

Michelle DeSmyter:Dear All, Welcome to the Next-Gen RDS PDP WG call on Tuesday, 13 December 2016 at 17:00 UTC.

Michelle DeSmyter:Meeting page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_45vDAw&d=DglFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe_5iHWGIBLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=JPwWlh4DRB8kP4oKpp7V_cyp7p0KF8EsO4Ng_X7I6Xc&s=rFH1HbUvFal6QY9reu82_WGfXxz_Ss_RiQ3q6-53-Zo&e=

Ayden Férdeline:hello

Farell Folly (Africa 2.0):hi qll

Vaibhav Aggarwal:Hey guys

Chuck Gomes:Hello

Vaibhav Aggarwal:Hey Hows Health ?

Vaibhav Aggarwal:President Trump is quite a Business Man ;-)

Benny Samuelsen - Nordreg AB:Hello all

Lisa Phifer:someone may be using speakers and have an open mic? a little echo when Chuck spoke

Greg Shatan:Apologies that I will have to leave after 30 minutes. Time for the annual physical.....

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Hello All

Griffin Barnett:Still an echo -- can people please mute if not speaking?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):echo ...

Kal Feher:Vaibhav, please mute yourself

Griffin Barnett:Looks like Vaibhav's line may be open?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Vaibhav, please mute

Marika Konings:@Vaibhav - I've muted your mic as it was creating background noise. Please let me know if/when you want to speak and we will unmute your line.

Stephanie Perrin:test

Lisa Phifer:we see you Stephanie

Stephanie Perrin:amazing, I shall try to resist breaking into the Hallelujah chorus...

Vaibhav Aggarwal:Oh I was already Mute From My Console

Vaibhav Aggarwal:wasnt me

Marika Konings:I'll unmute your mic on this end so hopefully it won't cause further interference

Vaibhav Aggarwal:Sure

Alan Greenberg:Sorry to be late.

Vicky Sheckler:sorry to b late

Lisa Phifer:To seek common ground, start by focusing on "thin data" per Thick WHOIS Policy. For discussion today: - What IS the purpose of "thin data" about gTLD domain names?

Marc Anderson:Thin (Registration): domain name for which the Registry Operator maintains and provides only technical information (e.g., name servers, statuses, creation date) and the Sponsoring Registrar associated with the domain name. Contact information for the domain name is maintained by the sponsoring Registrar.

Marc Anderson:That's the language from the Thick Transition policy.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):how do we deal with non true statements of purpose?

Alan Greenberg:Purpose, but not identify who is querying?

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):It's worth noting that RDAP does not support inclusion of a purpose by default...

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):what portion of the data do we regard to be public - IPv4 and IPv6 addresses of NS ?

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):...and RDAP (updated by my proposal for client authentication) DOES support the model that allows some information to be accessible without specification of a purpose.

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):@Maxim: IP addresses are already available publicly via the DNS

Benny Samuelsen - Nordreg AB:@maxim

Benny Samuelsen - Nordreg AB:ip addresses are not part of Whois data, host names yes ip no

Stephanie Perrin:thanks for clarifying Scott....so presumably we could specify certain elements that would be generally available for certain very broad purposes (eg to ascertain whether a domain was registered, and if so who was the sponsoring registrar).

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):in current output of the WHOIS dns servers are part of the format

Benny Samuelsen - Nordreg AB:the names yes

Greg Aaron:The "thin" data -- the limited data that Susan and I are talking about -- is on pages 133-135 of the EWG Final Report.

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):@Stephanie: yes

Stephanie Perrin:thanks!

Marc Anderson:Name Server queries provide their IP address in the results.

steve metalitz:@ Chuck Are you asking about purpose of collecting the data or purpose of accessing it?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):if Registrant info not accessible - registries are going to sink in calls/abuse messages

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):*Registrar

Greg Aaron:"To meet basic domain control needs, the following Registrant-supplied data, which is mandatory to collect and low-risk to disclose, must be included in the minimum public data set:a. Domain Nameb. DNS Serversc. Registrant Typed. Registrant Contact ID (further defined in Section V)e. Registrant Email Addressf. Tech Contact IDg. Admin Contact IDh. Legal Contact IDi. Abuse Contact IDj. Privacy/Proxy Provider Contact ID (mandatory only if Registrant Type = Privacy/Proxy Provider)k. Business Contact ID (mandatory only if Registrant Type = Legal Person)" (EWG report, page 46)

Lisa Phifer:Thanks Greg. Domain Name Control is the first permissible purpose listed in the EWG excerpt in our working document

Alex Deacon:remember that "ID" is just a handle - not the details associated with the contact.

