Nathalie Peregrine:Dear All, Welcome to the Next-Gen RDS PDP WG call on Wednesday, 19 October 2016 at 05:00 UTC.

Nathalie Peregrine:Meeting page:https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__community.icann.org_x_eBy4Aw&d=DQICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=PDd_FX3f4MVgkEIi9GHvVoUhbecsvLhgsyXrxgtbL10DTBs0i1jYiBM_uTSDzgqG&m=owKP4ESGHywNvS7Z4Fw9MRAM6UuI-RT9o6r7Z2-d7y0&s=yRjivSG123bKyEsKYiGiBy1e60NCPeXtm1hX-eThF4A&e=

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Hello All

Benny / Nordreg AB:Morning everyone

Stephanie Perrin:test

Stephanie Perrin:test2

Michele Neylon:anything before 9am is undesirable

Nathalie Peregrine:reading you!

Alex Deacon:I feel like I've been on ICANN calls all day. started at 6am for me and ending the day with a 10 pm RDS call!

Chuck Gomes:Much appreciated Alex

Susan Kawaguchi:sorry I am late

Nathalie Peregrine:Welcome Susan!

Marika Konings:sorry, just needed to make sure to save the updated version :-)

Kal Feher:perhaps it should say "based on concensus policies".

Greg Shatan:"agreed policy" is an odd term. Is there another kind of policy?

lawrence olawale-roberts 2:this looks okay to me

Marc Anderson:I tend to agree greg... I thought it would be sufficent to just say policy (rather than agreed policy). Policy is either policy or it isn't.

Alex Deacon:the first purpose also used the word "providing"

Alex Deacon:...i think

Alex Deacon:I don't object to keeping it in, but as we did for the previous purpose i think less may be more here.

Kal Feher:registries can also add data to RDS via their own policies.

Kal Feher:these would be added via RSEP. but their reason for existing would be a policy specific to one TLD

Lisa Phifer:During last week's call, there was a decision taken to not try to enumerate all of the information, or all of the types of contacts in the next item, but rather to acknowledge that policy will further detail this.

Greg Shatan:Thanks, Kal. That would be beyond "consensus policy."

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):temporary policy adopted by the board - mentioned in the Registry Agreement

Michele Neylon:manage??

andrew sullivan:apologies that I joined late. I did have some trouble with the Connect application (and let me again register my deep complaint about this technology), but my tardiness is my own fault.

Nathalie Peregrine:Welcome Andrew, please raise the AC issues to us: gnso-secs@icann.org so we can provide assistance

Michele Neylon:Andrew the plugin / app gets confused with the new hostname

Greg Shatan:i refer to managing the data itself.

andrew sullivan:@Nathatlie: This wasn't a technical issue. The complaint can't be solved by staff. It's a policy problem. This all should be WebRTC in the interests of open standards and so on. But I have no strict techsupport issue. Thanks

Greg Shatan:Not to using the data to manage domain names, etc.

Stephanie Perrin:test 7

Nathalie Peregrine:test received

Marika Konings:I think the idea of using a catch all term at this stage would be to avoid having to detail it now, but it may get further defined at a later stage through the policy requirements.

Marika Konings:as Chuck said :-)

Lisa Phifer:The text that was replaced by "domain contacts" included "registries, registrars" - the concern is that "domain contacts" can be misunderstood to be just admin and tech contact

Marika Konings:Andrew, could you repeat your suggestion in the chat?

andrew sullivan:I think what I'm suggesting is "contacts related to the domain name, including those directly related to the domain name and also those involved in the registration sytem as rellevant"

andrew sullivan:or something like that

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):"All possible" seems to be bit broad , for example typical company has lots of contacts releavnt to the domain name

Kal Feher:@maxim these are contacts within the Registry

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):the list of Registry contacts in GDD portal is more than 16, and most of those should not leak , and used for intaraction with ICANN

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):*interaction

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):for example - billing contact of Registry is not for Registrars or Registrants

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):law is still in power , despite what is invented in GNSO

andrew sullivan:I don't understand why recommending that applicable law be applied helps us. It's impossible to develop a policy that ignores applicable local law

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@andrew, some of current WHOIS set of policies there is a conflict with local law

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):for some of jurisdictions

andrew sullivan:Or rather, it's impossible to develop a policy that insists a policy imposes a rule extra-legally

Michele Neylon:Andrew - you' think so

Michele Neylon:but unfortunately ICANN has done so repeatedly

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):+1 Michele

David Cake:Andrew, just how far ICANN can go in its efforts to ignore local law is the subject of an ICANN policy, about which there is some current debate, you see

Michele Neylon:*some*? :)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):most

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):also for Registries there are no procedure currently to deal with non-WHOIS conflicts with law (will RDS fall here :)?

andrew sullivan:I believe the latest ICANN bylaws restrict it from imposing anything like rules that are extra-legal in local jurisdictions

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):formally ICANN can violate their own bylaws

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):at least nothing happened in the past

andrew sullivan:@Maxim no, not any more

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):hope so

Stephanie Perrin:test8

Stephanie Perrin:test9

andrew sullivan:@stephanie: got it

andrew sullivan:8 and 9

David Cake:I would be happier without it.

