

Michelle DeSmyter:Dear all, Welcome to the Next-Gen RDS PDP WG call on Tuesday, 24 January 2017 at 17:00 UTC.

Michelle DeSmyter:Meeting page:

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_jrPDAw&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrw113mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe5iHWGlBLwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=My9Rr7M29_oNEcLzYPbBBkVNTTSboPmkRF7Y8qUWkjo&s=t1BLuK0x2DuAAM08aG19qLo9MH21xuvp3omXcQj-zEQ&e=

Lisa Phifer:Several people are queued up waiting to get it
Chuck

Lisa Phifer:"get in" that is

Holly Raiche:Are Dial outs happening?

Michele Neylon:I'm running late

Michele Neylon:on now

steve metalitz:If affiliation is shown it should include the caveat noted.

Holly Raiche:Should the wording on the actual poll say that people are speaking for themselves?

Lisa Phifer:@Holly, I think we did say that in the intro to an earlier poll but perhaps we should as a standard part of the intro to all polls?

Carlton Samuels:@Chuck: Happy to hear that. While I caucus with the At-Large, is endorsed by the ALAC for this WG and sensitive to the overall posture, it would be problematic to gain official seal of the ALAC everytime.

Holly Raiche:@ Carlton +1

Fabricio Vayra:PLs repeat the question?

Nathalie Coupet:my microphone doesn't work.

steve metalitz:what is question?

Lisa Phifer:@Fab, do you support adding WG affiliation to poll results

Carlton Samuels:Yea, what is the question?

Fabricio Vayra:Thanks, Lisa. And NO.

Carlton Samuels:Oh yes, member affiliation is ok!

Carlton Samuels:Show member affiliation yes, I agree.

steve metalitz:OK with caveat noted in response #7

Lisa Phifer:@Holly, if name is not published, affiliation is not available unless we add it. If name is published in raw data, then it is already available from SOIs.

Carlton Samuels:@Holly +1. Its not the ALAC speaking BUT we are steeped in the At-Large

Michele Neylon:I can't decipher him

Lisa Phifer:@Carlton, sounds like Darth Vader

Greg Shatan:I'll pay the ransom!

David Cake:always very aware that polls are not votes, just a sense of the room mechanism.

Carlton Samuels:@Greg: +1 on nature of polls and ow they must be perceived..

steve metalitz:Carlton is swimming iwth the sea lions??

Lisa Phifer:For the 8-9 people who objected to a) or c), could you possibly explain why?

Carlton Samuels:@Chuck: I would wish my affiliation to be known, yes. That it may telegraph my likely position is ok, seeing the At-Large and the ALAC operates ain the sunshine so those positions are generally published and broadcast

Lisa Phifer:@carlton is your mic still open? Getting odd echo when others speak

Carlton Samuels:@Chuck: My red X was in context of saying my vote reflected the ALAC's position!

Greg Shatan:Carlton's mic is still open.

David Cake:https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_datatracker.ietf.org_doc_rfc7282_&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl13mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe_5iHWG1BLwwwhehFBfjrsjWv9&m=My9Rr7M29_oNEcLzYPbBBkVNTTSboPmkRF7Y8qUwkjo&s=g1SNzVRT_Mh2_BGUjpuLsCNZe9e14NdyPoefz-8iJnM&e is a usefully informative document on IETF consensus and humming

Carlton Samuels:Done!

Greg Shatan:I was a red X, but I've already done my time.

Lisa Phifer:All, we have three options for what to publish - raw data in an Excel spreadsheet (includes names, IPs, timestamps, unless stripped), exported PDF of poll results (similar to what you've been getting, but includes names, timestamps), exported individual results (contains names, IPs, timestamps)

Carlton Samuels:@Alan: +1.

Greg Shatan:So small...

Lisa Phifer:@Greg, it's five pages wide

Alan Greenberg:Should I presume that everything Chuck is saying in this call is an official Verisign position?

Greg Shatan:I'm still unclear what the purpose of this is.

Sara Bockey:+1 Greg

steve metalitz:Shouldn't the presumption be that people are expressing their personal views? Especially in a short turnaround, informal poll like these.

