Michelle DeSmyter:Dear All, Welcome to the Next-Gen RDS PDP WG Meeting on Tuesday, 06 September 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 mics. Please remember to mute your phone and mics when not speaking.

   Michelle DeSmyter:Agenda page:
https://community.icann.org/x/JBmsAw

   VAIBHAV AGGARWAL::-)

   VAIBHAV AGGARWAL:10 & counting :-)

   Chuck Gomes:Hello all.

   VAIBHAV AGGARWAL::-)

   Alex Deacon:Helllo all...

   Greg Shatan:Hello all. I will need to leave at the bottom of the hour due to a conflicting ICANN-related meeting.

   Ayden Férdeline:hi all

   Michele Neylon:afternoon all

   Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Hi All

   Volker Greimann:Purpose != what it is being used for

   Volker Greimann:?

   Greg Mounier 2:Having issues with audio...

   steve metalitz:Who are members of the Board team?

   Marika Konings:@ Steve - see
https://features.icann.org/composition-and-scope-board-working-group-registration-data-directory-services-bwg-rds-0?language=ru

   Marika Konings:he Board hereby names the following Board members to serve on the BWG-RDS: Steve Crocker, Bruce Tonkin, Erika Mann, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Markus Kummer, Cherine Chalaby, and Chris Disspain. The Board also names an ex-officio role on the BWG-RDS for ICANN's CEO, however that role will not become operative until the next ICANN CEO takes office.

   Volker Greimann:does not?

   Volker Greimann:that's what I thought, Chuck, thanks for making that clear

   Jim Galvin (Afilias):+1 chuck - a use today does not mean it that is the purpose of registration data going forward.

   Lisa Phifer:sac055 link
https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-055-en.pdf

   Volker Greimann:the definition of purpose is paramount to the legality of the collection of data

   Jim Galvin (Afilias):+1 steve - an important point the SSAC report brings up is that if there are different purposes we should not constraing ourselves to a single method of access (currently the role that RDAP serves in "loose" conversation)

   Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):it is just the tool, and it is hard to

deny that people will use it in unimaginable ways ...
  Kal Feher:that doesnt really read like a purpose to be honest.
there arent any reasons in there. just statements of functions
  Roger Carney:+1 Jim
  Lisa Phifer:How specifically does registration data support
ICANN's missuon t ensure the security and stability of the
uniique identiier system?
  Kal Feher:security of the internet is a goal. a purpose
statement should give us the reason why certain things
tangientially connect to that goal. this purpose does not tell me
why RDS should exist
  Lisa Phifer:+1 jim
  Volker Greimann:give the statement again?
  Volker Greimann:useful, maybe. Necessary, no!
  Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):promotion is usually about marketing ..
tech things might not intersect with that field
  Greg Shatan:Is somebody someplace windy or on a train?
  Jim Galvin (Afilias):@lisa - some short bullets: regarding
stability: from the business side you need to know who to
continue the relationship - this includes all kinds of things not
just money, consider transfers.
  Jim Galvin (Afilias):@lisa - regarding security - you need to
know who if you want to track down malefactors
  Greg Shatan:Maxim, promote is not being used in the "marketing"
sense here. I believe this phrasing reflects a similar use in
the Bylaws and/or Affirmation of Commitments.
  Jim Galvin (Afilias):@lisa - all of this is entirely
independent of the mechanism, viz RDAP, and expressly independent
of who gets access and when (i.e., public access)
  Michele Neylon:+1 Greg
  Michele Neylon:on the "promote" bit anyway
  Kal Feher:I'm disagreeing because that statement is not a
purpose
  Jim Galvin (Afilias):@kal - agree it is not a purpose, per se,
but it is pretty close in my view
  Klaus Stoll:Sorry, audio problems
  Klaus Stoll:move on
  Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Greg, I meant that it was not used in
tech meaning , more about behavioural patterns of parties
  Lisa Phifer:bulllets ere untended to describe how registratio
data supported stated mission and purpose
  Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Could we add ? to the end?
  Lisa Phifer:(as I reco;;ect the EWG discussion)
  Kal Feher:@jim. actually I feel the whole statement is a long
way from being a purpose. a prupose statement should be giving us
reasons for the existance of this system. there's no link between

this system and the goals

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@maxim - I agree with your point, as I think about it. privacy is a second order issue. with the purpose we can define what we need and then we have to overlay on top of that privacy concerns

Lisa Phifer:does anyone have an example of a well foormed statement of purpose that would be helpfuk to illustrate what this WG should aim for?

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@lisa - here's what I like to say

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@lisa - the purpose of registration data is to support the life cycle of a domain name.

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@lisa - everything else is a secondary purpose. :-)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):the last bullet itself is controversial

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):which one is appropriate in which case?

Volker Greimann:not on phone line

Volker Greimann:sorry

Volker Greimann:aw enforcement can contact service provider directly.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):it is better to use"ensure ongoing effort to provide ..."

