Adobe Connect chat transcript for Tuesday 16 February 2016

Terri Agnew:Dear all, welcome to the next-generation RDS PDP Working Group call on the 16 February 2016 at 16:00 UTC

Terri Agnew:If you do wish to speak during the call, please either dial into the audio bridge and give the operator the password RDS, OR click on the telephone icon at the top of the AC room to activate your AC mics. Please remember to mute your phone and mics when not talking.

Ayden Férdeline:Hello everyone

Stephanie Perrin:Hello all!

Chuck Gomes:Welcome to all

Adrian Cheek:Good Morning/Afternoon

Andrew Sullivan:Hello everybody.

Stacie Walsh:Hi all!

Alan Greenberg:Long delay to get on bridge - well over 2 muinutes now.

Alan Greenberg:Finally!

Grace Mutung'u:hi everyone

Aarti Bhavana:Hi All!

Terri Agnew:alerting op

Alan Greenberg:On now - typing message caused them to pick up apparently.

Richard Padilla:Helloo

Michele Neylon:dialling in now - sorry was on another call

Carlton Samuels:Howdy all

Patrick Anglin:Good Day All

Patrick Anglin:Hail Sir Carlton

Jim Galvin (Afilias):I just joined

Terri Agnew:WG Members & Mailing List Archives: https://community.icann.org/x/I4xlAw

Matthew Shears:Hello

Carlton Samuels:Happy to see you Patrick

Ron Sherwood:Hello everyone

Otieno Antony:Hello Team!

karnika seth:hello all!

Michele Neylon:Getting feedback from somebody

Carlton Samuels:Is it just me or the audio from Chuck is low?

Elaine Pruis - Donuts:MUTE

Nathalie Coupet:Hello all!

Iliya Bazlyankov:Hello All!

karnika seth:yes audio from chuck is a little low.

Elaine Pruis - Donuts:PLEASE STOP UNTIL THEY MUTE

Michele Neylon:http://www.slate.com/content/dam/slate/blogs/future_tense/2014/05/12/twitter_s_new_mute_button_is_antithetical_to_the_service/mute.jpg.CROP.promo-mediumlarge.jpg

Elaine Pruis - Donuts:thank you

Patrick Anglin:Chuck - You're audio is very very low

Amr Elsadr:I can hear him pretty clearly on my end.

Marika Konings:A larger chat means that you cannot see all of the participants / hands raised. Or see less of the notes / agenda...

Carlton Samuels:I can hear Jim clearly but Chuck is very low

Stephanie Perrin:Agree with Jim

Ayden Férdeline:I like being able to see the agenda and notes tab, but I don't need to see the names of the other participants. That being said, it would be nice if we had a larger chat box.

Zuan Zhang（Peter Green）:Hello sorry for joining minutes late

Michele Neylon:I'm not sure if you can make it bigger

Michele Neylon:maybe move its position?

Carlton Samuels:Hi Steph. Glad you're here

Marika Konings:@Ayden - it is important for the chairs to be able to see who have their hands raised without having to scroll every time

Michele Neylon:MArika - hand up moves you to the top tbh

wseltzer:on my interface, I can maximize the chat to see only that

Michele Neylon:(I just double checked :))

Marika Konings:@Michele - yes, but if you make the participants window very small you do not even see that or how long the list is

Michele Neylon:true

Amr Elsadr:Only one comment: That Susan will need to be replaced as the council liaison.

Marika Konings:but we can experiment with a different lay-out

Susan Kawaguchi:@Amr, I will resign at the GNSO meeting on Thursday

Amr Elsadr:Thanks Susan. My bet is that you're more valuable on the leadership team anyway. ;-)

Michele Neylon:Amr - you can volunteer to replace her

Amr Elsadr:Hmmm.

Michele Neylon:Amr - hey you mentioned it

Amr Elsadr:Me and my big mouth, huh?

Michele Neylon:you'll learn eventually ..

Michele Neylon:we will learn you good :)

Amr Elsadr:Unlikely, but I hope so.

