmum retention period can be established by ICANN for purpose 2

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:05) Thanks Berry, that makes sense. It's written down somewhere in the doc, I assume, and I missed it

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:05) So, no retention for Purpose 2

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (12:05) good

Alan Woods (RYSG): (12:06) kudos for use of the word behooves ... just saying! :)

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:08) "minimum public data set" sounds good

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:08) I like it also (but was also a co-chair of RDS so am tainted)

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:08) LOL Alex

Alan Woods (RYSG): (12:11) publication is absolutely necessary to achieve the fundamental purpose. IMHO! Stephanie....am i too far off base there ?

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:11) some language to avoid us having this debate again and again......and again would be great.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (12:11) The Breyer case is pretty definitive on IP address. Are you saying we need to publish IP address in the minimum public data set?

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:12) if the IP is tied to the nameserver, then yes? it needs to be public or else the NS can't function

Alan Woods (RYSG): (12:12) to achieve the resolution of a domain to an IP, a publication is necessary

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:12) different from if it's the IP of my own home connection to the Internet (for example)

Alan Woods (RYSG): (12:12) (in an IP trace etc .... gosh i'm straying into tech places)

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (12:14) So when we explain this publication, we need to be crystal clear that this is assignment to a domain.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (12:15) One of the reason I ask is that those issues have been conflated in the law enforcement ask documents, historically (coming out of the OCTOPUS conference for instance, back in pre 2013 RAA days)

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:16) sorry - which processing activity are we discussing?

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (12:16) In my untechie opinion, at least....

Berry Cobb: (12:16) 3-PA3

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (12:20) There is no reason to pass anything on, with RDAP. Thick is dead.

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:24) assessing impact is very different changing policy set elsewhere.

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:24) different than

Alan Woods (RYSG): (12:25) well we can recommend where a policy will have to be reviewed and likely changed. (From my POV)

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:25) agree Alan

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:29) We have listed policies that will be impacted in our Initial and final report. This is what the charter states we need to do.

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:29) that sounds like what rec 22 does? Updates to existing policies

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:29) right

Alan Woods (RYSG): (12:30) I think there is overlap with 1 b and 3 in this a transfer is fine for contact with the registrant .... but we would no longer publish this for purpose 3 ... (Sorry perhpas I've missed to boat here)

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (12:30) we need to provide the home work though. I dont want to go through this again, I don't know about you guys.....\

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:30) that enabling will happen based on the info alraedy held by the CP

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:31) +1 marc

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (12:32) Does the Council have a timetable for reviewing these policies? is the liaison recommending priorities in tackling all the policies?

Marc Anderson (RySG): (12:33) can't hear you Alan

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (12:33) I just have witnessed a whole lot of good work on the RDS getting dropped and re-argued (painfully) here and don't want to go through this again....

Terri Agnew: (12:33) much better Alan

Terri Agnew: (12:35) will be silence during the break

Berry Cobb: (12:37) Give me a green check mark when you return.

Terri Agnew: (12:40) recording restarted

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:44) nope you're quiet

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:44) ah yes

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:46) I'm OK with adding collection to 4A, keeping in mind that there are Optional fields (which if they are collected they should be escrowed)

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:48) are the dnssec/nameserver/etc. things green or yellow also?

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:49) Scroll down a bit further for us?

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:49) Thanks

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:49) Do we escrow NS data? Is that already happening?

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:50) hopefully escrow includes all data required to "make the user whole" if a failure happens. if NS data isn't included its not clear how you can do that.

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:50) OK. I'm sure we do, if it's required.

Berry Cobb: (12:51) @Sarah, yes. The 4A data elements selected are those designated in the 2013 RAA.

Alan Woods (RYSG): (12:51) That logic seems really good. Our beiggest problem is if your logic tallies with the Escrow requirments ... and then we have a direct conflict with the escrow specifications .... and our policy will need to replace the escro specification with my new favourite term " the Mean Data Set" for "recovery" of the zone in the event of a triggering failure..

Alan Woods (RYSG): (12:51) biggest .. the problem is not beige

Alex Deacon - IPC: (12:51) lol...