Lisa Phifer:The goals Greg is asking about were deleted

Marika Konings:as Lisa noted these were deleted, but with the understanding that these did underpin the statement of purpose (but it was felt that these didn't belong in the statement of purpose)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Registry Agreement is California law, and for Registries outside of US it makes conflicts with local law

Lisa Phifer:See Goals for each Purpose, (iii) To provide a framework that enables compliance with applicable laws

Lisa Phifer:That text did remain - it was the Overall Goal that was deleted

andrew sullivan:It seems like a preamble remark to me

andrew sullivan:Oh, good point

andrew sullivan:I misunderstood that bit

andrew sullivan:Got it

andrew sullivan:still there, I agree

Benny / Nordreg AB:sound gone?

Alex Deacon:no sound here...

Greg Shatan:I hear nothing,

Kal Feher:I hear nothing either

Susan Kawaguchi:me neither

Daniel K. Nanghaka:I am not hearing anything

Greg Shatan:That I heard.

Michele Neylon:I hear Marika :)

Holly Raiche:Folks - I have to leave this call now - I have a teaching commitment. Apologies

Nathalie Peregrine:Thanks Holly

Lisa Phifer:Item 1 begins "A purpose of gTLD registration data" while Items 2/3 begin "A purpose of RDS" - which is Item 4 in reference to?

lawrence olawale-roberts 2: audio off on my end

lawrence olawale-roberts 2:okay now

Lisa Phifer:@Marc, yes that text was deleted from Item 2

Marc Anderson:thank you Lisa

lawrence olawale-roberts 2:Could we substitute the word Provide in red with "maintain"

lawrence olawale-roberts 2:sorry Manage i meant not maintain.

Lisa Phifer:"A purpose of gTLD registration data" is also used in Item 1, so it would be consistent to use that same phrasing in Item 4.

andrew sullivan:I'm having trouble with un-handinf. Sorry

andrew sullivan:un-handing

andrew sullivan:even

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):the string might be not registered , but not available (reserved)

Michele Neylon:using whois to check availability = terrible idea

Michele Neylon:it's really unreliable + there are rate limits

Greg Shatan:record of "all" domain name registrations?

andrew sullivan:"To provide a record of whether a domain name is registered, available for registration, ot unavailable for registration"?

Greg Shatan:What do you suggest as an alternative, Michele?

Kal Feher:whois can't truly be used to tell you that a domain is available. that is not a purpose of whois currently

Marc Anderson:I like Andrew's suggestion

Michele Neylon:Greg - we use EPP or other simpler services just to check if a domain is available or not

Benny / Nordreg AB:No no no

Benny / Nordreg AB:it can be reserved

Kal Feher:agree with Benny

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):no EPP for non-Registrars :)

Michele Neylon:Greg - a domain can be reserved / blocked or somehow blocked or something and not all are listed as such in whois

Michele Neylon:Maxim - not directly no, but they can check via a registrar's site

Benny / Nordreg AB:but its not black and white

Michele Neylon:DAC works pretty well

Michele Neylon:with new TLDs whois probably won't tel you if a domain is set at some crazy premium price either :)

Alex Deacon:I prefer the purpose as edited in the doc. Andrews suggestion seems more narrow/restrictive than necessary.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Michele, it might not be possible to check it via EPP, until the Registry implements epp price check

Kal Feher:we typically respond with no data found for non registered labels. that includes reserved names which will never be registered

Michele Neylon:Maxim - I know - we have to load some strings into a black list

Alex Deacon:Yes - agree with stephanie that we should remove thte stuff after the comma.

Kal Feher:support removing everything after the comma

Lisa Phifer:It seems the RDS can provide records for domain names that are registered, but not necessarily say anything about domain names that are not registered

Kal Feher:availability should not be a purpose. it is the purpose of other services.

Michele Neylon:that is not whois

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Reserved names are reserved by the Registry according to

policies of the TLD (including enforced by ICANN)

Kal Feher:godaddy uses EPP for that greg

Michele Neylon:and zonefiles and other technologies

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):we respond with can not be registered, and accredited registrars have access to the reserved lists

Michele Neylon:just because a string isn't in whois doesn't mean anything

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):could we add "for registration" after "is available" ?

Greg Shatan:It means it's not registered by someone else.

Greg Shatan:It's reliable enough for the purpose of a potential registrant seeing if the domain desired is already owned by someone else.

Benny / Nordreg AB:What Michele descripes are only available for registrars... most people check other ways

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):+1 Michele

Michele Neylon:benny - our websites "hide" those details though

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Benny, it is not possible to understand if the string is reserved without Registrar

Michele Neylon:+1 - record of registration = correct

Greg Shatan:I think "available" means one thing to registrars and another to potential registrants.