Amr Elsadr::)

Kal Feher:3am here

Michele Neylon:pavlov's dog

Susan Kawaguchi:Thanks Amr, I am hoping to add value!

Amr Elsadr:Will you be ringing bells to get my attention Michele?

Michele Neylon:Amr - that could be arranged ..

Andrew Sullivan:I don't think I fully understand the plan. It's 16:00 on Tuesdays except the last Tues of the month, which is 05:00 Tues again?

Marika Konings:@Andrew - yes, that is correct

Andrew Sullivan:(I heard "Wed" in there, and I don't see how that happens)

Marika Konings:but it would be Wed 5.00 UTC

Andrew Sullivan:Ah. Ok

Andrew Sullivan:Well, then, I won't make those

Andrew Sullivan:the IAB meets on Wed mornings, so I'm not willing to do a meeting 00:00-01:30 local time before that

Stephanie Perrin:Sorry to be lazy, but what time is that for Australia, Perth and Sydney?

David Cake:It might be memorable.

Don Blumenthal:Might?

Michele Neylon:Marika knows what I'm like without sleep

Michele Neylon:it's not pretty

David Cake:5 UTC will be in the middle of the work day for Australians

Marika Konings:@Alan - we can review that, but as you noted it may be difficult as not everyone moves at the same time. :-)

wseltzer:my regrets in advance for the midnight meetings, too

Kal Feher:we are +11 right now in AEDT

Kal Feher:so 5 UTC = 1600

David Cake:Its the normal meetings that are terrble for Australians (I think it is after 3am for Holly and other east coast Australians, only

Farell FOLLY (@Africa2.0):I am finally in.. sorry for being late

Holly Raiche:Thanks Greg - 2100 UTC is also fine

Marika Konings:21.00 UTC is not very convenient for those located in other parts of Asia (e.g. Hong Kong)

Andrew Sullivan:I think the difficulty of having a global meeting at a good time for everyone is yet another reason to prefer to do as much work as possible on the mailing lists, since that works asynchronously

Alan Greenberg:The switch-over times are different in various localities, but they are all within a few weeks of each other. Revisiting then is fine, but the next switch in in just a few weeks (having done this a LOT trying to schedule ALAC meetings over the last year).

Amr Elsadr:@Andrew: I agree that would be best. Perhaps a mix/coordination between both.

Andrew Sullivan:On rotation: I vastly prefer an inconvenient meeting regularly than one that moves around

Amr Elsadr:Generally, I prefer that decisions be made/confirmed via email rather than on WG calls.

Andrew Sullivan:the moving around meetings just mean that I get to have jetlag without leaving the house

Michele Neylon:Andrew - the problem is that a lot of people in the ICANN space don't use mailing lists as effectively as you find in the IETF / ASO space

Andrew Sullivan:@Michele: I know :)

Jim Galvin (Afilias):So the meeting times are 1600 UTC on Tuesday except that last Tuesday of the month when it will be 0500 UTC on Wednesday. Right?

Ankur Raheja:Yes @Jim

Marika Konings:@Jim - yes that is correct

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@Marika - can the notes please updated to reflect that. Thanks!

Amr Elsadr:Is this the joint board/council group on RDS?

Lisa Phifer:@Amr yes

Marika Konings:No - this is the WG that was created by the ICANN Board. See https://features.icann.org/composition-and-scope-board-working-group-registration-data-directory-services-bwg-rds-0?language=ru

Lisa Phifer:@Amr my error, Marika is right

Amr Elsadr:Thanks.

Holly Raiche:It did happen

steve metalitz:I can volunteer to assist the small team, especially if this can be done via e-mail.

Stephanie Perrin:I would be happy to join that team as well.

Wendy Seltzer:I bet almost none of us "want" to be on weekly calls...

Andrew Sullivan:+∞, Wendy!