Susan Prosser:thin data supplies domain status and create / expire dates along with sponsoring registrar

Lisa Phifer:In EWG report, Domain Name Control includes tasks such as "Creating, managing and monitoring a Registrant's own domain name (DN), including creating the DN, updating information about the DN, transferring the DN, renewing the DN, deleting the DN, maintaining a DN portfolio, and detecting fraudulent use of the Registrant's own contact information."

Greg Aaron:And a lot of people regsitere domains via resellers. RDS reveals the name of the sponsoring registrar, who is contractually responsible for the domain.

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Palage

Stephanie Perrin:The registrant surely does not need to go to the RDS to find out who their registrar is, they pay them and have records of that.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):in gTLDs we see mostly two tier actions, where registrants interact with registrars ... so removing this info will create loop where all registry does - is sais which registrar is for which domain...

Alan Greenberg:@Stephanie. That is not correct. Lots of cases where a registrant does NOT know who the registrar is.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Stephanie , in cases of lost records - companies usually check - who sold it ... and interact

Susan Prosser:@Stephanie - we educate many registrants on who their registrar is and how to contact them

Alan Greenberg:Forgetfulness, death, resellers are among the reasons

Rod Rasmussen:A great use case is when your domain has been hijacked - you need to find out the new registrar to get it back!

Stephanie Perrin:Oh I understand the hacking part, I think resellers should be obliged to disclose....the area of registrant rights in the RAA is remarkably thin from a consumer protection perspective.. A valid question is whether or not the replacement for WHOIS should have to make up for inadequate protection of end user rights at ICANN.

Vicky Sheckler:@chuck, yes need at least that

Benny Samuelsen - Nordreg AB:btw an interesting expiration date on the example data :-)

Kal Feher:I'm not clear why nameservers appear in RDS. that does seem redundant when you consider that the DNS is the most logical place for that data

Ayden Férdeline:What is the significance of the referral URL? Why is it needed?

Rod Rasmussen:Nameserver published in the DNS is NOT always the same as published in whois. That's pretty much always an error condition, but it does happen, and helps for troubleshooting to have it published.

Ayden Férdeline:I agree with the expiration date, and possibly the updated date, but I do not think the creation date is necessary.

steve metalitz:Not sure how "is there a purpose" relates to "should it be accessible for any purpose"?

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Steve

Lisa Phifer:@Steve +1

Vlad Dinculescu:I'm not understanding why the Updated Date is important to the public through the RDS.

Rod Rasmussen:@Steve +1

Alex Deacon:seems to me expiration date would be helpful in the hijacking (mis-)use case.

Benny Samuelsen - Nordreg AB:Ayden creation date are useful for a

number of purposes

Fabricio Vayra:The creation and update dates have significance under certain court proceedings.

Alan Greenberg:Is "curiosity" a valid purpose?

Kal Feher:@Rod that makes no sense. what are you troubleshooting if nameserver data is different in the RDS? the only nameserver data that applies or is useful appears in the DNS. if the domain isnt resolving, going to RDS instead of the DNS is not going to be helpful

Rod Rasmussen:Registrars do not always publish the correct expiration date - having a definitive source of "truth" is most helpful for this and for any disputes that arise. Also having the expiration date published in a standard format allows folks who manage large portfolios of domains to automate their renewals and management process. Again, dependent upon a correct, authoritative source.

