

AC Chat Next-Gen RDS PDP WG Tuesday, 28 March 2017

Terri Agnew:Welcome to the GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group teleconference on Tuesday, 28 March 2017 at 16:00 UTC for 90 minutes.

Terri Agnew:agenda wiki page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_pLzRAw&d=DwlCaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpCjgmKXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=ZkUclCQQ1PQi9nOhOeqWYYO3t437nT5bAljfd3WZP8E&s=1QzgQgalEFpobLuD4opGY_ZGudMiwbxAhhxf9KkWece=

Chris Pelling:Afternoon all :)

Theo Geurts:'lo

Andrew Sullivan:I can only join for a short time

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):I have an update to SOI - added RDS PDP WG & RPM PDP WG to .12. of the form

Venkata A:Good Morning Everyone

Sam Lanfranco npoc/csih:Hello everybody. I will be off for short periods since I am boiling maple sap for maple syrup, and the wood stove needs feeding (-:

Volker Greimann:sounds like a fun activity, Sam

Sam Lanfranco npoc/csih:I have a question that I will also post to the discussion list. It is not for answering here. Does any one have knowledge of and experience with Octree-Related Data Structures and Algorithms? There may come a time when that knowledge is valuable here.

Chris Pelling:Somebody needs to mute their Mic please

Chris Pelling:not Chuck

Chris Pelling:~)

Lisa Phifer:<https://community.icann.org/display/gTLDRDS/WG+Charter>

Lisa Phifer:<http://gnso.icann.org/council/annex-1-gnso-wg-guidelines-08apr11-en.pdf>

Terri Agnew:everyone can scroll themselves

Lisa Phifer:These results, and all other meeting materials, can be downloaded here:

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_pLzRAw&d=DwlCaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpCjgmKXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=ZkUclCQQ1PQi9nOhOeqWYYO3t437nT5bAljfd3WZP8E&s=1QzgQgalEFpobLuD4opGY_ZGudMiwbxAhhxf9KkWece=

Sara Bockey:Interesting. I completed the poll but I don't see myself listed. Error in the poll?

Marina Lewis:Hi everyone...sorry to join late. I'm also on the phone bridge.

Lisa Phifer:@Sara, I will check

Lisa Phifer:@Sara, I do not see you having submitted a response to this poll. Could you have responded to a previous poll?

Sara Bockey:No. It was this one.

Lisa Phifer:@Sara, let's discuss offline afterward to determine when, etc

Kal Feher:low volume Andrew

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):timestamp allows to identify particular persons who answer , so we could simplify it, just adding the name :)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):or to remove the timestamp

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):I meant in the slidedeck

Lisa Phifer:@Maxim, the timestamp cannot be removed from raw data. Refer to previous discussion and decision on how poll data will be collected and published

Andrew Sullivan:As long as _somewhere_ we capture the resolution stuff, I don't care. but not having ns, or being on hold, or whatever, is of course part of resolving

Terri Agnew:finding echo

Andrew Sullivan:I may drop.

Kal Feher:ns details and epp status are def useful for troubleshooting.

Stephanie Perrin:WHile I hesitate to opine on things like DNS where I am really still far from sure I understand it.....I agree with Marc on this.

Lisa Phifer:Alternative: "A purpose of gTLD registration data is to provide information useful in troubleshooting problems in resolution of a domain name on the Internet."

Greg Shatan:Is that a use, a purpose or both?

Greg Shatan:If the RDS provides info on resolution, that would seem to be a purpose. Even if DNS (zone files) also contain that info.

Greg Shatan:If they are not separated, does this mean these are a single purpose?

Lisa Phifer:@Greg, either information about resolution is a purpose or it isn't - it doesn't matter if it's a separate purpose

Marina Lewis:Is there any harm in utilizing the current definition we have now? Can we re-visit later on if we find that it does not work? I feel like we're splitting hairs and consuming a great deal of time unnecessarily at this point.

Terri Agnew:Juan Manuel Rojas just joined on audio only

Greg Shatan:If we are coming up with a list. of multiple purposes, there is no reason to combine different purposes into a single item.

Sara Bockey:Can you state the revised wording?

Lisa Phifer:Alternative: "A purpose of gTLD registration data is to provide information useful in troubleshooting problems in resolution of a domain name on the Internet."

Sara Bockey:thanks....just want to make sure I knew what we were voting on

Lisa Phifer: "1) A purpose of gTLD registration data is to provide information about the lifecycle of a domain name." would remain as-is.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):identification of the party which owns the domain?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):ok

Greg Shatan:This is only "a" purpose. Not "the" purpose. More purposes will follow. Or am I wrong?