Stephanie Perrin:It seems to me that we need to decide what expertise we need, first of all. It is not entirely clear, at least in phase one, what expertise we need. In order to define the purpose of the RDS, we need some data protection expertise. We are thin in that respect, in my humble opinion, although there are many volunteers whose expertise is not represented in their SOIs

Lisa Phifer:@ Steph see 1) on task's suggested approach

Grace Mutung'u:60 plus people and there is no expertise?

Dick Leaning:+1 michele

Andrew Sullivan:We're also not talking about a fantastically complicated dataset here: the data in registries is not super rich

Lisa Phifer:Listing perspectives and needed expertise is a pre-requisite to reviewiing existing membership to determine if there are gaps - and if so recommend filling them

Michele Neylon:grace - there's actually closer to 200, but the question being asked is specific expertise not that we simply have lots of members :)

Chris Pelling:\Sorry for tardiness

Andrew Sullivan:so the questions can quite possibly be asked of experts (and anyway, even semi-informed opinion might be adequate for early drafts)

Carlton Samuels:Difficult to hear Karnika

Grace Mutung'u:@Michele, hope we are not putting the horse before the cart...unless there are specific people we want to reach out to....

Kathy Kleiman:Michele makes a good point - clearly there are those with both expertise, and also legal jurisdiction, over the type of areas we are addressed. Having ongoing communication with Data Protection Commissioner associations (both those for the EU and thosee for international DPCs) will be key.

Stephanie Perrin:I have semi-informed technical opinions.....I would not recommend that anyone build systems based on my opinions ;-) Similarly, semi-informed opinions on data protection law and practice can be dangerous

Michele Neylon:Andrew - one of the key gaps we've had is in relation to data protection - though this group seems to bridge that gap

Wendy Seltzer:apologies, I need to drop early. Back to the email list!

Terri Agnew:goodbye Wendy

Michele Neylon:Grace - the key is asking the question now to see if there are any obvious gaps

Michele Neylon:grace - there might not be any real gaps

Michele Neylon:Grace - but the idea is to make sure that we have actually tried our best to cover this now rather thant trying to fix it much later

Andrew Sullivan:@Stephanie: I wouldn't suggest anyone build anything on semi-informed opinions. But every bit of software I've ever worked on has _started_ with a semi-informed opinion. When you start, you don't know what you can do and you don't really understand the problem

Grace Mutung'u:I see...

Andrew Sullivan:I think it's valuable to find people who can contribute, but it's not like we can conscript people. If data protection is a gap, where are all the people who have been complaining about the lousy data protection in the whois since forever?

Stephanie Perrin:I understand that Andrew....I have been doing a bit of actor network analysis on who has been involved in previous WHOIS efforts, and the DPAs have not been well represented.

Stephanie Perrin:There was a resolution of the international conference of data protection commissioners several years ago to monitor ICANN, the role was never staffed.

Scott Hollenbeck:@Chuck: wasn't part of phase 1 also to consider if an RDS is needed at all?

Lisa Phifer:@Scott yes, see bottom of page 1 (A)

Amr Elsadr:@Lisa: Could we please add the documents on ICANN's legal review on the thick whois transition to this PDP's wiki? The ones I'm looking at are on this page: https://community.icann.org/display/TWCPI/Documentation

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@Scott - that question is in Chuck's message.

Scott Hollenbeck:Right, but Chuck didn't mention it just now.

Lisa Phifer:Decide whether a new RDS is needed and, if so, why...

Lisa Phifer:@Amr re legal review docs, yes, I'll take care of getting a link to those added to this WG"s wiki

Stephanie Perrin:I guess if we decide it is not needed this will be a quick PDP....

Amr Elsadr:Thanks Lisa. They're part of the implementation of thick whois, so is not on the actual PDP WG's wiki space.

Lisa Phifer:@KK, it's question #1

Andrew Sullivan:It wasn't just for business purposes. It was for technical operation purposes

Andrew Sullivan:so that you could actually find someone in order to make the network operate

Andrew Sullivan:It's worth remembering that when WHOIS/NICNAME was published, you could write away to the NIC and get a list on paper of all the names and addresses of everyone connected to the Internet

Scott Hollenbeck:It was actually published in a printed directory...