Lisa Phifer:@Alan, from EWG report, no - must be a permissible purpose (that is, approved by policy)

Nathalie Coupet:Agreed

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):given the experience with CZDS ... most requests are going to be "scientific research"

Benny Samuelsen - Nordreg AB:ha

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):it is the case of lots of 3rd parties requesting access to zone files

Benny Samuelsen - Nordreg AB:not surprised

Lisa Phifer:@Steve, requiring a purpose does not mean making data non-public

Vicky Sheckler:@steve +1

Kal Feher:Not to be too pedantic, but the WHOIS Server field may not have a future once the transmission protocol to the RDS is updated (to RDAP presumably)

Rod Rasmussen:@Ken, have had to do this in the past in managing domains on behalf of corporate customers. Typically happened "back in the day" when systems were often manual process intensive, but still can happen today. You make a change to your domain, the registrar updates whois to your new nameservers, but doesn't have a systems update handle the back-end to update the registry. It happens, and then you get stuck. since you have two separate databases. Helps immensely when you're talking to the support person. We also have the case where you may have

an automated system move domains to new nameservers (say around expiration) but not update the whois database. Again, you have differing entries in two different DB's and that may help figure out what's actually going on.

Roger Carney:+1 Alan

Fabricio Vayra:please repeat the Q?

Ayden Férdeline:I do not object to *some* of the thin data being accessible for any purpose, i.e. the domain name itself?

Griffin Barnett:perhaps green checks / red x instead of raising hands?

Kal Feher:@Rod, your example shows why it should not appear. the nameserver data should appear in DNS and nowhere else. that way it cant be confused. parallel data sets always diverge. if there isnt a reason for it to be duplicated, it shouldnt be.

Lisa Phifer:Q: Should gTLD thin data be accessible for any purpose, regardless of what that purpose it?

Ayden Férdeline:I have lost audio - is it just me?

Alan Greenberg:audio fine

Ankur Raheja:Audio is fine

Susan Kawaguchi:I agree with Greg

Marika Konings:@Ayden - I still have audio on this side

Lisa Phifer:@Greg, I think you just said thin data should NOT be accessible for fraud, so not any purpose at all

Vicky Sheckler:should be any lawful (or legitimate) purposes

Griffin Barnett:+1 vicky

Lisa Phifer:@Vicky, I think you are defining "specific purposes" = "lawful or legitimate purposes"

Alan Greenberg:I have no problem saying that if I declare my purpose as Fraud, th edata should not be accessible. But since no one would declare that, I find it a waste of time to talk about.

Stephanie Perrin:+1 Scott

Greg Aaron:No, Lisa, that was not my meaning at all.

Lisa Phifer:@Alan, purposes to be deterred can be useful to create and enforce terms of service, anti-abuse measures, etc

Vicky Sheckler:disagree w/ scott

Stephanie Perrin:Some of us did not agree with the EWG disclosure recommendations

Benny Samuelson - Nordreg AB:well Alan LEA repeats telling us that fraud

people are stupid enough to give real data so why shouldn't they state frauds as a purpose;-)

Alan Greenberg:@Benny, it is quite possible that stupidity has no limits, but I am not sure how much time we should spend investigating that.

Benny Samuelsen - Nordreg AB:agree

Lisa Phifer:@Steve, good distinction - available for anything except where prohibited, or available for nothing except where permitted?

Kal Feher:We may end up creating a very large user identification program by requiring some form of authentication for very low level information.

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):@Kal: not required with use of federated authentication

Kal Feher:@scott, just because its federated, doesnt mean we havent forced someone to give up their anonymity.

Vicky Sheckler:@kal - agree that the cost / benefit analysis may make some user identification program overkill for thin whois data, which, as noted above, doesnt include any PII

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):That's not the same thing. There's no need to create a "program" when facilities already exist.

Lisa Phifer:@Stephanie - To her point, the next question is: 2.2 For what specific purposes should gTLD registration data be collected, maintained, and made accessible? Who should be permitted to use gTLD registration data for those purposes?

Kal Feher:@scott. those facilities may not have existed for RDS up until now. we are obliging users to lose their anonymity on a fairly large scale if we move to this model

Stephanie Perrin:THanks Lisa. It is almost like we need a question, what parameters do we need to determine to scope a query (eg. who, how authenticated, for what purpose, which data elements)

Vaibhav Aggarwal:Sure

Lisa Phifer:@Stephanie, when we finally get to Gated Access question, it asks what the criteria should be - I think that gets to your list. It is hard to disentangle these.

