

Michelle DeSmyter:Dear All, Welcome to the Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group call on Tuesday, 23 August 2017 2016 at 16:00 UTC.

Michelle DeSmyter:If you 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 speaking.

Michelle DeSmyter:Agenda page:
<https://community.icann.org/x/jg6sAw>

Chuck Gomes:Under agenda item 3 please move 20 after 19.

Chuck Gomes:Thanks

Chuck Gomes>Welcome to all. We will wait a couple more minutes while people continue to join.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Hello All

Ankur Raheja:Hello

steve metalitz:Marika's notes from last week indicate that use case from Rod on domainis registered to miscreant would be deferred to this week. Has that been further deferred?

Lisa Phifer:yes Steve - Rod is unable to join today

steve metalitz:OK thanks Lisa

Ayden Férdeline:hi all.

Greg Shatan:Hopefully Rod's absence is not due to miscreants.

Greg Aaron:Probably is!

Greg Shatan:Scroll and magnification control please.

Lisa Phifer:sync off go ahead

Greg Shatan:It came and went...

Stephanie Perrin:my apologies for being late

Ayden Férdeline:It's redundant, feel free to remove "in defining this policy" if you like.

Alex Deacon:Agree its redundant
marksv:"is resolving the tension"

Alan Greenberg:will be to resolve...

Alex Deacon:agree it could be cleaned up...

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):+1 Michele, solve -> resolve and remove the second one

Alan Greenberg:addressing the tension

steve metalitz:+1 to "accommodates"

Ayden Férdeline:"The core problem will be accomodating the tension among the varied and competing views..."

Fabricio Vayra:I also like accomodating

Beth Allegretti:+1 to "accomodate"

marksv:"addressing" is also good

ELAINE PRUIS:+ 1 addressing

Michele Neylon:+1 to either address or accomodate

Jeffrey Eckhaus: +1 addressing

steve metalitz:The vrebs I had suggested considering were

resolve/manage/accommodate/mitigate

Michele Neylon:we are splitting hairs though :)

Holly Raiche:Just a suggestion - happy with either

Sara Bockey:"taking into consideration"

steve metalitz:verbs

andrew sullivan:"The core problem will be to get everyone resigned to the compromise with which nobody is satisfied" ;-(
) (No that's not a real suggestion.)

marksv:hah

Stephanie Perrin:+1 Alan

Greg Shatan:I don't think accommodating implies resolving.

Jeffrey Eckhaus:I agree with Alan -

Ayden Férdeline:I do not think "accomodating" implies any sort of final resolution. Sounds more like a compromise to me.

Jim Galvin (Afilias):Agree with Alan

marksv:no problem from me

Holly Raiche:Works for me

andrew sullivan:@Ayden: if you think there will be a _final_ resolution, then I urge you to consider the last 30 years of Internet policy development.

Ayden Férdeline:Andrew, I don't think that all.

andrew sullivan:I strongly object to the stakeholders/claim to stuff. I think it's inconsistent with ICANN processes

Ayden Férdeline:Yes, I maintain we must include "claim to" in the sentence.

marksv:I think "claim to" feels perjorative

Greg Shatan:Agree with Mark

Lisa Phifer:roughly 12 opposed, two in favor of "claim to"

Michele Neylon:as do I

Ayden Férdeline:re: the count. Just a simple reminder that was not a referendum... :)

marksv:ok to delete

ELAINE PRUIS:remove is good

Beth Allegretti:ok to delete

Holly Raiche:Agree with Chuch and Andrew on this

andrew sullivan:Not only will we not lose, I think we gain something

andrew sullivan:ditch it

Alan Greenberg:delete

Richard Padilla:HI all sorry for being late

Susan Kawaguchi:Facebook as a registrant does

marksv:registrants have an interest

Susan Prosser:retain registrants

andrew sullivan:If registrants don't have a legitimate (no idea about "vested") interest here, then nobody does

Ayden Férdeline:no, actually, i think we should retain

registrants.