Volker Greimann:no need to put that information out there. similar to telephone lines or hosting services where there is no such database but law enforcement can do their job

Volker Greimann:can still do their job

steve metalitz:@Volker, not sure hos "contacting service provider" is inecessarily inconsistent with the final bullet.

steve metalitz:how.... necessarily...

Volker Greimann:we are talking about if that purpose is desirable.

Volker Greimann:I am not certain it is desirable, or even necessary for this purpose

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):also they need more than RDS :)

Jim Galvin (Afilias):+1 chuck - the bullets are more requirements than a purpose

Jim Galvin (Afilias):to the extent they are requirements, the details are negotiable and thus may not be achievable

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):vendors usually tend to evaluate via additional income instead of number of issues

Susan kawaguchi:@Michele name those registries

Chuck Gomes:Please remove your check marks and x's

Susan kawaguchi:there are very few that do not provide information

Alan Greenberg:@Michele, I will do my nonest best to say something so outrageous you will find it easy to disagree.

Sara Bockey:I believe .UK has a very narrow WHOIS published

Alan Greenberg:nonest=honest
VAIBHAV AGGARWAL:@Sara .UK puts the Onus on the Rgistrars
Volker Greimann:can LEAs use it? sure, is their use the purpose of it? no! is it a legitimate purpose for the collection in a legal sense? No!
Sara Bockey:Gotcha Vaibhav
Volker Greimann:VA: Actually, Nominet handles these directly.
Alan Greenberg:It seems rather masochistic for a registry to insis that they have to handle requests for information on a pure 1 by 1 basis.
VAIBHAV AGGARWAL::-)
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):goals?
Nathalie Coupet:I believe hte purpose of an RDS depends on who you ask. Ebd-users might have a different take on this.
Michele Neylon:Sara - Nominet - IEDR - AFNIC all have quite limited whois
Nathalie Coupet:End-users
Michele Neylon:depending on how the registrant has classed themselves
Michele Neylon:in the case of .ie you'll often only get a name
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):cctlds are free to do what they like ...for example .to ccTLD :)
Michele Neylon:so if it's patrick murphy good luck finding them :)
Michele Neylon:Obviously the registrar + registry have more data
VAIBHAV AGGARWAL:@Michele That is what I was just sharing with #Sara that Registries like Nominet have a Automated Feild Verfication System, use the eg. of .TEL and put the onus of the who is info on the Registrars
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):also even RDS does not resolve issue when the legal company is hired to make registrstions and to provide additional services(so it is not regulated by p&P)
VAIBHAV AGGARWAL:so Incase the data is incomplete or not right then the regisrar is to be contacted
Michele Neylon:Vaibhav - their automated validation system doesn't work
Michele Neylon:it's horrendous
Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB:+1
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):+1
Volker Greimann:remember: If we end up with a purpose statement that does not satisfy the requirements of data protection laws, we may end up with a situation where we build a system that is unworkable since it has a built-in conflict
Michele Neylon:my sales staff are currently working through several thousand *.uk registrations to manually validate them for

nominet
   Michele Neylon:and it's wrecking their heads (and my bottom
line)
   Michele Neylon:+1 Volker
   Jim Galvin (Afilias):@chuck - I can take the proposal one step
further too
   Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):RDS reflects the lifecycle
   Nathalie Coupet:Chuck, does that mean whois, whowas services
and what else?
   steve metalitz:could support jJim'as formulation as "a" purpose
but not the sole purpose. It is necessary but not sufficient.
   VAIBHAV AGGARWAL:@MN I agree
   Greg Shatan:It all depends on what we mean by "the lifecycle of
a domain name."
   VAIBHAV AGGARWAL:but just to share the Purpose
   steve metalitz:Jim's formulation
   VAIBHAV AGGARWAL:I was about to loose two .Uk ones I saved :-)
   Jim Galvin (Afilias):@greg - yes and hence my suggestion to
take it one step further ....
   Greg Shatan:It's an element but it lacks clarity and
specificity.
   Michele Neylon:Vaibhav - the argument we had with them was
around "harm" ie. how many complaints had they got about domains
associated with us
   Michele Neylon:the total was ZERO
   Kal Feher:to take it a little further Jim, the RDS supports the
lifecycle by collecting relevent data for each lifecycle event.
that data is defined by existing policies for those events. for
example IRTP, renewals etc.
   VAIBHAV AGGARWAL::-)
   Jim Galvin (Afilias):@greg - I suspect that any purpose we
could all agree too will be just vague enough to need a series of
bullets to explain it.
   Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):it is not handled, just reflected
   Jim Galvin (Afilias):@kal - yes, we collect data based on
policy for the events we agree are in the lifecycle
   Greg Shatan:The little black book would be a failure as an RDS.
   VAIBHAV AGGARWAL:@Susan not just that - If I want to have a FB
verified Account / Page then My whois is verified too
   VAIBHAV AGGARWAL:So Its Customer Facing too
   Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):do we think that different expiry dates
from registrars and registries are not going to survive RDAP
profile stage ?
   Susan kawaguchi:@ VA agree my example was just one of many uses
   VAIBHAV AGGARWAL:@SK :-)
   VAIBHAV AGGARWAL:Just the Importance from a Policy as well as

