

From: amy.bivins@external.icann.org
To: amy.bivins@external.icann.org
Subject: [Ext] Adobe Connect - Chat Transcript from PPIRT
Date: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 11:33:24 AM

Amy Bivins:Hi Susan--this call will start in approximately one hour
Susan Kawaguchi:Thanks! I have it on my calendar twice so was confused. Talk to you in an hour
Amy Bivins:Hi Chris--we will get started at the top of the hour!
Chris Pelling:Hi Amy - sure just getting things ready :@)
Amy Bivins:Great! talk to you soon :)
Chris Pelling:HI Amy
Chris Pelling:yep can hear both of you
Chris Pelling:wow
Chris Pelling:Hey Theo
Chris Pelling:It more woke me up :p
Amy Bivins::)
Sara Bockey:Good day all!
Darcy Southwell>Hello!
Graeme Bunton:Good morning all
Theo Geurts:lo
Eric Rokobauer>Hello everyone
Vlad Dinculescu:Hi all
Chris Pelling:Someone is doing some vigorous typing
Graeme Bunton:Someone needs to mute their vigorous and competent typing
Chris Pelling:can that person mute their mic please ?:)
Chris Pelling:Now the news :p
Theo Geurts:lol
Eric Rokobauer:lol
Chris Pelling:someone have the news on ?
Tom Kinstler>Hello All.
Vicky Scheckler:hi.
Graeme Bunton:Maybe we could use a bit more colour?
NotTheDonald:hmm, maybe
Tom Kinstler:I like the idea, but i'd need to research and understand it better before I could say yes or no.
Michelle DeSmyter>You can also click on the full screen mode at the top right corner of your Adobe Connect screen for easier viewing
steve metalitz:My recollection is similar to Theo's.
Chris Pelling:Retention was not on the table before on this
steve metalitz:Amy lease note that some of the 38 are duplicates. e.g. my phone number is listed separately from my name
Darcy Southwell:Same for my phone #
Ashley Heineman:Wasn't on the PDP WG, so not appropriate for me to respond.
NotTheDonald:escrow is already taken care of for registrar affiliated service providers
Theo Geurts:seems we are divided here, perhaps we should be looking who and what shouldbe escrowed and by whom
Lisa Villeneuve:Wasn't on the PDP WG, so not appropriate for me to respond.
NotTheDonald:non affiliated providers are a different story
Graeme Bunton:FYI: Not the Donald = Volker being silly.
NotTheDonald:sorry, yes, I am! the app on the phone does not allow changing nicknames
Chris Pelling;if the service provider is part of a registrar, then the underlying is provided anyway, if not, the pp service will HAVE to escrow data themselves to ICANN
Chris Pelling:this was discussed in dublin F2F - I was VERY vocal in that meeting on that point where Graeme and Steve were at top of the table
Chris Pelling:COMMENT TO BE READ OUT ABOVE PLEASE
NotTheDonald:steve: the raa alreadyrequired the escrow of underlying data even without the spec