Kal Feher:typically the tools used by consumers will be using EPP and zone file access to return availability. EPP is the most reliable. no capable provider will use whois to deliver an availability service to internet users

Michele Neylon:+1 Kal

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):if Registry does not add "can not be registered"

Benny / Nordreg AB:@Maxim I agree

Greg Shatan:Kal, can you give me an example of such a tool?

Benny / Nordreg AB:but if RDS are to replace whois we need to look out of the narrow registrar scope

Kal Feher:Goddady's availability tool.

Kal Feher:or blacknight's

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Kel it works only for TLDs where those Registrars are accredited ... no EPP for non contracted Registrars usually

Kal Feher:you have to remember that the people offering whois, generally know it's weaknesses. when they offer an availability service, it might sit next to their whois service, but underneath it will use EPP

andrew sullivan:I agree with Greg mostly. Why I suggested the words I did

Benny / Nordreg AB:have to leave no have fun

Michele Neylon:checking a domain on the godaddy website (or anyone else's) isn't using whois

Lisa Phifer:@Andrew, can you recap your suggested wording for 4 please?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):of historical data?

Greg Shatan:Are you saying that when I go to GoDaddy's Whois page, I'm not using Whois??

Michele Neylon:Greg - if you do a domain search on their site you're not using whois

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):data is a snapshot of was true (hopefully) at the moment of the last change

andrew sullivan:To provide a record of whether a domain name is registered, available for registration, ot unavailable for registration

Michele Neylon:if you go to their whois server you are

Michele Neylon:two different things

Kal Feher:@maxim, currently historical data is out of scope, so you are suggesting an expansion of the current use

Michele Neylon:https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.blacknight.com_search_&d=DQICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=PDd_FX3f4MVgkEIi9GHvVoUhbecsvLhgsyXrxgtbL10DTBs0i1jYiBM_uTSDzgqG&m=owKP4ESGHywNvS7Z4Fw9MRAM6UuI-RT9o6r7Z2-d7y0&s=t48odjOnRYWXPQiyRccbt2Kckg6Ig3NZZ0fl1cSwH_Q&e=   - check if a domain is available

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Kal, the data does not change in real time, thus it is old and at some moment of time it might differ from real

Michele Neylon:https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__whois.blacknight.com_&d=DQICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=PDd_FX3f4MVgkEIi9GHvVoUhbecsvLhgsyXrxgtbL10DTBs0i1jYiBM_uTSDzgqG&m=owKP4ESGHywNvS7Z4Fw9MRAM6UuI-RT9o6r7Z2-d7y0&s=7I8aK0d7wiWKW30xaqOLwSlzEDsJnxISPyv0fp_Ku6Q&e= do a whois lookup

andrew sullivan:@Lise: did you see it? "To provide a record of whether a domain name is registered, available for registration, ot unavailable for registration"?"

Michele Neylon:two totally different things

Kal Feher:it definately changes in real time

Greg Shatan:Got it, Michele

Lisa Phifer:@Andrew, yes, I have added to notes for further consideration

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Kal, when registrant changes his mobile number, it is not reflected on full auto

andrew sullivan:I am completely opposed to adding 5

Kal Feher:real time relative to the registry

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Kal, it relevant only to the moment of update, which is always in the past

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):We have not decided that it is a single database - it is for later deliberations

Michele Neylon:Greg - the list of attorneys doesn't get updated as quickly as domains get registered and changed

Kal Feher:ok. I see where you are going, but I don't think that is a relevant clarification. historical data implies data that is older than what currently sits in the registry. there are whowas services that provide that.

Kal Feher:don't support retaining point 5. agree with Andrew

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):is is reflection of the registration data, not the source

Greg Shatan:I don't see where throughput ultimately affects accuracy. Clearly we need to have practical approaches.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):the source of the registration data is the contract with registrant

Michele Neylon:Greg - you're ignoring the technical realities

Michele Neylon:there can often be a lag between what someone has entered on our end and what is reflected elsewhere

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):and actions under such a contract (even click through one)

Michele Neylon:be that a DNS server change or a contact update

Kal Feher:@maxim I understand your point but I think you are perhaps on too fine a linguistic tangent that is going to to more to mislead than enable our discussions

Greg Shatan:I want to work within the technical realities and achieve a practical level of accuracy. I'm not a perfectionist....

Michele Neylon:Greg - oh come on :)

Lisa Phifer:Note that this WG's charter asks us to consider whether any accuracy improvements are required - this is explicitly in scope, although the WG can recommend no changes are required

Michele Neylon:Greg - if you want to sit down in India I can show you where the delays / issues can crop up

Michele Neylon:EPP servers exploding

Greg Shatan:Lags are completely understandable and not the issue when it comes to seeking "accuracy."

Kal Feher:boo for regular time. this time is perfect. :)

Greg Shatan:Michele, happy to do so if it involves beer.

Michele Neylon:right more coffee time

Michele Neylon:Greg - it always involves beer or coffee :)

Michele Neylon:ciao

Greg Shatan:Bye

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):bye