Michelle DeSmyter: Dear All, Welcome to the Next-Gen RDS PDP WG call on Tuesday, 11 October 2016 at 16:00 UTC.

Michelle DeSmyter: Agenda page: https://community.icann.org/x/JRa4Aw

Michelle DeSmyter: Member page: https://community.icann.org/x/I4xlAw

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): Hello All

Daniel K. Nanghaka: Hello Maxim

Carlton Samuels: Howdy all

Chuck Gomes: Hi all.

Daniel K. Nanghaka: Hi

Marina Lewis: Hi everyone

Marina Lewis: I can help...

Lisa Phifer: @Marina, thanks for volunteering

Marina Lewis: :)

Elaine PRuis: good morning

andrew sullivan: I don't feel strongly about that, note -- it was just a suggestion to try to unstick us.

Elaine PRuis: I brought this up a few weeks ago--not every TLD has the same lifecycle.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): +1, @Elaine, for example some do not have AGP

Elaine PRuis: I'm hestiant to refer to the ICANN diagram of lifecycle as many TLDS don't follow that lifecycle, and specific timelines indicated

Elaine PRuis: keep losing connectivity

andrew sullivan: But the point Jim just made on the phone is that you don't need to have _one_ lifecycle

andrew sullivan: the point is that every domain necessarily has some registration lifecycle under it

andrew sullivan: and the RDS tells you about it

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): ALP did not work , (one of GEOs tried that - it took around year to explain things to ICANN)

andrew sullivan: I could support that mod

Jim Galvin (Afilias): SAC054 is the reference for discussion of life cycle that recognizes that not all TLDs are the same.

Lisa Phifer: @Jim thanks for doc ref

steve metalitz: @Chuck, why does your proposal omit information about registrants?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): it is in IANA

andrew sullivan: What Maxim said

andrew sullivan: whois -h whois.iana.org com

andrew sullivan: for instance

Lisa Phifer: RDS currently = Registration Directory Service, not Registration Data Service. Is that change in acronym intentional here?

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB: sounds keep dropping

andrew sullivan: I disagree with Greg also. One version of managing access is to allow anyone to query anything

andrew sullivan: it's a completely open management policy

Rod Rasmussen: Or a "No" management policy. ;-)

Greg Aaron: none

andrew sullivan: But there is management of information

andrew sullivan: for instance, there are things in the registry that don't appear in the whois today

andrew sullivan: that's managing the info

andrew sullivan: (I certainly won't die on this hill, however)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): @andrew, some of registry info (such as IDs of persons) should not be uploaded

Rod Rasmussen: @Andrew - of course - did you see the smiley at the end of my smart-ass comment?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): or at least should not be accessible

Jim Galvin (Afilias): What are the other choices in summary?

Greg Aaron: i prefer "provoide information"

Rod Rasmussen: Provide information works better for me.

Lisa Phifer: "manage access to information" v "provide information about"

Carlton Samuels: In my view "Provide information" is a more generic reference

andrew sullivan: I will merely point out that "one big database" is the system the DNS replaced

andrew sullivan: because it didn't scale properly

andrew sullivan: (That's an aside.)

Carlton Samuels: @Alan: RDS is to provide information. How we provide it is a bout management

Marika Konings 2: yes, correct, has been added

Marika Konings 2: that is not possible with live editing

Marika Konings 2: sorry about that

Alan Greenberg: @Carlton, perhaps, but saying purpose is SOLELY to provide without the caveat may set incorrect expectations.

Alan Greenberg: TO be specific, management is not a purpose, but providing information "according to some defined rule-set" is. I find that wording awkward thought.

Alan Greenberg: though

Carlton Samuels: @Alan:...which is now being discussed in #3

Carlton Samuels: ...so RDS provide information..........for specific polciy defined purposes. The 'specific policy defined purposes' connect use with rule set

Lisa Phifer: Possible text: "Provide information about <list>, based on an agreed rule set."

Stephanie Perrin: test

Lisa Phifer: @Stephanie we see you

Stephanie Perrin: wonderful!

Greg Aaron: agreed rule set should be "policy"

Lisa Phifer: @Greg +1

Carlton Samuels: @Greg: Yes

Daniel K. Nanghaka: I agree with you @Greg

Daniel K. Nanghaka: Rules are policies

steve metalitz: Presumably the rule set could include a default rule. What to do if not covered by a rule.

Marc Anderson: why agreed policy?

Vicky Sheckler: apologies for joining laate

Marc Anderson: policy is just policy...

Carlton Samuels: @Steve: Yes, a catchall we'd call that

Stephanie Perrin: and applicable law

steve metalitz: Could use on #3 same phrasing as in #2 re "agreed policy."

Vicky Sheckler: we should remove "for specific policy defined peruposes" per Marc Anderson's comment

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB: Why is it we want registries striked out?

