Terri Agnew:Welcome to the GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group teleconference held on Wednesday, 24 February 2016 at 05:00 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.

Chuck Gomes:Hello everyone

David Cake:Hello Chuck

Ankur Raheja:Hello

Aarti Bhavana:Hi All

Michele Neylon:mute your line if you are not speaking

Donna Austin, Neustar:Does Chuck sound very faint to everyone?

Michele Neylon:Donna - no

Michele Neylon:loud and clear here

Stephanie Perrin:loud enough here

Lawrence OlaWale-Roberts:am in the Ac room now

Norm Ritchie:Security = cyber security?

Elaine Pruis:may I suggest adding compliance expertise -registry and registrar.

Donna Austin, Neustar:okay, thanks.

Stephanie Perrin:Noted Elaine....thanks

Ankur Raheja:+1 @ Elaine

Lisa Phifer:Was the intent to cover first responders? Incident investigators?

Rod Rasmussen:From a technical perspective, actually working with RDAP, whois, etc. in actual implementation - could be any angle of implementation - provision of the service or creating software/tools that use the protocols. We should make sure we have people who've actually written code and framed architecture around "whois" involved, not just having technical expertise in a related field.

Lawrence OlaWale-Roberts:there are some Govt institutions that administer the internet domain in country, but are not security agencies, so Govt should suffice

Lisa Phifer:@Rod - Are you suggesting an additional category such as software/service developer?

Greg Shatan:DNS technical specialists should also be a category!

Rod Rasmussen:@Lisa, You could do that - coding, sure since it's not covered, but what I'm trying to get at is that we want coders or architects that have actually worked with the technical protocols involved to create systems as a specific skill set. Scott Hallenbach type experieince.

Tapani Tarvainen:Which category (if any) would include anti-spam organizations/companies (spamhaus &c)?

Rod Rasmussen:@Tapani - looking for that category for myself! :-)

Lisa Phifer:@Tapani, @Rod - perhaps cybersecurity orgs?

Rod Rasmussen:@Lisa - Sure - but no biggie. Right now "Technical Security" is good enough for me - we don't need to cover the entire spectrum of job descriptions if we're going to bog things down.

David Cake:Public safety organisation is a good suggestion.

Greg Shatan:We have legal/criminal -- I think that covers what Stephanie is talking about.

Greg Shatan:That would have to be defense, because the other side of criminal law is law enforcement.

Stephanie Perrin:as long as it is clear that we are not just looking at criminal prosecutors...

Greg Shatan:That should probably be under "public safety," Stephanie.

Michele Neylon:Private infosec companies aren't really public safety though, are they?

Greg Shatan:No.

Greg Shatan:Public Safety is just governmental arms.

Michele Neylon:Spamhaus being a good example

Kiran Malancharuvil:wouldn't privacy advocates ensure the function of limiting potential overreach of law enforcement? criminal defense wouldn't come in play in this.

Stephanie Perrin:I don't actually think privacy advocates can adequately take on the constitutional protections for due process in each jurisdiction, these are normally criminal defence matters, not privacy]

Kal Feher:I can see the full document

Kiran Malancharuvil:criminal defense isn't responsible for due process, constitutional law scholars are

Marika Konings:Please note that you can resize the document by using the plus / minus sign, or even use the full screen option (the four arrows in the right hand corner)

Richard Padilla:Morning all

Kiran Malancharuvil:weren't there two full comment periods on the EWG report? plus comment on the issue report that referenced it?

Lisa Phifer:@Stephanie - note that question1 is purposes

Amr Elsadr:@Stephanie: We actually made a big deal out of asking for a new preliminary issues report (following the first one published a couple of years ago) to have the opportunity to comment on the final EWG report within the context of this PDP. Just sayin'. :)

Stephanie Perrin:Indeed, Amr, but the problem is there was not the amount of comment that the content warranted. Always a problem of course, but the timing did not serve us well in that regard.

Lisa Phifer:@Steph, @Amr - see 2b as opportunity for community input

Stephanie Perrin:and yes Lisa, we will have the opportunityt to interrogate each use and purpose, but that is a different process. the global purpose will have to be threaded in each time.

Lisa Phifer:@Steph - the overarching purpose can be one of the possible requirements, no?

Stephanie Perrin:Wait till you see the minority reports I refrained from submitting, Chuck!

Stephanie Perrin:Yes Lisa that would make me happy!

Amr Elsadr:Stephanie's dissenting statement to the EWG final report was included as a document to be reviewed in the issues report. A link to it is also available on this WG's wiki.