Holly Raiche:Agree with Chuck - registrants DO have an interest
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):I wonder if registrants are aware of RDS
at all

marksv:good point

Susan Kawaguchi:@ Maxim I couldn't manage the FB portfolio
without the registration data

marksv:in the spirit of conciseness, i am ok to delete the
verbiage

Susan Kawaguchi:All registrants should use the registration
data to confirm their own information

Ayden Férdeline:@Maxim largely they are not. ICANN has
conducted research on this before that suggests less than 5% of
registrants are aware of WHOIS.

andrew sullivan:Even if registrants _don't_ know about RDS,
they have an interest. (This is the same problem I had with the
"claim to" language)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Ayden, but adding very few registrants
does not help .. so we might remove it

Ayden Férdeline:I wasn't suggesting to add that text to the
document.

Alan Greenberg:We are going down a rathole of everyone wanting
their key-words in this.

Susan Kawaguchi:@ Ayden if you are talking about internet users
that are not registrants I would agree with your assertion but I
can't imagine anyone that runs a business on a domain name or is
in the business of selling domain names does not use registration
data frequently

marksv:good point, i agree with the distinction between privacy
and anonymity

Nathalie Coupet:+1 Michele

Ayden Férdeline:@Susan hi, yes, that is what i was suggesting.
i agree that for *some* commercial registrants would be the case.

Greg Shatan:Ayden, do you have a link or cite for that
research?

Vaibhav Aggarwal:that's right @michele

Fabricio Vayra:Agree with Michelle. What he's saying is that
there's no parity.

Susan Kawaguchi:I would bet the registrants of oer 300 million
domain names registered use registration data so it is not
insignificant

Greg Shatan:Seems like we have picked one edge case and called
it for effect or because of a particular interest in the
anonymous subgroup.

Holly Raiche:Agree with Chuck on this issue - there are some
who really do want to go beyond privacy

Greg Shatan:Let's use "dealing with" again.
Fabricio Vayra:+1 Stephanie. Respecting is good.
Vaibhav Aggarwal:yes
Stephanie Perrin:Let the record show Fab and Steph agree!!!!
Jim Galvin (Afilias):I agree with Michele we should remove the sentence.
Fabricio Vayra:+1 Alex
Holly Raiche:Do not agree with the removal
Ayden Férdeline:No. Strongly disagree with @Alex. We should retain the final sentences.
steve metalitz: +1 to Alex and Michele on removing last 2 sentences, why would we single out one viewpoint "for example"?
Vaibhav Aggarwal:There shud be two parts of this statement
Susan Kawaguchi:+1 Andrew
Fabricio Vayra:+1 Alan
Jim Galvin (Afilias):+1 Andrew - keep registrants
Holly Raiche:Totally agree with Andrew
Vaibhav Aggarwal:1from backend and one for front end we shud be able to separate in treatment
Michele Neylon:+1 Alan
Ayden Férdeline:@Alan The sentence says "some" desire anonymity or pseudonymity ... not everyone.
Susan Kawaguchi:+1 Alan
ELAINE PRUIS:+1
Tjabbe Bos (European Commission):+1 Alan
Stephanie Perrin:We have to remove accurate and complete then if we remove these lines
Jeffrey Eckhaus:Agree with Alan again +1
Alex Deacon:+1 Alan
Beth Allegretti:+1 Alan
Jim Galvin (Afilias):+1 Alan - remove the two sentences
Ayden Férdeline:+1 Stephanie
Fabricio Vayra:+1 Alan
Ayden Férdeline:If we remove the final two sentences, we need to edit the first sentence.
Geoffrey Noakes (Symantec):+1 Alan
Stephanie Perrin:This is respectfully an good example of the problem.
marksv:"a list of examples is available in document abcd.pdf"
Stephanie Perrin:remove complete if you remove ut
marksv:hooray
Volker Greimann:SSL needS: there are no other means of authentication than whois? As anyone can put anything into whois, how is that a secure method?
Rod Rasmussen:Internet > Web - just a friendly reminder. :-)
Vaibhav Aggarwal:+1 JEFF

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):We saw situations when persons changed their names legally to be full copy of company names

Alex Deacon:@volker - whois is one of many data sources used - depending on the cert kind/type/product

marksv:SSL (actually, TLS 1.1 or higher) is necessary but not sufficient

David Cake:yes, authentication for CAs can be done directly via DNS not using Whois for basic certs. eg ACME used by lets encrypt