Carlton Samuels: @Stephanie: Yes, a very important sub-clause

andrew sullivan: My calendar reminds me that I have a conflict in :10

andrew sullivan: so I will have to drop early

steve metalitz: You're identifying registrants, registrars, etc.

Lisa Phifer: "identify and facilitate contact with" refers to the list of entities that follow

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB: And if these data are to be used for historical reasons then a gTLD can change to another Registry

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB: might not be important

Lisa Phifer: Possible alt text: "A purpose of the RDS is to identify domain contacts, and facilitate contact with them.

Vicky Sheckler: could say identifiy domain contact and faciliate communication w/them

Lisa Phifer: It seems that policy will determine the list of contacts

Lisa Phifer: possible contacts currently include registrar, registrant, admin, tech, and abuse (for WHOIS today)

Lisa Phifer: but policy will determine future contacts that may be provided via RDS

Beth Allegretti: Aren't all of those "contacts"? It seems redundant.

Greg Aaron: we don't need to enumerate them here -- we probably don;t need to.

Beth Allegretti: +1 Lisa

Greg Aaron: you need to say both. If you give mejust a name you ahve identified the contact, but are not facilitating contact with them.

Greg Aaron: +1 with Andrew

steve metalitz: +1 t o Vicky's suggestion re "facilitate communication" instead of "facilitate contact"

andrew sullivan: Alas I have to drop

andrew sullivan: bye all

Greg Aaron: "facilitate communication" is a good construction

Marc Anderson: 4 seems re-dundant with #2

Marika Konings 2: someone called 'Stephanie Perrin' is in Adobe Connect though -an impersonator? ;-)

Lisa Phifer: @Marc, are you proposing deleting #4?

Carlton Samuels: @Alan: +1

Marc Anderson: @Lisa yes, we seem to be having the same discussion we had on #2

steve metalitz: Can you show us #2 again?

Marc Anderson: it might help if we can see both on the screen

Marc Anderson: thank you

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB: Exacly not public available

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB: are the difference

Vicky Sheckler: agree that "may not be otherwise publicly available' adds no value for the statement of purpose

Marc Anderson: agree, it's true, but doesn't add value for the statement of purpose

Alan Greenberg: list is an example, so we should use wording such as "for example" or "but may not be limited to"

Vicky Sheckler: @metalitz +1

Lisa Phifer: @Steve, you are not proposing deleting all of that information, but rather adding "domain contacts" to #2?

steve metalitz: @ Lisa, correct, or substitute "domain contacts" for "registrants"

Marc Anderson: the word accurate could be added to either purpose if the decision is that it should be included in the purpose statement.

Marika Konings 2: @Steve - note that in #3 we deleted registrars, P/P providers and replaced those with domain contacts. Agree that we do need some consistency - does domain contacts cover broader range than registrants or not?

Lisa Phifer: @Marika, #2 is information provided, which includes but is not limited to contacts

Lisa Phifer: (that is, name servers etc are information about the domain itself, not contacts)

Marika Konings 2: right, but in the other one we grouped registrars and P/P providers as part of domain contacts

Greg Aaron: SSAC 055:RecommendationThe SSAC recommends that the Registration Data Policy Committee's charter shouldinclude the requirement to define "accurate registration data" and provide guidance as tohow to achieve it.

Vicky Sheckler: a big part of building trust in an authoritative database is having some comfort that the data is accurate. in light of this, part of the purpose of the RDS should be to have accuracy to build such trust

Stephanie Perrin: test

Kal Feher: I think accuracy is a purpose of the way data is collected. it is also a purpose of the transmission mechanism used by RDS (RDAP, port 43 or whatever we choose). but accuracy is not a purpose of the RDS itself.

Greg Aaron: No, and RDS is not a technical system only. Ita is also the enveloping policies.

Vicky Sheckler: dissagree with jim

Marina Lewis: All, I need to jump off for a 10:30 meeting. Bye!

Lisa Phifer: Is the purpose to provide an authoritative source of accurate data?

Lisa Phifer: (sorry A purpose...)

Greg Aaron: yes

Vicky Sheckler: can remove only if concept covered elsese

Vicky Sheckler: elsewhere

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): should we reffer to it as historically accurate :)?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): or with potentially accurate

Vicky Sheckler: @lisa - like the concept. consistent with my previous point

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB: authoritative by who?

Vicky Sheckler: @alan - having a purpose of having accurate data is not the same as certifying accuracy

Alan Greenberg: I guess...

Susan Kawaguchi: agree with Steve

Sara Bockey: I need to drop for another meeting. Thank you all

Carlton Samuels: Gotta go. Bye all

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): bye all, need to drop

Kal Feher: yay for alt time

Marika Konings 2: yes, you can Stephanie

Michelle DeSmyter: of course

Nathalie Coupet: Bye all

Marika Konings: Firefox works for me...