Alan Woods (RYSG): (12:52) agreed we are processors in this intance ... no argument here

Alan Woods (RYSG): (12:52) *instance

Alan Woods (RYSG): (12:55) the cart is definately before the horse here and it makes this exceptionally difficult to define!

Alan Woods (RYSG): (12:58) FYI all ... I'm going to have to drop at the top of the hour Sorry!

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (12:58) we'll miss you Alan

Alan Woods (RYSG): (12:59) lies!!! lol

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (13:01) I'm going back to the definitions one sec

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (13:01) Transfer is when both involved are Controllers/Processors, while Disclosure has one of them as a third-party. So I think Transfer is more accurate?

Berry Cobb: (13:02) I don't want to spend a lot of time on this 5-PA3.

Berry Cobb: (13:02) Great, thanks Sarah.

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (13:02) Agree with Marc, this is its own purpose

Alan Woods (RYSG): (13:02) OK sorry .... i'm dropping ... just when things are getting Juicy! :)

Berry Cobb: (13:03) we went past that though in 4A and 4B right?

Alex Deacon - IPC: (13:07) its more than just 3rd parties - its part of ICANN's bylaws.

Berry Cobb: (13:07) For sure, this accruacy/ARS is something we cant resolve in this small team.

Alex Deacon - IPC: (13:08) I'm not sure he is looking for unliminted data.

Alex Deacon - IPC: (13:08) i've not heard him say that

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (13:08) trust me I have tried to talk him out of it on the RDS review team as well, with no success so far.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (13:08) Open-ended perhaps is the correct term

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (13:09) WEll the liability would be entirely theirs

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (13:11) typo on complianant near pa4

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (13:11) (and in my message)

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (13:17) well said!

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (13:18) agree

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (13:18) +1.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (13:18) and your excellent data maps really show this Berry.

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (13:18) Good point Stephanie

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (13:21) who is the controller, are the UDRP providers processors for the purposes of this activity? ICANN is the controller here, in my view

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (13:21) What the complainant does is out of scope for this group.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (13:22) But they are accredited by ICANN, no, and they follow ICANN policy?

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (13:22) I dont feel comfortable with the DRP publishing or retaining the data, however, I also know that there's a Rec about entering intio a data protectiona agreement of some sort with the DRP, so I'm sure that will be resolved within that contract...

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (13:22) Makes them processors in my view. they have no rights to use the data except as dictated by ICANN policy.

Berry Cobb: (13:23) They submitted as part of public comment.

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (13:24) maybe the arrow should go both ways

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (13:24) The complainant first submits the complaint, with the public-available info

Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (13:24) then the DRP updates the complaint with the real info (received from registrar) and tells the complainant the real info

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (13:26) sorry but I really need to know who is th controller, who is the processor, what the DPA will say....

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (13:26) It makes a difference.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (13:27) For instance, in terms of the treatment of Complainant data. If a processor, then that has to be all spelled out in the DPA

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (13:27) Forgive me if we sorted all this out at some meeting, I must have glazed over....

Alex Deacon - IPC: (13:29) i'm pretty sure its not been discussed in any detail.

Alex Deacon - IPC: (13:30) we have a recommendation on this (setting up a GDPR compliant arrangement with the DRPs.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (13:31) This is why sorting out the exercise of control is so fundamental. Particularly in the ICANN environment where there is significant faith in an MS /private sector model

Berry Cobb: (13:31) It has been negotated in a few legacy gTLDs, all of which are Thick Whois.

Alex Deacon - IPC: (13:32) not in our scope to make those changes - but we can point out any impact of our policy.

Berry Cobb: (13:32) locks/unlocks namely. But could also be done at a Rr.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (13:32) They go in the long list of necessary revisions.

Berry Cobb: (13:32) not to discuss today.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (13:33) Thanks to all. May I say it is a great pleasure working with you. I have to say, I don't say that after an EPDP meeting.....

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (13:36) agree, list it is!

Marc Anderson (RySG): (13:36) I hope we can wrap on the list, but maybe have a place holder just in case?

Marc Anderson (RySG): (13:36) good meeting, thank you Berry
Sarah Wyld (RrSG): (13:36) Thanks, all