the Business Case
  Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Directory will have issues with single
instance and localisation issues
  Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):latter is from legal side
  Susan kawaguchi:I do!   online information is critical
  VAIBHAV AGGARWAL:I agree to RDDS
  VAIBHAV AGGARWAL::-)
  Susan kawaguchi:@Jim agree with the discussion disagree with
your point that I can use anything other than verifying online in
an emergency situation the status of my domain name. Lots of war
stories to share
  Volker Greimann:I for one would appreciate a fully thought out
and 100% legal (no gray areas) system for a change
  Kal Feher:@susan, not to be too pedantic, but the only check
that matters with regards to your control of your domains is DNS.
either your names are delegated to you or they arent. if you are
using whois to answwer that question, you arent guaranteed to get
the correct answer
  Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Volker, legal requirements viary from
jurisdiction to jurisdiction , so it will require segmented tool
  Volker Greimann:Susan: if there is only one mechanism to
achieve something good, but using that mechanism has legal
issues, that mechanism has a problem.
  Volker Greimann:maybe a different mechanism must be developed
  Michele Neylon:Kal - that's not true either. If I was hijacking
your domain(s) I'd leave the DNS alone until the last minute
  Nathalie Coupet:Won't IOT also require fast, bulk, daily Whois
searches?
  Michele Neylon:Nathalie - for what??
  Volker Greimann:it is not our job to provide a service for
every possible and useful use.
  Kal Feher:@michele, if you hijacked the domain, I doubt you'd
update whois first. there's no gain there
  Michele Neylon:Kal - sorry, but most hijackers do ..
  Nathalie Coupet:If devices are DDOSing your network, are faulty
or any other type of technical pbs?
  Michele Neylon:Nathalie - we look at the IPs not domains
  Michele Neylon:Network = IP address
  Michele Neylon:I don't really care about your domains
  Michele Neylon:well I do, but not that much
  Jim Galvin (Afilias):@susan - I do not dispute what works for
you today. I believe we agree there needs to be discussion about
whether to continue to support that use case going forward and,
if so, what is the best mechanism for that (i.e., RDAP/WHOIS may
not be it).
  Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):or we might leave some needs outside this

time
   Susan kawaguchi:@ Jim agree to the discussion but please do not discount other uses of the registration information because there may be another way we can do it.
   Greg Shatan:@Jim, this is not jsut what works for Susan, it's what works for many many domain name owners/managers. And it's a critical use.
   steve metalitz:"self-evident" may not be useful concept, depends on the self involved......
   Kal Feher:@michele maybe. but at registries we tend to see quick dns hijacking for immediate gain. whois tends to be the long play and would be more applicable to dispute resolution processes.
   Jim Galvin (Afilias):but then that means it's not self-evident. :-)
   VAIBHAV AGGARWAL:Jim The WHOIS is the way for the time being till we dont do Brainstroming on the New System and till such time we should improve the Whois as I dont see the new system coming up that quickly anytime soon
   VAIBHAV AGGARWAL:@Susan is right on the importance of the matter
   Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):registry suports the lifecycle , I think RDS reflects the state of the domain
   Greg Shatan:DNS is really a different set of records, useful for different (though probably overlapping) purposes..
   Susan kawaguchi:@Kal I don't agree
   Greg Shatan:If we're going to use a cramped definition of lifestyle, I can't support a statement that includes "lifecycle.."
   VAIBHAV AGGARWAL:DNS cannot be Mixed with the RDS topic
   Fabricio Vayra:thanks, all
   Greg Shatan:lifestyle = lifecycle.
   VAIBHAV AGGARWAL:it is a separate whole lot of it
   Kal Feher:@greg. DNS is your name. everything else is stuff about your name
   Sara Bockey:thanks all!
   Susan kawaguchi:and very critical
   Nathalie Coupet:thank you!
   Greg Shatan:I know what DNS is, that's not the issue. But thanks.
   Vlad Dinculescu:Thanks all.
   Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):bye all
   VAIBHAV AGGARWAL:Lets keep the entire Discussion focused and Simple
   VAIBHAV AGGARWAL:From a perspective that we can make anything but will it be easy from the USer perspective

VAIBHAV AGGARWAL:so Users of the RDS is a Very Imotant Stake
Holder
VAIBHAV AGGARWAL:hanks Guys
VAIBHAV AGGARWAL:Have a Good Rest week
VAIBHAV AGGARWAL::-)