Vaibhav Aggarwal:the systems are already widely getting upgraded to TLS 1.2

Vaibhav Aggarwal:perfect point JEFF about the domains

Vaibhav Aggarwal:but a larger part of the world has only access to Whois for information

Vaibhav Aggarwal:and nothing else

marksv:@Vaibhav, agree that we should all skip over TLS 1.1 to TLS 1.2. I don't recall if PCI certs are requiring 1.2 yet; I know they are disallowing 1.0

Vaibhav Aggarwal:the transition has begun @marksv

Vaibhav Aggarwal:we just did in one of my ecom businesses

marksv:~)

Susan Kawaguchi:echo

Vaibhav Aggarwal:for e.g there is a large part of CAs available for \$1 or more and there is no other authentication done

marksv:echo echo echo

Greg Shatan:David was echoing....

Vaibhav Aggarwal:echo

andrew sullivan:I don't see how it is relevant to this case that some CAs don't use the RDS this way

Alex Deacon:@Andrew +1

andrew sullivan:Just because some people don't do this doesn't mean that it's not a useful thing to offer

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Andrew

Ayden Férdeline:why do you need to use WHOIS, what if the registrant just added a TXT entry to their DNS?

Vaibhav Aggarwal:@this application shud have thumbs up :-)

Vaibhav Aggarwal::~-(

Michele Neylon:somebody has an echo

Sara Bockey:David needs to mute when not speaking

andrew sullivan:@Ayden: there are different ways to do things, but records in the DNS are not the same thing as validating who is supposed to be allowed to do something.

Michele Neylon:please turn off your speakers or whatever

andrew sullivan:There are lots of people who are sceptical of the value of EV and OV and so on certs

Michele Neylon:Ayden - there are different types of certs with different levels of validation

andrew sullivan:but if you think they're useful, evidence in the DNS isn't enough

Vaibhav Aggarwal:onus of enactment is at the tier level

Michele Neylon:DNS records mean nothing

Michele Neylon:nothing

Michele Neylon:I could register facebookucksdonkeytoes.somthing now

Michele Neylon:add a DNS record

Michele Neylon:done

Vaibhav Aggarwal:1st, the registrar, 2nd Registry and 3rd ICANN

Michele Neylon:doesn't mean we are FB or have any right to use the domain

Chuck Gomes:It is not in scope for this WG to change DNS.

Susan Kawaguchi:@michele most CAs then reach out to me to validate the domain name

Vaibhav Aggarwal:considering that the registrar will be providing faulty information most of the time

Ayden Férdeline:@Michele I wasn't suggesting it was or should be the only form of verification

Michele Neylon:Susan - yes, though that's only cos you're big enough for them to care

Susan Kawaguchi:true and lots of bad stuff going on with certs in the past

Vaibhav Aggarwal:+1 Chuck

Michele Neylon:there's been some very odd things in the past ..

Alex Deacon:LetsEncrypt-style certs provide strong encryption with very weak (or perhaps no) authenticaiton.

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Greg

Vaibhav Aggarwal:Q keeps coming back to the validation of the information provided by the registrant

andrew sullivan:@Alex: the ACME use case is basically sceptical of EV and so on, at least for those use cases

David Cake:not weak authentication, weak credentialling

Ayden Férdeline:@Greg - That is not what happening. People are simply asking questions to understand how a task could be performed if access to the RDS was not available.

Vaibhav Aggarwal:let's not take examples of 100\$ CAs

andrew sullivan:I think anyone involved with letsencrypt would say that, if you need an EV cert, their way is probably not the way to do it

David Cake:verifies that you own the domain

Stephanie Perrin:Hold on, are we not here to try to figure out the better way?

Benny Samuelson / Nordreg AB:I cant see how access to whois info in RDS change anything from how it is today? There are no magic about the RDS solving fake registrations

Alex Deacon:for the record I'm a fan of LetsEncrypt - more encryption is always better.