Vaibhav Aggarwal:right - My Vies is just to give the Dicussion a Specific Direction

Stephanie Perrin:agreed Lisa. Must go step by step....

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):@kal: they're not RDS specific, and there is a balance that must be struck between what people can have access to

without sharing information about themselves

Kal Feher:@Scott. exactly. and perhaps I didnt express it clearly, but I fear we are getting that balance wrong.

Michael Palage:I respectfully disagree for the points I had raised before, there can be NO privilegde in a person's choice of registrars - that must be public

Vaibhav Aggarwal:Thanks

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):@Kal, well, that is indeed something we need to talk about (as Chuck just said)

Vaibhav Aggarwal:+1 Alan

Roger Carney:They do not query whois

Vaibhav Aggarwal:Right - So When The Public Searches for it it is open

Vaibhav Aggarwal:So Its Specific - to the Query

Vicky Sheckler:need to balance public need for transparency with legitimate privacy rights. disagree that all by default should be "privileged"

Kal Feher:not all names appear in zone files. those that arent delegated won't be. it's not that small a corner case.

Vaibhav Aggarwal:Untill I have a Pupose for Identifying a PArticular Domain Name - I wont Look for it - I wont Query It - I wont Know about it.

Vaibhav Aggarwal:The Purposes have to be clearly stated

Vicky Sheckler:@greg +1

Ankur Raheja:@VA +1

Benny Samuelsen - Nordreg AB:we can't change how internet works VA

Vaibhav Aggarwal:Tanks

Vaibhav Aggarwal:Thanks

Alan Greenberg:Short of an error, the name servers ARE in the DNS and cannot be hidden.

Vaibhav Aggarwal:@Alan at least for the Non Tech It is

Vaibhav Aggarwal:for the Techy or the Hacker there is no Gateway

Vaibhav Aggarwal:No firewalls

Vaibhav Aggarwal:so

Benny Samuelsen - Nordreg AB:seriously?

Alan Greenberg:BTW, if I recall correctly, the zone file only has names that resolve in it, not all those that are registeres.

Vaibhav Aggarwal:@Benny I agree

Vaibhav Aggarwal:but we can try to bring some improvements

Vaibhav Aggarwal:Yes

Vaibhav Aggarwal:Client Transfer

Fabricio Vayra:update date, for instance, can have significance on ACPA federal cases

Ankur Raheja:@VA agree with these two fields

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):@Vaibhav: I actually like seeing those values as a registrant - they confirm that a change I made through my registrar has been implemented at the registry

Vaibhav Aggarwal:Yes

Fabricio Vayra:and I'd assume both parties would benefit from a public record

Kal Feher:@chuck The purpose of WHOIS Server may not be as long lived as the purposes of the other fields. its reason for existing may lapse within the lifetime of any policy we create

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Scott

Vaibhav Aggarwal::-)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):URS policy requires particular statuses

Lisa Phifer:For this familiar with SAC055, this feels like the "blind man and elephant" story where everyone is feeling a different part of the elephant thus reaching a different conclusion

Vaibhav Aggarwal:@Scott - So We are all referring to Our Own Dashboard - I know form it right ?

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):@vaibhav: no, it's a check to confirm what i see in my registrar dashboard

Vaibhav Aggarwal:we will talk of Two Thin Lines - I am not saying not capture It - But Not Display in open

Vicky Sheckler:Also, that info is used as part of diligence for M&A and other purposes as well

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):Note that we're talking about "is there some valid purpose?". Not if it should be disclosed publicly.

Vaibhav Aggarwal:YEs Agreed

Vaibhav Aggarwal:Right

Vaibhav Aggarwal:Yes It serves Some Purpose

Vaibhav Aggarwal:But as Alan Said - there may be better feilds capture could be better productivity

Vaibhav Aggarwal:When I KNow I have a LOCK - I have a LOCK - and the LOCK can be a Registrar Application Specific

Ankur Raheja:Status can have some purpose to the Domain Owner but not

sure, if it has to general public. And the domain owner can view the status within his admin panel.

