

Michelle DeSmyter:Dear All, Welcome to the Next-Gen RDS PDP WG call on Tuesday, 10 January 2017 at 17:00 UTC.

Michelle DeSmyter:Meeting page:

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_tarDAw&d=DgIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrw113mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe5iHWGlBLwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=qHnwi4PCG5yfsM1EMDvxkNz77GVHMqioX2hpN88U1HU&s=nm0h0fsPpYt7Pn4UVjubM36hB7SLzvX7tBISAdGTd_4&e=

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Hello Michelle

Michelle DeSmyter:Hi there Maxim! :)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):is it cold in LA?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):yesterday night it was -35C (-31F) here in Mocsow

Michelle DeSmyter:I am actually near Chicago, Illinois - I definitely wish I was in LA, the weather would be much warmer! It is about 30 degrees today, a warm up, but has been in the single digits lately

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):bit warmer :)

Michelle DeSmyter:yes :)

Alan Greenberg:Balmy -5 C here (-23 F) here

Holly Raiche:And a very warm 30 celcius here in Sydney

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Alan, -5C is +23F

Alex Deacon:Good morning all....

Fabricio Vayra:Good afternoon

Alex Deacon:55F in San Francisco and lots of rain. (rain is good!)

Nathalie Coupet:Happy New Year to All!

steve metalitz:@Alan, could you specify how ia bropader RT scope would impact those of us who are not going to be members of RT?

Fabien Betremieux:@Alan: FYI the GAC has objected to the proposal for a limited scope for the RDS PDP

Fabien Betremieux:sorry

steve metalitz:*a broader*

Fabien Betremieux:RDS Review

Fabien Betremieux: @Alan: FYI the GAC has objected to the proposal for a limited scope for the RDS Review (corrected)

andrew sullivan:If there is a fully-blown review of the RDS that can produce new recommendations about the RDS even as a PDP is working on new recommendations for the RDS, I will conclude that this effort is doomed.?

Nathalie Coupet:Is the decision by teh GAC to exrend the scope of the RDS Review can be considered as hostile? Or what is the rationale for this?

Nathalie Coupet:Ca the decision ...

Nathalie Coupet:Can the decision (sorry)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):+1 @Andrew

andrew sullivan:Actually, I'd agree with Holly and go further
andrew sullivan:we won't be doing an unnecessary duplication of effort

Fabien Betremieux:@Nathalie, some GAC members believe the Review Team itself should decide on the scope of their work

andrew sullivan:it will be an opportunity for those who want to foil the effort to do something about the RDS to re-litigate everything in two places

andrew sullivan:Which means that everything will fall apart, and the ridiculous whois system -- which is obsolete now by at least 20 years -- will continue to be used

andrew sullivan:The only reason at all to do the RDS review is because it's bylaws mandated, and the mandate was left in the bylaws because it was going to be too hard to fix up the bylaw to allow some one-time skip while this PDP happened

andrew sullivan:Everyone decided to leave it alone because we assumed, perhaps unreasonably, that pragmatics would win out.

Holly Raiche:@ Andrew - thanks. I totally agree

Fabien Betremieux:@Nathalie, on substance, some GAC Members believe that the current WHOIS will remain for long and its improvement should not be neglected while awaiting a Next Generation RDS

Marika Konings>Note, this item is not on the Council agenda for 19 January. The letter was already submitted to staff/ICANN Board.

Greg Shatan:There was a spectrum of opinion in the CCWG on what to do with WHOIS review, from those who wanted to kill it to those who thought it was important to have.

Marika Konings:so it may be more effective to send responses / input directly to the staff support for the effort and Board.

Holly Raiche:My other concern is the overlapping nature of the terms of reference - and what happens is the review team goes in a separate direction to this group

Volker Greimann:We can only set the requirements that the protocol must meet.

Greg Shatan:I think the GNSO letter did a good job of trying to avoid overlaps.

Lisa Phifer>Note that review teams are implementation review teams - they assess the effectiveness of current implementation of current policies. PDP WG's recommend policy changes or new policies.

Marika Konings:but the GNSO Council is just one part of the input. As Fabien noted, the GAC has also weighed in.

Stephanie Perrin:Does the GAC propose a different scope document?

Jim Galvin (Afilias):With respect to Alan's comment regarding the use of RDAP, I expect this group to agree that RDAP is the protocol of choice to support its proposed policies, procedures, and guidelines.

Stephanie Perrin:Apologies for my lateness.

Alan Greenberg:The GNSO reference to RDAP is "Assess the value and timing of RDAP as a replacement protocol.". How can the RT do that without knowing what it is re will require of the protocol?

Holly Raiche:@ Stephanie - agree - from my reading, the scope of work of a review overlaps what we are going and again, what happens if we are heading in different directions

Jim Galvin (Afilias):"agree" does not mean a technical evaluation, per se. It means we have to acknowledge that RDAP is the only other choice after WHOIS. Thus, we have to be extremely cautious about suggesting that RDAP will not meet our needs.

