Michelle DeSmyter:Dear All, Welcome to the Next-Gen RDS PDP WG call on Tuesday, 22 November 2016 at 17:00 UTC.

Michelle DeSmyter:Meeting page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__community.icann.org_x_v4-2DDAw&d=DgICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe_5iHWGlBLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=Mhsar0enBR-EjJGN_4_GGqY4pc13YvlTYIu7BQppkiA&s=ZtkAD4aO5Sw0X0ocdhJQXFdeCf8elPKw9Fdcp7xU5C4&e=

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Hello Michelle, Marika

Michelle DeSmyter:Hi there Maxim! :)

Maryan Rizinski:Hello everyone!

Chuck Gomes:Hi all.

Daniel K. Nanghaka:Hi

Alex Deacon:Morning.....

Vlad Dinculescu:Hi all

Daniel K. Nanghaka:In Uganda it is Evening

Greg Shatan:In New York it is high noon.

Holly Raiche:In Sydney, it's 0400

Greg Shatan:Ow.

andrew sullivan:In Toronto, it's low noon, I suppose.

Vaibhav Aggarwal:Hello Peeps

Vaibhav Aggarwal:Welcome Back after Hyderabad

Jim Galvin (Afilias):Hmm, low noon Toronto, high noon New York, does that make it mid noon in Washington DC?

Michele Neylon:please mute yourself if you are not speaking

Sara Bockey:Sorry Michele that may have been me connecting my audio.

Michele Neylon:Sara - nah - your voice isn't that deep :)

Marika Konings:I should be connected now so whenever you want to hand it back, I'm ready :-)

Lisa Phifer:yes

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):way better audio

Alex Deacon:Where can I find the list of requirements sorted by "set" (as defined in the slide presented by Markia?)

Lisa Phifer:The list of possible reuqirements for deliberation were circulated in advance of the call and are on the meeting page

Klaus Stoll:Could you give again the url for the survey. Thanks!

Lisa Phifer:In addition, the entire list which can be filtered by Code is on the wiki Phase 1 documents page

Marika Konings:https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__s.zoomerang.com_r_99FNX2W&d=DgICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgf

kbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe_5i
HWGlBLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=Mhsar0enBR-
EjJGN_4_GGqY4pc13YvlTYIu7BQppkiA&s=PJ0vULseicBl-
07lJUSsWvEIwf3JwO6xDtPMSzNgMrQ&e=

   Lisa Phifer:@Alex, phase 1 documents page URL is
https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-
3A__community.icann.org_display_gTLDRDS_Phase-2B1-
2BDocuments&d=DgICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5c
M&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe_5iHWGlBLwwwehFBfjrsj
Wv9&m=Mhsar0enBR-
EjJGN_4_GGqY4pc13YvlTYIu7BQppkiA&s=8T7j_kFVGjBt0snOinJ_ViDiDh-
lgokvN2WOG9gwSBM&e=

   Lisa Phifer:You will always be able to find the most recent version of the possible requirements list there, as well as links to future phase 1 documents

   Alex Deacon:so the doc "Initial-Deliberation-List-Week2-0001" represents "Set A"?

   Lisa Phifer:@Alex, Set A was the initial deliberation in Hyderabad. Any additional PRs we start deliberation on today (week 2) would be Set B. We may not get to all in week 2 (probably won't) but there will be some new PRs each week and they become a set for polling.

   andrew sullivan:I confess that the approach of reacting to individual sentences one at a time, rather than sections of a document, does not make me comfortable.

   andrew sullivan:I worry that I might disagree with the resulting document even if I can accept each proposition

   Alex Deacon:OK - I guess I was hoping to get the bigger picture - i.e. know what requirements were in each set up front.   I'm struggling with the concept of looking at a narrow subset of requirements (in sets) without knowing where we are headed.

   Lisa Phifer:@Andrew, we don't yet have one document to deliberate on - the goal is to help us build a draft to deliberate on in its entirety

   Fabricio Vayra:+1 Alex

   steve metalitz 2:+1 @ Andrew re responding to individual sentences. Willing to give this approach a try though.