Volker Greimann:As for a purpose, should we not also define for whom the information is provided? That definition may become necessary with relation to data protection requirements. If we define a purpose, , we need to be very specific

Volker Greimann:down the road

Volker Greimann:+1 Chuck.

Terri Agnew:finding line that is crackling

Kal Feher:yes. disrupted audio for me

Greg Shatan:Key punch operator?

Sara Bockey:Question. After the last poll there seemed to be support for language that did not include "authoritative". 50% supported a purpose of RDS is to facilitate dissemination of gTLD registration data, such as domain names and their domain contacts and name servers, in accordance with applicable policy. Curious why that wasn't the start point for this poll.

Lisa Phifer:@Sara, we had already polled on that, so we polled on a proposed revision only.

Andrew Sullivan:must drop at least for a bit but likely won't be back. apologies; ietf week here.

Lisa Phifer:@Sara, possibly when we poll on rewording, we could ask if people prefer original wording, revised wording, or something else, if that would be helpful.

Sara Bockey:@Lisa, it just seems that the results of the last poll were discarded

Lisa Phifer:@Sara the goal is to move towards consensus on revised language but I see your point

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):tech meaning of authoritativeness , to avoid confusion ?

Chris Pelling:My apologies, I have to drop now, Ill catch up on mp3 recording

Greg Shatan:Using iPad Pro -- echo comes before I disconnect microphone.

Lisa Phifer:The requirement should drive implementation decisions

Lisa Phifer:If it's not a requirement, implementation need not provide it. Or vice versa.

Greg Shatan:What is the "purpose" of non-authoritative data?

Sara Bockey:But ultimately the registrant data is coming from the registrant or is this only re thin data - technical data?

Lisa Phifer:bad data is not the same as non-authoritative data

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Sara , Registries can make self registrations, the same for Registrars

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):works

Vicky Sheckler:still disagree with stephanie. Not sure if concept of authoritative should be a purpose, or a requirement, but it would be useful to have some concept that the data source is the authoritative source for the data, whether its in a federated or centralized system

Vicky Sheckler:system - sorry

Michael Palage:The term "authoritative" is often used in Registry Registrar Agreement (RRA) to cite which data is authoritative when there is a conflict between Registrar and Registry databases. This is a important definition which has real world implications

John Bambenek:For the record, I would emphatically agree that authoritative be included.... and it's most basic level SOMEONE needs to know WHO owns a domain to authorize transfers, make changes, etc. Where that happens is another question, but something somewhere has to be authoritative.

Kal Feher:@greg non-authoritative data is a representation of what the entity has (such as the Registry), but is explicitly not represented from the true source of that data

Kal Feher:the true source being the Registrant

Kal Feher:or registrar

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):technologically authoritatively ?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):not legally

Sara Bockey:Defining the term would help - just so there is no misinterpretation 8 mos down the road

Sara Bockey:Understood. Thank you!

Lisa Phifer:Can we ask a few people to bring back a definition to the WG?

Stephanie Perrin:@Lisa yes, I apologize, I was talking in shorthand. We had a lengthy discussion on the matter, as to what authoritative means. One can have authoritatively sourced bad data. But including authoritative here seems to me to presume decisions....

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):may we add "further clarification might be required?"

Marika Konings:You may want to consider the definition used in the Thick WHOIS final report? "Authoritative, with respect to provision of Whois services, shall be interpreted as to signify the single database within a hierarchical database structure holding the data that is assumed to be the final authority regarding the question of which record shall be considered accurate and reliable in case of conflicting records; administered by a single administrative [agent] and consisting of data provided by the registrants of record through their registrars." A proposed shorter version is "the data set to be relied upon in case of doubt".

Marika Konings:correct

tobrien:+1 John Bambenek

Lisa Phifer:Captured in notes already

Lisa Phifer:This was discussed at ICANN58; anyone working on this may want to consult our F2F meeting notes for the back and forth on this topic

John Bambenek:Re: q4: If accuracy is going to be a requirement of registration data, SOMETHING has to enable enforcing it. It makes sense some of this should be built-in to RDS, but that need not be only place. For instance, something to flag the various domains registered with phone numbers of 000 000 0000 etc.

Marika Konings:as far as I am aware this is the only definition of the term authoritative in a GNSO context so if that does not align with what this WG understands with authoritative, it is important to define the term to avoid any kind of confusion or references to previous work that has been done on this term.