Vicky Sheckler:We know the data is used publicly today, we have discussed valid purposes for the data, and yet I haven't hread any compelling reason for it to considered ""privileged" or any risks to registrants for having that info public

Susan Kawaguchi:but if someone else removes the lock without your permission then your domain name registration is less secure

Vaibhav Aggarwal::-)

Vaibhav Aggarwal:@Susan - How will they ?

Vaibhav Aggarwal:Your Dash Board is Private to you already

Susan Kawaguchi:only if your dashboard is secure

Vaibhav Aggarwal:and the Lock is based on a Algorithm not due to RDS but due to the registrar Registration Application

Vaibhav Aggarwal:which can be controlled

Vaibhav Aggarwal:Of course

Vaibhav Aggarwal:Totally

Susan Kawaguchi:it has happened to domain names in my portfolio on multiple times

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Greg

Vaibhav Aggarwal:I agree

Vicky Sheckler:@greg+1

Benny Samuelsen - Nordreg AB:VA I strongly disagree with your narrow viewpoint on this, registrars day to day work often are helped to give an excellent service to all those registrants that have no idea of why there domain stopped working

Benny Samuelsen - Nordreg AB:even if they are not registrar for the domain

Benny Samuelsen - Nordreg AB:remember most registrants have absolutely no idea about what happens

Vaibhav Aggarwal:@Benny - Nope - I Disagree. Again, If i have looked for a specific Domain name - I have already established a Purpose to access information of that domain.

Lisa Phifer:@Stuart, in the EWG's recommendations, there were choices for data elements that were optional

Vicky Sheckler:+1 Alan

Vaibhav Aggarwal:So @Benny the data is atill there just have to be treated

in a Left Hand & Right Hand purposes

Lisa Phifer:that is, some data elements were mandatory to collect and (for some purposes) disclose, but others were left to registrant's discretion

Vaibhav Aggarwal:time has come to establish utility of captured data with a purposes attached

Vaibhav Aggarwal:per the audiences

Vaibhav Aggarwal:the data will / shud still be captured

Vicky Sheckler:I have not yet heard a valid reason for denying transparency. This is not PII.

Benny Samuelsen - Nordreg AB:VA you said that only you as a registrant should be able to see it

Vaibhav Aggarwal:@Vicky I agree

Alan Greenberg:Only the registrant seeing data sounds like a perfect world for hijackers.

Vaibhav Aggarwal:@Benny Some Information needs to be ine

Marika Konings:We can try :-)

Vaibhav Aggarwal:I mean You can See My Suit and the Tie - why will you be interested in My Best ? If you are then the purpose has to be stated - Right - Does not mean data will not be catured or not be available - Just per Audience

Vicky Sheckler:@lisa/chuck - consider asking the question another way - why should transparency to the public be denied for various data elements?

Marika Konings:@Vicky - we are not yet talking about what should be publicly available or not - that comes next :-)

Lisa Phifer:@Vicky, perhaps we can use a poll to ask for rationale and look for commonality in rationale given? Would that help?

Vaibhav Aggarwal:so Name, Address, Email, Country, Datas, Registrar - can be front - May be NS and the Status At least this one - clientTransferProhibited

Vaibhav Aggarwal:could be private

Vaibhav Aggarwal:priveldged

Lisa Phifer:@VA, we are not yet to specifying individual data element access levels - we need to start at a higher level and key concepts

Vaibhav Aggarwal:and Friends, Priveledged will be Defined - as Per Roles - Dnt we all have Sales Force - Like Applications - Administrator, Manager, Admin, Etc.

Vaibhav Aggarwal:Yes Lisa

Stephanie Perrin:yes to that last question re 2.2

Vaibhav Aggarwal:but this will give us clarity for capturing the Data - What Data for What Purpose - In My Opinion will allow us to have more targeted approach

Kal Feher:yay for alt time! not at my best at 4am

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):bye all

Nathalie Coupet:Bye

Ayden Férdeline:Thanks all

Vaibhav Aggarwal::-)

Alex Deacon:thanks!

Vaibhav Aggarwal:Thanks Chair, and TEam

Vlad Dinculescu:Thanks all

Vaibhav Aggarwal:Ciao