   Lisa Phifer:@Alex, the possible requirements list is that bigger picture - if you want, you can filter on Phase = 1 and Code = A to see the smaller set we'll start picking from

   andrew sullivan:@Lisa: I get that. It just seems like an expensive way to get there.

   Marika Konings:@Andrew - how would you approach it? If there are better ways, we definitely want to hear them.

   Lisa Phifer:Here, refinement = "further deliberation" to help us focus next step of deliberation

andrew sullivan:Well, the way that I usually do this when facing a tricky document problem with potentially contentious issues is to write a first draft for people to beat on

andrew sullivan:but I normally work in other contexts

Lisa Phifer:@Andrew, that was the EWG report but we're not limited to that as input here

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Greg. Aren't we risking unnecessary argument by starting so granular?

Fabricio Vayra:or recreating the wheel?

Maryan Rizinski:+1 @ Andrew and Greg

Beth Allegretti:+1 Fab and Greg

Marika Konings:the challenge is that staff needs some guidance on what has support which is what we are trying to get through this approach. How do we do that with a list of over 1000 possible requirements?

andrew sullivan:@Marika: I agree

Marika Konings:(guidance to develop a first draft)

andrew sullivan:I think that 1000 possible requirements is a little crazy. But my feeling all along has been that we have a more fundamental dispute and we haven't made a decision about it

andrew sullivan:some people want no RDS at all

Alex Deacon:I like the idea of using the EWG report as a starting point.   I understand many have issues/concerns, but its a great start IMO....

Fabricio Vayra:Why not go through the EWG report and find out, conceptually, what people agree with and not, and accept the acceptable and negotiate/iterate where there's difference

andrew sullivan:some people want to maintain the whois as it is, because they have a desire for everything to be public info

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Alex (and jinx)

andrew sullivan:and other people want an RDS with differential access

andrew sullivan:IMO the basic decision is to choose which of those directions we're going to go, and I think we're avoiding making that decision

andrew sullivan:and we're trying to get it out of this building up out of minute pieces

andrew sullivan:but I think that we won't get there this way.

Lisa Phifer:Note that the charter questions and subquestions were intended to be questinos about key concepts - but not the answers, the answers come from the WG

Vicky Sheckler:agree with fab and alex re: look at EWG as starting point

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Greg!

Beth Allegretti:+1 Greg

Jim Galvin (Afilias):+1 @andrew - for me, the high level point

is to answer the question, "what is the purpose of registration data"?

Jim Galvin (Afilias):the rest of these requirements will make sense or not in that context

marksv [MSFT]:@ Jim, +1

Lisa Phifer:@Jim, isn't that what we've been doing with the Statement of Purpose? How to we progress further on that?

Jim Galvin (Afilias):we have a draft purpose, and evaluating in that context is something I'm willing to try, although I wish we would just answer that single most difficult question first.

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@lisa - let's find consensus (vote) on the statement of purpose. everything else, in my opinion, will derive from that agreement.

Marika Konings:Can someone provide an example of a key concept that is different from what is on the list of topics per the charter? And how do you get agreement without going into the details of what it means?

Fabricio Vayra:@Chuck, the EWG report is a good roadmap

Jim Galvin (Afilias):the EWG report left one big major question

marksv [MSFT]:My +1 was based on the assumption that I will judge each requirement based on what is needed to operate the DNS and Domain Name Industry. We may not have an explicit statement "purpose of data = X" but I think that was OK

Jim Galvin (Afilias):while it is a nice survey of the different purposes of registration data, it simply did not commit to the actual purpose, leaving that to the community (us, here and now)

Fabricio Vayra:@Stephanie, now is your time to make final comment and address your concenrs. That's the point of a PDP. Not to recreate the wheel and toss out yr and 6 mos of hard work

Greg Aaron:Chuck, the SSAC pointed out some significant issues with how the EWG failed to frame some of the issues. Worth reading. See SAc061:

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.icann.org_en_system_files_files_sac-2D061-2Den.pdf&d=DgICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe_5iHWGlBLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=Mhsar0enBR-EjJGN_4_GGqY4pc13YvlTYIu7BQppkiA&s=mehV4N9lnZJLG6i6jf8sFN16ul3M2Yz_bVuhdgulHds&e=

Fabricio Vayra:So keep the good, iterate the areas of concern

Greg Aaron:IN somme ways the WHOIS Review Team work is a better source for identiying issues we need to grapple with, rather than the EWG report.