Carlton Samuels:If it is made clear I am speaking in my personal capacity and not for the ALAC, I would agree my name and affiliation is good enough

Greg Shatan:+1 Steve.

Greg Shatan:For what purpose?

Greg Shatan:was the data requested?

Holly Raiche:I can't see why anything but name (and affiliation?) is necessary -NOT all raw data

Alan Greenberg:@Steve, I would think so.

Lisa Phifer:@Greg, it was requested for transparency and to allow review of individual results

Alan Greenberg:Or perhaps give an opportunity to say it is an official position.

Lisa Phifer:@Greg, that WG member requested both raw data and individual responses, including name

Greg Shatan:Lisa: Why do individual results need to be reviewed?

Lisa Phifer:@Greg, I don't recall rationale for that sorry

Greg Shatan:Without the rationale, I have trouble supporting a change in our practices.

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Michele

Alan Greenberg:@Michele, since when do we have to have a real reason for spending a lot of time on something.

Michele Neylon:Alan - since I started worrying about how much I cost per hour to be on these calls? :)

Alan Greenberg:@Michele - indeed! This type of discussion is cited as a reason that people give up and stop participating in WGs

Rod Rasmussen:So are the polls meant to be a continuation of our discussions that already have attribution "built in" so that we can get through the work faster or are they somehow more "formal" than that without being actual votes on stuff? If we're just extending the discussion, knowing who said what is no different than what happens on a call (including our little hand raising polls during calls). If you don't want to respond on a topic, you don't have to.

Greg Shatan:I think the "personal capacity" issue is a bit of a red herring for these snap polls. As noted, that should be the assumption for these snap polls. And how do we deal with those who have no SO/AC affiliation? And is it sufficient to provide data only at the SO/AC level, without drilling down to the SG/C/RALO level?

Greg Shatan:The opposite question holds as well -- do some people feel more comfortable participating anonymously?

Fabricio Vayra:But, speaking of comfort, aren't we also making some uncomfortable with speaking their minds outside of affiliation?

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Greg

Michele Neylon:This debate is hurting my head

Holly Raiche:I think Chuch has just asked the big question - how are the responses being used? Will they go beyond this group?

Sara Bockey:+1 Michele

Greg Shatan:+1 Fab, what if someone's personal position is at

odds with their affiliated entity.

Holly Raiche:sorry - Chuck

Michele Neylon:I'm trying desperately not to scream :)

Greg Shatan:And do we also ask for employer data?

Greg Shatan:And other IG-related organizations that they might be affiliated with?

Rod Rasmussen:Check me if I'm wrong on this, but the transcript of the call plus the chat is publicly available after each call, so no one can "participate anonymously" in this WG.

Fabricio Vayra:I know that Stephanie requested this, what was her rationale? What's the purpose?

Greg Shatan:It's only the polls we are atalking about.

Michael Palage:Use the Force Michele

Greg Shatan:Perhaps only Stephanie can answer, and she's not on the call, unless she is participating anonymously.

Lisa Phifer:Stephanie's post can be found here:

<http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-rds-pdp-wg/2017-January/002065.html>

Alan Greenberg:@Michele +1000

Greg Shatan:Maybe we should hold the topic until she can speak on her own behalf.

Nathalie Coupet:ye

Greg Shatan:The "Neuman Rule": If it ain't broke, don't fix it.

Michele Neylon:/me smacks head off desk and screams in his padded cell

Nathalie Coupet:microphone dpes'nt work

Alan Greenberg:If someone wants to log onto the call as L'il Abner or Donald Trump, LET THEM!

Lisa Phifer:In summary, she said 1. ICANN is fundamentally an open, transparent multistakeholder organization where pdps are open to all. 3. The data is useful to those of us who are trying to understand where people are coming from.4. At a rather fundamental level, data that is used by us even to form rough concepts of concensus should be accessible to all in my view.

steve metalitz:@Alan I was on an ICANN call with NotDonald must this morning!

Nathalie Coupet:I love polls!