Andrew Sullivan:exactly

Jim Galvin (Afilias):White pages - if you were directly connected you were given a printed copy at regular times.

Kathy Kleiman:According to those who names were published, these were generally liaisons on behalf of institutions (e.g., MIT.edu, Harvard.edu) and they listed their office contact data.

Holly Raiche:@Andres. I think the operative words are: so that you could find someone to make the network operate.

Holly Raiche:Let's emember that Whois preceded the RAA requiements

Amr Elsadr:@Andrew: It's safe to say that who uses WHOIS, and how it i being used has changed over the years.

Stephanie Perrin:The accretion of data elements needs to be examined.

Michele Neylon:Holly - yes, but the original purpose of whois was very very different to the current beast

Andrew Sullivan:It's true that the people were generally someone who had some sort of official connection to the operation of the network, but that's because of who the population of the network was. The point is that precedents in whois are bad in two ways

Andrew Sullivan:(1) that the one-policy-for-all rule was adequate in a network where everyone knew everyone else anyway.

Holly Raiche:@@ Michele - absolutely agree - which is why Alan makes the good point - what was collected and why is interesting - but needs to be looked at again

Andrew Sullivan:(2) that the kind of link between operation of a domain and operation of the network was tight

Kathy Kleiman:But Chuck, we may find that certain court rulings bar some of the uses and some of the purposes

Richard Padilla:Hi maybe not a good question to ask but is there any reason why we should based a repalcement for WHOIS on WHOIS itself. how difficult will it be to look at a new option that can put us on different track but will provide the requireement necessary in replacing WHOIS

Andrew Sullivan:We _should_ ditch whois-the-protocol. The IETF has provided alternatives. Twice, now.

Stephanie Perrin:Indeed we have a Supreme Court case in Canada (Spenser) that prohibits certain kinds of disclosure without a warrant.

Andrew Sullivan:Whois-the-protocol should die. It's terrible.

Holly Raiche:@ Michele - agree - we need to relook at purposes for collection - and what is collected - it is a very different set of issues now

Kathy Kleiman:(I'm referring to the court order overturning the Safe Harbor with the US)

Carlton Samuels:@Richard: This is the proposal from the EWG. The report is on the list of resources for this WG

Richard Padilla:@Carlton thank will look at it

Holly Raiche:@ Andrew - maybe use the SSAC terminology as far more precise

karnika seth:much of who is data is inaccurate and that is quite a challenge for law enforcement .I think therre should be a layered access !

steve metalitz:@Kathy, the Schrems decision you reference has no direct impact on RDS

Dick Leaning:why is it inaccurate?

Michele Neylon:Karnika - LEA can access lots of data that is unrelated to whois if they follow proper procedure

Grace Mutung'u:@Karnika, layered access may be the way to go

Amr Elsadr:@Karnika: I'm not of the opinion that whois is meant to be a tool for law enforcement at all.

Carlton Samuels:@Karnika: This was one of the outcomes reported/proposed by the EWG

Richard Padilla:+1 Amr

Michele Neylon:Karnika - we have IP addresses, billing details etc

Holly Raiche:@ Dick. The Final Report of the Whois found that some of the reasons relate to people deliberately not wanting their personal information made public - for quite legitimate reasons

Michele Neylon:Karnika - none of that would ever be made public

Richard Padilla:+1 Carlton

Andrew Sullivan:@Holly: in that case, I'd just say "whois", and people would be confused :)

Richard Padilla:+1 Michele

karnika seth:sure ip addresses may be spoofed ... onion routing !!

Michele Neylon:Karnika - yes, but you will always have an IP

Marika Konings:Please note that the mind map was also circulated together with the agenda

Michele Neylon:and do you honestly think I can't spoof an address easily?

Holly Raiche:@Andrew - they wanted to replace Whois with terms line registration data, regisration services, etc

Richard Padilla:@Karnika yes that is probably true but the information remain on the original owner

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@amr +1, i.e., I'm not of the opinion that LE is dependent on WHOIS.