Rod Rasmussen:@Greg Aaron - really? in what way?

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Chuck

marksv [MSFT]:I like that the actual purpose remains in discussion of teh community (us, here and now), and I think that this process albeit expensive, will generate stats about potential consensus (or areas without) without these open-ended debates about theoreticals

Rod Rasmussen:@Stephanie - WHAT Biases?

Jim Galvin (Afilias):Both SAC055 and SAC061 stated that the question of the "purpose of registration data" was the starting point.

Maryan Rizinski:Whether it is the EWG report or not, I think that selecting some of the already available documents would be a good starting point overall. That document can be refined by iterating through the requirements which would be more time effective rather than going through all requirements and try to build a new document from scratch.

Jim Galvin (Afilias):key concepts from SAC055:

Jim Galvin (Afilias):Why are data collected?What purpose will the data serve?Who collects the data?Where is the data stored and how long is it stored?Where is the data escrowed and how long is it escrowed?Who needs the data and why?Who needs access to logs of access to the data and why?

marksv [MSFT]:During drafting of problem statement I suggested a defined purpose for the data, and I didn't get traction or consensus on that - I think the approach of asking this group to agree on that verbiage at this point is a nonstarter I think. But the voting over time will paint a picture and the purpose of the data will be de facto defined organically over time

Jim Galvin (Afilias):Note first the question "why?"

andrew sullivan:I think Jim is right about that, and if we don't agree about that (which I think requires starting with proposed text and then arguing about it) I think we'll get nowhere

andrew sullivan:I was hoping that we'd have done that by now, but clearly I was too optimistic :)

Fabricio Vayra:Basically, using the EWG report helps us reduce redundancies

Marika Konings:note that we shared the latest version of the statement of purpose for review last week, so any input is still welcome

Vicky Sheckler:lisa - is there a document with the proposed responses (and dissent) from the EWG report to the charter questions?

Vaibhav Aggarwal:??

Michele Neylon:ow my ear

marksv [MSFT]:"binaric cant"

Vaibhav Aggarwal:...It wasnt me...

Lisa Phifer:@Vicky, the charter questions were derived from the EWG's recommendations - plus other input from the board and GNSO council members - not the other way around

Greg Shatan:Might have been me. Sorry.

Fabricio Vayra:@Stephanie, thank you!

Michele Neylon:Do I need to thank Stephanie?

Michele Neylon:hmmm

Greg Shatan:Good to have blueprints and floorplans first. Rather than just a pile of bricks....

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Greg

Alex Deacon:OK - so step 1 is to finalize/agree on the purpose then step 2 use EWG as a starting point to argue about (to borrow Andrews words).

Lisa Phifer:@Greg, Q3 asked about a very high level principle - purpose-driven approach - but write-in responses said that without knowing the permissible purposes, it couldn't be commented on. How do we get around chicken and egg?

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Alex

marksv [MSFT]:(I am printing out the SSAC report as you speak)

Lisa Phifer:PRoblem is that SAC061 commented on the initial report not the final report from the EWG, did it not?

Fabricio Vayra:Why not do an "overlay" exercise, EWG report, overlayed by SSAC, etc.

Fabricio Vayra:the point being, lets not duplicate

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@lisa - yes but I don't think that matters. one approach is to consider if the final report answered the questions that SSAC laid out and then discuss those responses.

Rod Rasmussen:@Stephanie - thanks for the clarification.

Jim Galvin (Afilias):However, the most important point I will continue to repeat, is that the EWG did not answer the question "why", or better stated as "What is the purpose of registration data?"

Lisa Phifer:@Jim, the EWG's final report was substantially different that its initial report a year earlier,

Greg Aaron: SAC055 was about the bigger issues -- ie. identify the purpos(s) of registration dataa. SAC061 identified some weakesses in the EWG report, notably that the EWG report was sometimes weeak on policy eval and explication, and skipped to specific solutions without enough justificaiton.