Greg Shatan:I don't think there is a common view in the WG of the GNSO position, so any comments should not be made on behalf of the WG, but rather should be personal or from one's SO/AC/SG/C, if so authorized.

Stephanie Perrin:@ Jim I certainly agree, that we are not in the business of developing protocols here. If we discover flaws, have questions or have concerns in RDAP, we can bring it to the attention of SSAC.

Fabien Betremieux:@Stephanie: no specific proposal from the GAC at this point. A desire however that appointed members of the Review Team do define the scope of their work.

Alan Greenberg:AGreg, I was not suggesting that the WG comment. But I thought it important that the WG MEMBERS had an opportunity to comment through whatever means were available to them. Our mailing list and this meeting was the only mechanism I knew for bringing it to our attention.

Stephanie Perrin:Those of us who aspire to be on the RT I think share that goal, so that is heartening.

Alan Greenberg:@Stephanie, we may also have to limit what we ask for based on what the protocol can do or can be modified to do.

Alan Greenberg:@Stephanie, which comment was your "heartening" in reply to?

Holly Raiche:@ Fabien: Did the GAC consider the work of this WG and the possibility that what we are doing has the potential to significantly impact on the Whois framework

Stephanie Perrin:Sorry Alan, I should have been more clear, I was referring to Fabien's response about the GAC concerns re the RT scope.

Sam Lanfranco npoc/csih:Of course there are illegal uses but ICANN should only say that some uses are illegal in some

jurisdictions, and leave it at that.

Alan Greenberg:The problem with the RT fully self-determining is that we may or may not end up with the right people on the RT, and the "threat" of it being a wide-ranging review will limit applicants.

andrew sullivan:I think deciding about "illegitimate" is a total distraction

andrew sullivan:the assumption of thin data today, at least, is that it's impossible to know who's using it or for what

andrew sullivan:because access to it is unauthenticated

andrew sullivan:therefore, the question is merely "is there some set of data that should just be available"?

Vlad Dinculescu:+1 Jim

Holly Raiche:Agree with Jim

Lisa Phifer:Q1 in the poll noted that this statement is NOT intended to imply authentication, disclosure, or access control for thin data - all topics to be deliberated upon later

Stephanie Perrin:+1. and even if we decide it should be public, we still have to decide if it is anonymously accessible, or that access should be authenticated

Holly Raiche:And yes, Andrew, that is what we are asking - what is being collected

Jim Galvin (Afilias):Agree with andrew - discussion of "illegitimate" is a distraction

steve metalitz:Agree with Jim that this group should decide (at some point) whether any RDS data should continue to be treated as public data.

Sam Lanfranco npoc/csih:One way of thinking here is that the Thin Data set is treated as Public Data, and anything beyond that (where authentication, purpose, etc. is required) is beyond Thin Data. To talk of collection of data where some is public and some is not is already getting into who has what rights.

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@Lisa - yes thanks. I only made my comment because Chuck had called out the survey comment for other reasons.

Fabien Betremieux:@Alan, Nathalie, Stephanie - Sorry for coming back to the RDS Review topic, but for the record, please note that the GAC has not taken a formal position objecting to limiting the scope of the RDS Review. Rather, the GAC Chair has conveyed the concerns of some of its members.

Stephanie Perrin:Thanks for that clarification Fabien.

Nathalie Coupet:Thank you, Fabien

Holly Raiche:2 Fabien - thanks for the clarification. It may be useful to take this group's concerns back to the GAC Chair?

andrew sullivan:I have to agree with (2). I think that the RDS has been renamed from the better SSAC-originated RDDS

andrew sullivan:which was a _Directory_ Service
andrew sullivan:and therefore it's a lookup database
andrew sullivan:the collection happens as part of the Shared
Registration System, and just because the charter is confused
about this is not a reason to promote that confusion

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):most common idea is that "we have rights,
and they, most probably, not" :)

Fabien Betremieux:@Holly, I just shared the GNSO proposal with
the GAC. It includes this suggestion: "9. Ensure no duplication
of work that is the responsibility of the GNSO's RDS Policy
Development Process Working Group.". Do you think more should be
said ?

Holly Raiche:@ Lisa +1

Holly Raiche:@ Fabien. It certainly is a start.But if the
terms of reference are broad, even if not overlapping with this
WG, it will add to the RDS workload

Lisa Phifer:Thinking as Venn diagram - All data has subset data
addressed by RDS policy has subset data accessed through a
directory service

Holly Raiche:I think what Stephaanie was saying is to query
whether the ICANN contractual requirement for RDS collection asks
for more or less or different data to what is actually required
from a registrar's requirements to operate as a registrar

Nathalie Coupet:@Andrew: Is there a limit to the number of
layers the RDAP can have? Is it indefinite?

andrew sullivan:The RDAP in principle could be used at any
level, but the WG decided to use an IANA registry for bootstrap

andrew sullivan:but RDAP uses referrals, so once you get
started it ought to be able to do any layer anyway

andrew sullivan:hope that answers your question

Volker Greimann:got to drop early, enjoy

Nathalie Coupet:Yes, thank you

andrew sullivan:I also have to drop. Apologies everyone

Holly Raiche:Again -agree with what Lisa said - we ARE looking
afresh as to what data is collected under ICANN policies

Alan Greenberg:The RAA and Ry agreement are how we implement
the policy. As we write a new policy, the contents of those
documents or others will change.