Dick Leaning:Ip addeess are shared, domain names are not

Richard Padilla:+1 Dick

Andrew Sullivan:@Holly, yes, but there's no way to refer to the protocol called whois and that runs on port 43 except as "whois", so I always say "whois-the-protocol" to make sure it's clear what I'm saying

Nathalie Coupet:@karnia What is onion routing?

Andrew Sullivan:IP addresses are shared?

Andrew Sullivan:IP addresses are shared much less than domain names are!

Carlton Samuels:I still believe that using the questions as guidance, we can get answers to some issues VERY quickly and I urge the leadership to promote a methodology where we 'manufacture' consensus over some issues as quickly as possible.

Holly Raiche:@ Andrew - from memory, I think they wanted to say RD protocol - or something like that (forgotten now)

karnika seth:as servers for many websites are outside country unless there is a mutual cooperation treaty, getting evidence from another country becomes difficult

Dick Leaning:LEA are not Jim, its one of many tools that are used by all people who are resonbile for the saftey of the public on-line

Andrew Sullivan:@Holly, yes, they did. And whois and RDAP are two RD protocols

Richard Padilla:+1 Carlton, yes the longer it continues we may end up just going round in circles

Holly Raiche:@ Andrew - I know that - but not sure how widely that is appreciated

Susan Prosser:@Andrew - I think what intended for shared IPs is multiple domains on an IP

Andrew Sullivan:@Susan: aha. Thanks. That's only sort of true, but yes

karnika seth:onion routing is multiple use of anonymous communication using encryption layers

Kathy Kleiman:In light of the discussion today, Chuck, I think we can all take a closer look at the mindmap -- with a bit more context and understanding.

Susan Prosser:agree, but I *think* that is what they were inferring

Kathy Kleiman:Adding - tx Chuck!

Holly Raiche:@ Susan - carrier grade NAT means IP addresses are REALLY shared

David Cake:Thank you for that useful suggestion Amr.

Michele Neylon:IPv4 - IPv6 transition means lots more NAT

Dick Leaning:and there will always be NATS

Richard Padilla:@Michele, but wouldn't the implemntation of IP 6 solve some iof the issue waround NAT and spoofng of IP address for doamin etc

Andrew Sullivan:I don't fully undetstand how any NAT or virtual hosting (or onion routing) has any consequence for us

Michele Neylon:Richard if the ISPs were turned on

Michele Neylon:Andrew - it depends on how philosophical you want to be :)

Richard Padilla:@Michele oh really didn't know lol

Andrew Sullivan:@Michele: well, I meant "for us" as participants here, not in general :)

Michele Neylon:Andrew - it was linked to the entire "data that someone has about a regisrant"

Michele Neylon:Richard - IPv6 penetration is growing, but it's still very very low

Michele Neylon:See http://www.google.com/intl/en/ipv6/statistics.html#tab=per-country-ipv6-adoption&tab=per-country-ipv6-adoption

Richard Padilla:@Michele, I know I will be heading back to Trinidad in March and I know they are no IP4 address for LACNIC region so I'm looking forward towards moving forward

Andrew Sullivan:But the registration data doesn't include the registrant's IP address. It includes the registrant's IP addresses of specific servers

Michele Neylon:Richard - there's a ton of IPv4 space that isn't actively used

Andrew Sullivan:you actually _do_ need that to make the system work

Michele Neylon:Andrew - you're missing the point entirely

Michele Neylon:As the registrar you collect a ton of info about your clients

Andrew Sullivan:Doubtless. Why I'm asking!

Michele Neylon:which could be useful for LEA

Andrew Sullivan:Yes, but how does that have to do with RDS?

Michele Neylon:including IP addresses where they conenctred to you, paid etc

Richard Padilla:@Michele I heard that as well

Stephanie Perrin:Getting back to layered access....need to cost it.