Sara Bockey:Agree with NotTheDonald
Amy Bivins:thanks Chris, I will in just a minute
Chris Pelling:No failing to find a red X :p
Sara Bockey:Dennis please mute
Amy Bivins:See Section 3.4.1.5 of the RAA re retention requirements for PP customer data
steve metalitz:@Amy, I stand corrected re existing RAA requirements. .
Amy Bivins:@Steve--you're right though, it is not in the interim spec at all
Chris Pelling:The requirement should be balanced. If the registrar already has to retain it, then a pp service that is not affiliated to a registrar has to do the same. Certainly for an escrow to ICANN of underlying data
Susan Kawaguchi:i have to drop off of adobe but will remain dialed in
steve metalitz:Of course the provision Amy flags in RAA automatically goes away once p/p accreditation is implemented, to the extent that the accreditation system requires data retention.
Vicky Scheckler:agree w/ chris
steve metalitz:So that would suggest that the policy could include a data retention requirement. But this was not something that was discussed in the WG -- to my recollection.
Darcy Southwell:@Sara, I don't expect that a registrar would have the underlying data if the p/p service is not affiliated with the registrar
Graeme Bunton:I think it will be possible for the P/P service to register a domain. So the registrar only has the P/p service provided details
Sara Bockey:@Graeme...ok, that makes sense
Mary Wong:On the Working Group discussion about escrow at the Dublin face to face meeting in October 2015: you can find the discussion starting on Pgae 27 of the transcript here: <file:///Users/mary.wong/Desktop/transcript-ppsai-3-16oct15-en.pdf>
Chris Pelling:Well said Graeme
Theo Geurts:+1 Graeme
Mary Wong:oops sorry wrong link
Greg DiBiase:That makes sense to me Graeme
Theo Geurts:old
Theo Geurts:old
Tom Kinstler:Agree with Graeme
Mary Wong:<https://meetings.icann.org/en/dublin54/schedule/fri-ppsai/transcript-ppsai-3-16oct15-en.pdf> (escrow discussion starts on Page 27)
NotTheDonald:should = suggestion, shall = requirement
NotTheDonald:that was presumption for the report
Tom Kinstler:It MUST be Shall. Should will leave so many loopholes
Darcy Southwell:@amy, which paragraph?
steve metalitz:red x = shall
Sara Bockey:Please state the question again?
Sara Bockey:which word?
Sara Bockey:what section
Graeme Bunton:Shall is totally reasonable on 2a 1 and 2
NotTheDonald:the language of the report was sufficiently clear
Mary Wong:The report did NOT use the words in the IETF sense
NotTheDonald:should = suggestion, shall = requirement
Mary Wong:@Volker, I don't think that is the case for the Final Report.
NotTheDonald:sorry, misclick
Graeme Bunton:This one gets tricky, because it's not clear HOW that work, correct?
Mary Wong:The staff recollection is that the distinction the WG was trying to make was not to say that "should" (when used) is merely a guideline/suggestion; the intent was to have a mandatory requirement, but NOT to prescribe HOW that requirement is to be implemented.
Darcy Southwell:II(B) assumes that the p/p provider is the registrar of record (or an affiliate). That may not always be the case.
Jennifer Gore:@Theo - ICANN staff is seeking for the concrete intent so that we can facilitate accordingly
Vicky Scheckler:agree w/ steve.
Theo Geurts:Thanks Jen, I think Steve frames it rather well atm
NotTheDonald:contrary to steve, I believe we. chose those words well when the report was drafted
Vicky Scheckler:exactly - how is it done, not re-arguing whther it should be done

Mary Wong:@Volker, then that would make many of the final recommendations non-mandatory ... this is why staff is seeking the IRT confirmation, to clarify that our interpretation is correct (most if not all the SHOULDs in the Final Reprot are intended to be mandatory).

Graeme Bunton:Nothing to add, Steve captured my thoughts well

NotTheDonald:if it say privacy or proxy somewhere in the Whois, that should be sufficient labelling

Susan Kawaguchi:agree with Steve

Jennifer Gore:Thank you Theo. The clear verbage is key and ICANN staff is seeking IRT consesus that the language mirrors the intent.

Jennifer Gore:+1 Amy

NotTheDonald:mary, you are right. I like voluntary

NotTheDonald:sorry, no voice left today

steve metalitz:@Amy noproblem with asking, but I think you have the answer now.

Sara Bockey:I need to drop... have a conflict. i will catch up on recording. Thanks all!

steve metalitz:iii needs to be in there somewhere.....

Darcy Southwell:+1 Theo

Lisa Villeneuve:+1 Darcy

steve metalitz:could you restate the question please

steve metalitz:+1 to Volker

steve metalitz:Here is text of WDRP: At least annually, a registrar must present to the registrant the current Whois information, and remind the registrant that provision of false Whois information can be grounds for cancellation of their domain name registration. Registrants must review their Whois data, and make any corrections.

Darcy Southwell:I don't believe the intent of the PDP WG was for P/P to send TWO annual notices

Graeme Bunton:Don't we also have arequirement in the policy that a P/P provider had to pass through all policy required notifications?

steve metalitz:Doesn't strking i and retaining ii achieve the same purpose without muddying the water in what is "current Whois information"

Amy Bivins:Hi Graeme, yes

Amy Bivins:Steve, I think that would achieve that result

steve metalitz:+1 Darcy. WDRP-like but not WDRP itself.

Darcy Southwell:I think deleting Ci and keeping Cii makes more sense.

Lisa Villeneuve:Sorry about that

NotTheDonald:and not if wdrp takes care of this

steve metalitz:+1 Susan re validating underlying customer data

Vicky Sheckler:+1 susan

Darcy Southwell:@Amy, thanks.

Theo Geurts:k leave it open for now?

steve metalitz:How about "at least on the provider's website"

Darcy Southwell:+ 1 Theo

Darcy Southwell:Otherwise we'll be revisiting this section every single week

Darcy Southwell:+1 Steve - it should be 'terms of service' when referring to P/P services

Griffin Barnett:+1

Theo Geurts:+1 steve

Chris Pelling:soprry that was a bit fast

Chris Pelling:what was the question ?

Chris Pelling:tick

steve metalitz:thanks Amy

Griffin Barnett:Thanks Amy

Leana Vitruk:thanks Amy

Chris Pelling:THanks

Vlad Dinculescu:Thanks all

Lisa Villeneuve:Thanks!

Darcy Southwell:Thanks, all