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Jim

steve metalitz:*just*

Rod Rasmussen:+1 @Jim Galvin

Michele Neylon:+1 Jim

Sara Bockey:If the poll is meant to get a sense of the room...then what is the point. If we want to drill down on specific input we can do it on the call...but I don't see value in this exercise

Holly Raiche:@ Jim and Michele +1

Holly Raiche:@Michel +1

Carlton Samuels:@Michele: +1 but employer is over the top

Michele Neylon:Carlton - I said "optional" and tbh I really don't care :)

Greg Shatan:For a consensus call, I can see the need for transparency. But we are only looking for a sense of the room, not a sense of parts of the room, or motivation or knowledge level (mentioned by Stephanie).

Holly Raiche:If the fields are optional, they can be ignored, but agree, affiliation should do it

Holly Raiche:Agree with Greg - the term is 'straw poll'

Greg Shatan:Should we have a Privacy/Proxy option for this? And what about accreditation.....

Greg Shatan:What if we anonymized the afffiliations, and just used colors, and only Chuck knew which color was which.

Greg Shatan:I'm actually not joking.

Greg Shatan:We can see trends that way without getting into anything more granular.

Lisa Phifer:All, if you have an interest in seeing "raw data" for future polls, we will post the Excel spreadsheet in meeting materials so that you can eyeball what's contained there

Greg Shatan:Just sptiballing....

Lisa Phifer:I mean the Excel spreadsheet with just Chuck's response for last week's poll.

Nathalie Coupet:I don't understand this obsession with privacy' if we use the analogy of teh phone book, nobody is seriously considering eliminating the phone book. Why isn't it the same with Whois?

Michele Neylon:You can opt out of the phone book

Michele Neylon:and yes, we have got rid of them in most countries

Greg Shatan:Glad Michele has stopped smacking his head against his desk. Progress!

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Michele

Greg Shatan:Cell phones have never been in US phone books.

Greg Shatan:AFAIK

Rod Rasmussen:There is an obligation to get a CERT to meet PCI compliance if you're taking CC payments online

Michele Neylon:Rod - yes, but nobody is forcing you to take payments online

Rod Rasmussen:No one is forcing me to breathe either, but I'm pretty fond of it. :-) However, I would say that just about any business wants to remain in business these days, they need to take CC payments online!

Roger Carney:+1 Marc

Michele Neylon:Rod - sure..

Lisa Phifer:2) seems to be about access/disclosure not collection?

Lisa Phifer:That is, if you request a cert, you are giving permission for disclosure to that CA

Rod Rasmussen:There are alternatives to CERTs for online encryption (e.g. DANE) but they don't have viability and won't for quite a while, and its unclear whether costs will go with different tech. Don't get me wrong, I'm not a big fan of the current status of the CERT market and tech, but it's the way things work now and for the next several years. Whether or not it was an "original intent" of providing whois data or not (it wasn't) it's the reality today. Remember our EWG proposal on this though - for those who *need* to publish data in order to get a CERT, we could provide a specific contact role for them to do so. That makes it voluntary, put s it outside of "Required" data collection/publication, and certainly outside of thin data.

Holly Raiche:@ JIm +1

Alan Greenberg:My patience is getting pretty feeble.

Greg Shatan:RDS should not foreclose options.

Lisa Phifer:re: Q1) comment 3, listen to Geoffry Noakes explain this in last week's WG call recording

Nathalie Coupet:Why can't we just use the data included in each country's phone book, as they last stood, and start from there? And see if there are commonalities. But at lest, we can have a sense of wha is acceptable in every country.

Greg Shatan:Will purpose vs. use be this year's policy vs. implementation?

Lisa Phifer:Chuck is referring to purpose-based contacts rather than using Registrant as the point of contact for all purposes

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@greg - since we're starting with a clean slate nothing is foreclosed. so, asking the question why, which has never been answered before, is important.

Norbert Komlan GLAKPE:@Nathalie: Countries phone book? Im afraid but n,ot evry one is recorded in phone books... And I'm not sure mobile companies do have a phone book

Michele Neylon:yay

Michele Neylon:someone agrees with me :)

Greg Aaron:UDRP and URS rely on WHOIS data.

Nathalie Coupet:@Norbert: I understand thta. But it gives a sense of what is acceptable, according to laws and regulations of each land.