Michele Neylon:Andrew - the question was about LEA using whois data

Michele Neylon:and the assuimption that whois is super important

Stephanie Perrin:Costs need to include authentication costs for ID of users. This is where it gets tricky.

Andrew Sullivan:are we suggesting that RDS ought to include data about the registrant's web browser's address?

Andrew Sullivan:Hmm

Michele Neylon:Andrew - NO

Michele Neylon:Andrew - we were picking holes in the argument that whois data is needed by law enforcement - they don't really need it, they have acc

Michele Neylon:ess to much more

Stephanie Perrin:We are indeed questioning the retention of metadata required in the 2013 RAA...

Andrew Sullivan:Hmm. Well, I think those are different kinds of problems. And anyway, there are really two questions there

Michele Neylon:Stephanie - yes

Andrew Sullivan:1. does LEA need access to the data?

Holly Raiche:@ Stephanie - do you mean data or metadata?

Michele Neylon:Andrew - when? how?

Andrew Sullivan:2. Does LEA need access to data without authenticating themselves?

Michele Neylon:they can always argue that they should have access to data

Stephanie Perrin:Indeed that was my point in bringing up the issues of frames. Some of us must operate from a different frame, we cannot slice our analysis the way ICANN slices its pdps.

Michele Neylon:but the key thing is that the amount of data they can access without a warrant is going to be limited

karnika seth:the time when a domain is booked there is an ip address from where such booking is made , it is relevant

Andrew Sullivan:yeah, I think that's reasonable

Michele Neylon:Karnika - that's actually not true

Andrew Sullivan:What Michele said

Stephanie Perrin:Relevant to what and for what purpose, is the key question.

Michele Neylon:Karnika - you assume that the registrar always sees the registrant's IP - we don't

Michele Neylon:some registrars sell domains "offline" "in person"

Michele Neylon:we sell a certain number over the phone

karnika seth:what i think is important is means to identify and verify registrant, this is precisely what requires discussion

Michele Neylon:Karnika - whois data is not a way of identifying anyone

Greg Mounier GAC PSWG:+1 Karnika

Michele Neylon:I register some domains using a PO Box

karnika seth:I beg to differ here.

Michele Neylon:good luck trying to identify me

Jennifer Standiford:It would be helpful to have the proposed date and time so we can determine our availability

Amr Elsadr:@Karnika: Are you talking about verification of registrant IDs?

Michele Neylon:Jennifer - it's on the schedule already I think

Andrew Sullivan:It seems to me that several different concepts are being blended together here, and I'm not convinced that they're all the same thing

Farell FOLLY (@Africa2.0):For Marrakech, is it the next monday ?

Alan Greenberg:SOme of us may be in Marrakech but will have conflicts!

Lisa Phifer:@karnika, you may find the EWG report section on optional identity validation of interest

Ankur Raheja:I think Ms Karnika points to the fact if false WHOIS is provided, then IP address of the registrant can help to identify !

Michele Neylon:Ankur - help who?

Farell FOLLY (@Africa2.0):next wednesday I'd mean

Farell FOLLY (@Africa2.0):ok

steve metalitz:Thanks for good chairing Chuck!

Ankur Raheja:Investigation agency @Michele

Michele Neylon:they can get a court order so

David Cake:Thank you Chuck

Amr Elsadr:Thanks all. Bye.

Michele Neylon:rightio - see you all next week

Sara Bockey:thanks all

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB:Bye

Andrew Sullivan:thanks Chuck, bye all

Jim Galvin (Afilias):Thanks and bye all.
Stacie Walsh:thanks!
Carlton Samuels:Thanks all
Richard Padilla:Byes folks see you next week
Vlad Dinculescu:thanks all
Grace Mutung'u:thanks all
karnika seth:thankyou chuck!
Iliya Bazlyankov:Thank you and bye!
Zuan Zhang（Peter Green）:Thanks all, byebye
Ayden Férdeline:Thanks everyone
Susan Prosser:bye
Ankur Raheja:bye
Nathalie Coupet:Thank you Chuck