Lisa Phifer:Cost requirements are question 9 - however this must be revisited during phases 2 and 3

Stephanie Perrin:Right, that is the problem...

Lisa Phifer:For example, phase 1 identifies what costs must be measured, phase 2 may ballpark those costs

Greg Shatan:We need to identify who's paying....

Norm Ritchie:can cost be specified as a requirement? ie, operatonal cost not to exceed x? Seems difficult to me

Greg Shatan:If you are in the Asia-Pacific region, I expect you are happy with the time of this call. Rest of World, not so much....

Lisa Phifer:@Norm - requirement might not be $ value, but a requirement to measure costs associated w development, deployment, maintenance, etc... and a requirement to identify who pays

Marika Konings:@Greg - it is called 'sharing the burden' ;-)

Lisa Phifer:Then in phase 2 those requirements could be examined against a specific set of policies

Greg Shatan:We will be happy to run the RDS. :-)

Michele Neylon:Greg - yeah you would be - we wouldn't :)

Greg Shatan:I would want you to be happy, too, Michele....

Amr Elsadr:@Greg: Whoah..., wait a minute. Paying for it and running it are not the same thing. ;-)

Stephanie Perrin: If everyone paid for access to data, it would soon pay for itself....

Greg Shatan:@Amr, the incentives are limited otherwise... :-)

Tapani Tarvainen:@Michele: we *do* care about making spammers' lives more difficult - we want that!

Michele Neylon:Tapani - that's what I said (indirectly)

Tapani Tarvainen:@Michele - yes, obviously. Apologies for my odd sense of humour.

Greg Mounier:Agree with Chuck we need to keep our respective communities informed regularly about what the WG is discussing so as to get input from them on an permanent basis.

Marika Konings:Please note that the 35 days requirement is a minimum - the WG can always extend this timeframe, or entertain requests for extensions.

Greg Shatan:David, could you back off your mic please? You are way in the red....

David Cake:Thanks Greg

Michele Neylon:Marika - thanks for clarifying

Michele Neylon:Greg - you have colours?

Michele Neylon:I'm so jealous

Marika Konings::-)

Greg Shatan:I don't actually have needles bouncing into the red; I was being metaphorical.

Michele Neylon:Greg - you and your metaphors

Greg Shatan:I never metaphor i didn't like.

Michele Neylon:Greg - you might enjoy

http://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/M/bo3637992.html

David Cake:I am enough of an audio nerd that I could see Gregs metaphorical needles.

Nathalie Coupet:Yes

Rod Rasmussen:The approach is solid.

Alex Deacon:Chuck - i think the approach is great but we need to make sure we set milestones and all work hard to meet them. A challenge but not impossible.

Tapani Tarvainen:It is making sense to me.

Vlad Dinculescu:I like the approach. Very well thought out.

Richard Padilla:Yes with the approach there can always be some adjust as and when issue are different or complicated

Michele Neylon:I was just demoing the various emotions :)

Kal Feher:the approach is fine to me for now

Susan Prosser:Agree with Alex - approach is good, but need structure and deadlines

Michele Neylon:Susan - that's in the draft work plan we've been working on

Michele Neylon:this is just the overarching approach bit

Patrick Lenihan 2:We are on the right track....

Lawrence OlaWale-Roberts:The approach has my support as it is clearly well thought through

Tjabbe Bos (European Commission):Agree on the outline, but would like to stress importance of step 2b

Marika Konings:it is not 11.00 but I believe 16.00

Michele Neylon:Yes - Marrakech is on UTV

Michele Neylon:UTC even

Marika Konings:16.00 local time

Marika Konings:See https://meetings.icann.org/en/marrakech55/schedule/wed-rds for further details

Terri Agnew 2:Wednesday, 09 March 2016 at 16:00 local time

Nathalie Coupet:Thank you, Chuck!

Amr Elsadr:Thanks Chuck and all. Bye.

Greg Shatan:Thank you, Chuck and all!

Marc Anderson:thank you Chuck

Norm Ritchie:ty ... cheers

Lisa Phifer:Thanks!

Michele Neylon:it's Wednesday here

Richard Padilla:Thanks

Greg Mounier:thanks

David Cake:Thank you Chuck.
Lawrence OlaWale-Roberts:it's 7am here
Vlad Dinculescu:Thanks all.
Roger Carney:Thanks
Susan Prosser:ty
Michele Neylon:Europe is having breakfast
Richard Padilla:Laters peeps
Sara Bockey:thanks all
Lawrence OlaWale-Roberts:bye
Patrick Lenihan 2:Thanks again!
Ankur Raheja:Thanks