Lisa Phifer:All materials reviewed today, including displayed
handout, can be found at

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_tarDAw&d=DgIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrw113mSV_zgfkbpSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe_5iHWG1BLwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=qHnwi4PCG5yfsM1EMDvxkNz77GVHMqioX2hpN88U1HU&s=nm0hOfsPpYt7Pn4UVjubM36hB7SLzvX7tBISAdGTd_4&e=

Chuck Gomes:I assumed that

Roger Carney: Seems like Status and Expiration

Stephanie Perrin: Website functional issues imply a gamut of different stakeholders, if I understand this correctly. Different than control.

steve metalitz: Is inclusion of Sponsoring Registrar and Registrar's RDS/WHOIS URL in these lists really a proxy for saying that some "thick data" elements are needed to carry out the tasks?

steve metalitz: e.g., technical contact for Technical Issue Resolution

Lisa Phifer: Ultimately phase 2 will potentially specify the list of (thin and other) data elements that must be collected, but at this juncture we are trying to agree on the purposes for collection that will drive that later policy discussion

Stephanie Perrin: Unfortunately for our attempts to limit this discussion to collection only, collection for a purpose implies use and or disclosure to a stakeholder who needs/wants it.

Stephanie Perrin: If I am understanding technical issue resolution correctly, this is an example where the field of disclosure recipients gets broad. Not quibbling with that fact...but one has to wrap one's mind around it.

Lisa Phifer: @Stephanie, possibly there are data collected that are never disclosed through the RDS but collected for other aspects of policy. We don't know yet...

Holly Raiche: @2 Stephanie - true, but the implication of disclosure to whom is down the track. I think where we are is just is there a legitimate purpose

Lisa Phifer: Are certificates and DNS-based validation of them required for secure, stable operation of the Internet?

Stephanie Perrin: I would support this discussion of serious limitation of purpose. +1 Jim

Holly Raiche: Agree with Chuck and Jim

Jim Galvin (Afilias): @lisa - certificates no

Holly Raiche: @ Lisa - I would hope so

Jim Galvin (Afilias): @lisa - when you say DNS validation we need to be a bit more careful. DNSSEC is matters here and to the extent that is required and is an integral part of DNS operation, perhaps so. there are details here that deserve discussion though.

Lisa Phifer: @Jim, suggestions on how to seed that discussion with info needed for WG consideration?

Greg Shatan 2: I think we need to start from the presumption that all existing uses are valid.

Holly Raiche: @ Susan - I think where your statement is headed is that there is a legitimate collection purpose - but the next question is who needs that information for that purpose

Greg Shatan 2:We can't pretend we're letting people on the bus, when we're really kicking people off the bus.

Holly Raiche:Sadly, I will be an apology for the meeting at the better time - I'll be teaching

Stephanie Perrin:Not sure I follow your analogy Greg.

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@Greg - I think we should start from the presumption that all existing uses are invalid. Everything should have a defined purpose and we need to identify that and state it.

Greg Shatan 2:Our views are 180 degrees off.

Lisa Phifer:possible poll questions to help us move forward: do you wish to suggest any guiding principles for how the WG should decide whether a purpose is legitimate for thin data collection

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@Greg - Our starting point is 180 degrees off. We have the same goal in mind. :-)

Greg Shatan 2:Better formulation.

Greg Shatan 2:Need to drop off. Apologies.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):particular monkeys will regret :)

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@lisa - my position is we need a statement that justifies each purpose. Even if start as Greg is suggesting with keeping everything, each item still needs an advocate to propose the purpose that we all agree to. Absent that they get "kicked off the bus" as Greg says.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):though it does not hurt anyone,after all polls simplify idea collection, it is simpler than e-mails

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@lisa - to move forward we need a draft statement that we can survey for support for each "purpose"

Holly Raiche:I'm not sure it is appropriate that people's names are provided when the basis of the poll on which is different

Stephanie Perrin:if the results of the poll are used to indicate consensus, then I think disclosure becomes important.

Lisa Phifer:note that rough consensus is not formal consensus

Sara Bockey:thanks all

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):poll on polling polls ...

Nathalie Coupet:Bye

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):bye all

Patrick Lenihan:Thanks to Each and All!

Vlad Dinculescu:Thanks all

Stephanie Perrin:True Lisa, but experience shows it may be all we get....