Lisa Phifer:At one point, this purpose said "promote accuracy" and it then moved to "facilitate accuracy"

Marc Anderson:@Marika, I agree it's very important that we define the term to avoid confusion. As Lisa pointed out it's clear from our discussion that we don't all have the same starting point which makes it difficult to get to consensus.

Lisa Phifer:Language Chuck is asking about: "5) A purpose of RDS policy is to facilitate fulfilling requirements for the accuracy of gTLD registration data."

Greg Shatan:Maybe we need to ask "Provide the rationale for agreeing" and not just the "rationale for disagreeing."

Lisa Phifer:Perhaps some good that comes from this is that we have a few key concepts to define: "authoritative data" and "data accuracy"

Greg Shatan:I would love for those 17 people to provide their rationales now.... :-)

Marina Lewis:We have been talking about this issue since the tall. Please, we need to move on. Can we just pick something and agree that we can change it later if it doesn't work?

Marc Anderson:@Lisa I think it would be worth the time/effort to have a few key terms defined such as authoritative and accurate at least for purposes of this working group.

Fabricio Vayra:COMMENT: So we are saying the purpose of RDS to ensure accuracy? That makes the RDS a verification tool, but how does that help domain name owners manage their domains?

Juan Manuel Rojas:How we are going to deal "accuracy" vs "reality" of data?

Lisa Phifer:@Fab, I think "ensure" got rejected awhile back.

Stephanie Perrin:Let the record show that Greg and I agree, I think. We may have duelling footnotes, but I think we need to move forward.

Stephanie Perrin:I am trying to figure out how to reserve the right to object, and not be caught up on the gotchas.

Fabricio Vayra:COMMENT: Accuracy seems to be a requirement, not a purpose

Lisa Phifer:Proposed footnote: "Accuracy" as it pertains to the RDS will be defined later in this PDP.

Farell FOLLY (Africa 2.0):Anyway, in the final document we are going to include the definitions (intended meaning related to the context) of all those confusing words and terms, aren't we ?

Stephanie Perrin:I like Lisa's proposal. Spring n Montreal also sounds good....

Lisa Phifer:for what it's worth, we have a charter question on Accuracy - we haven't deliberated on it yet

Greg Shatan:Could add that to the fn.

Greg Shatan:Iterative and circular can sometimes be confusingly similar. The difference is that an iterative process makes progress, while a circular one doesn't.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):european ones will have to obey ... btw - quite interesting URL for GDPR understanding https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A_www.eugdpr.org_&d=DwlCaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfga0A1gn-H4xR2EBk&m=ZkUclCQQ1PQi9nOhOeqWYYO3t437nT5bAljfd3WZP8E&s=sQAT2NO907Uju9nvrO4io5b8PAU_bKoBEi2yOI_gSrY&e=

Vicky Sheckler:the regulation is an incremental step from the Eu data protection directive - agree with the

Nathalie Coupet:I volunteer

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):*quite ... and the most interesting part is : Increased Territorial Scope (extra-territorial applicability)

Lisa Phifer:Susan volunteered

Theo Geurts:I can reachout to all ccTLDs registries.

Vicky Sheckler:thanks susan!

Vicky Sheckler:@theo - let's work on the questions together first. thanks!

Theo Geurts:@Vicky makes sense :)

Lisa Phifer:Question: By ICANN60, could we be ready to start drafting our first initial report?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):60+ ?

Lisa Phifer:Note that means touching on all 5 questions (not just the 3 we discussed already) at least to some degree, and probably more than "thin data"

Kal Feher:need to drop off

Lisa Phifer:Work plan: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_olxIAw&d=DwlCaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0AIGN-H4xR2EBk&m=ZkUclCQQ1PQi9nOhOeqWYYO3t437nT5bAljfd3WZP8E&s=ePd9aOCimkplSwDBAc2ngKUR40haEEJGK_3X9FuMg14&e=

Lisa Phifer:These questions are reflected in work plan but not the separation of thin/thick - we can add that

Terri Agnew:Next Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group call Tuesday, 04 April 2017 at 16:00 UTC for 90 minutes.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):bye all

Venkata A:Good Day

Juan Manuel Rojas:Thanks all.

Nathalie Coupet:Bye

Juan Manuel Rojas:Bye all

Patrick Lenihan:Thanks to Each and All! :-)

Greg Shatan:Thanks, Chuck and all!

Theo Geurts:cya

Vicky Sheckler:bye

Sam Lanfranco npoc/csih:bye

Marina Lewis:Thanks all - bye