Fabricio Vayra:ACPA relies on WHOIS

Fabricio Vayra:Escrows rely on WHOIS

Lisa Phifer:The person may be saying that what's required for regulatory enforcement depends on local laws

Greg Aaron:yes, U.S. anticybersquatting law required on

registrant data as stated in WHOIS.

Michele Neylon:they all rely on THICK data

Michele Neylon:we're still talking about THIN data

Michele Neylon:#justsaying

Michele Neylon:#myheadhurts

Fabricio Vayra:#letsassumeitsanonissue

Fabricio Vayra:#andmoveon

Greg Shatan:Waving

Nathalie Coupet:Here is a list of all the yellow pages still in the world. https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_en.wikipedia.org_wiki_List-5Fof-5Fyellow-5Fpages&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl13mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe_5iHWGlBLwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=My9Rr7M29_oNEcLzYPbBBkVNTTSboPmkRF7Y8qUwkjo&s=LpMDOWlvtUNAtpESPq-XVz3LNudpttPd-07hIh9b5FE&e=

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_en.wikipedia.org_wiki_List-5Fof-5Fyellow-5Fpages&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl13mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe_5iHWGlBLwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=My9Rr7M29_oNEcLzYPbBBkVNTTSboPmkRF7Y8qUwkjo&s=LpMDOWlvtUNAtpESPq-XVz3LNudpttPd-07hIh9b5FE&e=

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_en.wikipedia.org_wiki_List-5Fof-5Fyellow-5Fpages&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl13mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe_5iHWGlBLwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=My9Rr7M29_oNEcLzYPbBBkVNTTSboPmkRF7Y8qUwkjo&s=LpMDOWlvtUNAtpESPq-XVz3LNudpttPd-07hIh9b5FE&e=

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):@Jim +1 - big difference between purpose for *collection* and legitimate purpose for *use*

David Cake:very much agree with Jim on 5

Carlton Samuels:@Jim @Scott: +1.

Holly Raiche:Jim and Scott +1

steve metalitz:@Jim and @ Scott, is it inherent in your position that some legitimate uses (that should be allowed) exceed the scope of the purpose of collection?

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@steve, I would say yes.

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@steve - however, I'm open to be convinced of otherwise. I really want a discussion of why these purposes are appropriate for collection.

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):@Steve: probably. I think that uses are derivatives of the fact that the data exists and is available. Thin data is collected primarily for DNS resolution and registrar identification, with a few bits created by the registry (like expiration dates). We don't explicitly collect thin data for the purpose of academic research, business sale of names, etc.

steve metalitz:@Jim, I think this discussion is colored by the issue Lisa jsut referred to, i.e., is there some data protection prohibition on uses that exceed the scope of the purposes of collection? Depending on how strictly that is applied it could make some of the concededly legitimate uses impossible.

Greg Shatan:If this whole exercise is an effort to deal with the spectre of domain protection laws, that's critical to acknowledge. And then it becomes a more-than-semantic issue. But without connecting the dots between the categories and the laws, we're just stumbling in the dark(or those who have certain views about data protection laws are giving answers regarding purpose of collection that will serve their views down

the line.

Lisa Phifer:@Steve, some of these may be purpose for collection of other (non-thin) data as deliberation moves forward. For example, registrants may have an option to supply a contact for Individual Internet use (instead of having their Registrant contact used for this). Just example, but relevance may become clearer later

Nathalie Coupet:@Chuck: are we looking for data that people cannot opt out of?

Carlton Samuels:Thank you all. Signing off

David Cake:+1 Jim again.

Norbert Komlan GLAKPE:@Nathalie: You are right if we consider legislation (in the sense of what is acceptable, according to laws and regulations of each land). that said, yellow pages a not representative, at least in many developing countries. Its just a business run by private. From my point of view, people who request for a DN are both companies and individuals. Also, most of time, the information you have in the WHOIS is that of the webmaster. not always the owner. this discussion is to be continued

Nathalie Coupet:@Norbert: Thank you

Nathalie Coupet:Norbert

Nathalie Coupet:Bye, Chuck!

Fabricio Vayra:Thanks, Chuck and team!

Greg Shatan:Bye all!

Norbert Komlan GLAKPE:Thanks all