Lisa Phifer:The final report from the EWG does lay out in an Annex a list of responses to the SSAC question, but by section reference

Greg Shatan:Jim, shouldn't the question be "What are the purposes of registration data?"

Fabricio Vayra:@Lisa, so if the issues from SSAC was addressed, move along, and if not, address it.

Susan Kawaguchi:@ Fab + 1

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@greg - now that's a point worth discussing. I don't think so but reasonable people will disagree. I'm open to be convinced.

Fabricio Vayra:@Greg A, perfect, so lets addres those issues today :)

Greg Shatan:Limiting purpose is a neat way of closing the door on uses, users and creating restrictions or prohibitions under some privacy regulations. Therefore, it's a loaded concept. If we can discuss "purpose" in a more pure way, that makes it easier to have that diswcussion.

Rod Rasmussen:@Greg A - thanks for the clarification - not sure I agree, but I'd have to compare the two docs.

andrew sullivan:I totally don't understand this question

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@greg - it's not "limiting purpose", it is define the purpose. If that's plural fine. If you're starting from scratch then there's no restriction and I presume we're starting from scratch.

Lisa Phifer:@GregS, it would be helpful to have an example of purpose "in a more pure way" to understand how that differs

Jim Galvin (Afilias):The EWG report made an excellent survey of the current purposes/uses of registration data. It did not commit to ranking those or in any way deciding which were the priority purposes (assuming one of those listed should be selected).

Lisa Phifer:Note that the EWG also started with the WHOIS RT report, and SAC055, and board questions - and tried to answer those. This WG doesn't have to come up with the same answers, but the starting point seems to be the same.

Greg Shatan:Lisa, I'm thinking about talking about "purpose" without worrying about how a characterization of "purpose" will have consequences when usedi in other contexts. If "purpose X" is considered a "secondary purpose" that's fine in our context, but if that characterization has consequences regarding access, etc., that becomes a problem.

Lisa Phifer:Note that we have also extracted possible requiments from all 3 documents -

Vaibhav Aggarwal:It will be good if the three can be posted on the Mail List in a coincise format and be uploaded onthe Confluence.

Vaibhav Aggarwal:The resurces accessed one place is always handy

Vaibhav Aggarwal:Along with the extracted Information

marksv [MSFT]:@Jim - I'll bet you have an opinion about the use

of the data... perhaps share it offline as a strawman for defining the more explicit statement? Otherwise you are creating an environment for yet more debates about theoretical issues, which we've seen doesn''t advance anything.

   Lisa Phifer:All three are on the WG"s wiki and were summarized by subteams previously. We can recirculate those summaries or extracted PRs or both - but from just those 3 sources

   Jim Galvin (Afilias):@mark, if by use you mean "purpose" then absolutely. I've suggested it before. in fact, you'll find it in the SSAC documents. The purpose of registration data is to support the life cycle of a domain name. That should be our starting point. Everything else is secondary unless it can be argued and supported that it should be equivalent.

   Greg Shatan::-)

   Greg Shatan:I'm cancelling Thanksgiving and re-reading all prior documents.

   Rod Rasmussen:@jim and everyone - So what are the implications of a purpose being "primary" vs. "secondary" as an outcome? If there is an "override" or "veto" effect caused by primary, then that's an issue, otherwise, we may be spending time on something that won't matter in the end.

   Susan Kawaguchi:Good plan Greg!

   Rod Rasmussen:In other words, if primary vs. secondary doesn't have a net material effect, why go through the exersize?

   Fabricio Vayra:+1 Greg!

   Jim Galvin (Afilias):it would be interesting to find a "veto" example.

   Fabricio Vayra:thanks all!

   Greg Shatan:Of course what is included in the "life cycle of a domain name" is an open question.

   Maryan Rizinski:Thank you all!

   Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):bye all

   Greg Shatan:Bye all.

   Daniel K. Nanghaka:bye all

   Vaibhav Aggarwal:Thanks Chuck and Good Bye Everyone

   Vaibhav Aggarwal::-)

   Vaibhav Aggarwal:ciao

   Jim Galvin (Afilias):@greg yes