Vaibhav Aggarwal:talk discuss about 10-1-2-3-4-6\$ CAs

Greg Shatan:A better way is one thing. But telling users to go away and find a way to deal with this in a fashion that doesn't involve RDS.

Stephanie Perrin:+1 Michele

Vaibhav Aggarwal:So would Michele u suggest a phase wise phase out of the who is ?

marksv:lol

Ayden Férdeline:+1 Michele

Vaibhav Aggarwal:or u r saying that this shud always exist @ Michele

David Cake:yes, letsencrypt solves only for domain validation. EV is a valid different case - but should go beyond RDS anyway.

Jim Galvin (Afilias):this is an example use case

Jim Galvin (Afilias):doesn't mean it will continue in the future, it just exists today

Jim Galvin (Afilias):seems reasonably well described to me

Ayden Férdeline:+1 Jim

Jim Galvin (Afilias):shouldn't we move on to the next one?

Vaibhav Aggarwal:@Michele Under \$1

Michele Neylon:well that's not a sustainable biz model :)

Vaibhav Aggarwal:but it'll always exist and u may agree to that

marksv:Glad I don't live within binocular range of Michele

David Cake:I agree Jim.

Michele Neylon:lol

Vaibhav Aggarwal:I agree with you but that is a way to up sell more expensive ones

marksv:hahaha

Vaibhav Aggarwal:ha ha ha gd one +1

Volker Greimann:Solution to this use case: Abolish FOA and rely entirely on EPP code.

marksv:Need to drop - thanks everyone

Vaibhav Aggarwal:ciao mark

Vaibhav Aggarwal:This is definitely @Chuck & @Jim

Geoffrey Noakes (Symantec):If anyone wants to connect offline about the use case for CA's use of WHOIS/RDS, I may be reached at geoffrey_noakes@symantec.com

Stephanie Perrin:Suddenly my microphone has become muted

Stephanie Perrin:Is there a difference when there is a proxy registration?

Stephanie Perrin:Can somone in tech please see if they have put me on permanent mute? I did not touch anything

Benny Samuelson / Nordreg AB:With the new IRTP-C getting in force in january yes that will create problems but not a RDS

problem.

Lisa Phifer:Michele, re: transfer case, is EPP code the same as "auth code"

Vaibhav Aggarwal:the app is just not working boss can Adobe be given feedback?

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):@Lisa - yes

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):aka authInfo

Lisa Phifer:re: authcode, I ask because there have been suggestions that it be published in the RDS and it sounds from the case like it should not be

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):SHOULD NOTE BE!

andrew sullivan:Most certainly should never be

Benny Samuelson / Nordreg AB:that is a no go

Susan Kawaguchi:+1 Scott

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):code is a secret ... not to be shared

Jim Galvin (Afilias):Practical problems exist, like registrars who do not make the auth_info available to registrants, but that is outside the scope of this discussion in my opinion.

Chuck Gomes>Note that registrars have requirements in their agreements with ICANN that require them to respond within certain time frames.

Benny Samuelson / Nordreg AB:That is a compliance issues and should be handled like that

Holly Raiche:Tks Michele

Greg Aaron:I am sending a note up to the list regarding the transfer and deletion use cases. The use cases do not mention a lot of relevant material from Consensus Policies, and so the use cases seem incomplete or miss a lot of scope. My note will reference the material.

Lisa Phifer:Day 1 - THursday - will be F2F meeting day

steve metalitz:Thursday Nov. 3

Holly Raiche:Time zones much better for APAC region

Stephanie Perrin:I am still trying to decide, may be remote

Greg Aaron:we need remote participation

andrew sullivan:I am supposed to be in H, but can't be sure

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):remote participation is a good idea

Greg Aaron:And count on a few people not getting visas in time!

Rod Rasmussen:To be clear - I will be there but may be in other rooms during some of our deliberations.

Ayden Férdeline:thanks all

Nathalie Coupet:Thank you

Alex Deacon:Thanks!

Vlad Dinculescu:thanks all.

VaibhavAggarwal:Thanks team

Patrick Lenihan:Thanks to Each and All!

andrew sullivan:bye

VaibhavAggarwal:Have a gr8 time ahead
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):bye all
Susan Prosser:thanks all