

Michelle DeSmyter>Welcome to the GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group teleconference on Tuesday, 04 April 2017 at 16:00 UTC for 90 minutes.

Michelle DeSmyter:Agenda wiki page:
https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_sMLRAw&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrw1l3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe_5iHWG1BLwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=Lt5HL89F0a9oXqWXjeWJwZFctTnTxFd2qxRihgIW90c&s=n_jBF3SB9Zm9f4jWnOu7SyaXb-qSdOYJ6-E-0dNpV-8&e=

Chuck Gomes:Greetings to everyone.

Chris Pelling:Afternoon all :)

Chris Pelling:wow - feedback

Michele Neylon:huh?

Michele Neylon:Am I on the wrong call?

Carlton Samuels:Howdy all

Stephanie Perrin:Hi Carlton!

Juan Manuel Rojas:Good afternoon

Carlton Samuels:Hi Steph, good to see you

Daniel K. Nanghaka:Hi All

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Hello All

Bastiaan Goslings:thanks for having me ;-)

Theo Geurts:welcome

tobrien:(waves) hello all, glad to help

Chris Pelling:Please unlock and allow zooming

Chris Pelling:^^@staff

Chris Pelling:ta :)

Lisa Phifer:@Chris done

Lisa Phifer:Annotated results being displayed now can be downloaded from https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_download_attachments_64078512_AnnotatedResultsForACDisplay-2DPoll-2D28MarchCall.pdf&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrw1l3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe_5iHWG1BLwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=Lt5HL89F0a9oXqWXjeWJwZFctTnTxFd2qxRihgIW90c&s=zYaeIr9vJfv0yH_QUwtXUC8HXTXB00sTD4_SDeva8Xw&e=

Greg Aaron:no one here is representing SSAC officially

andrew sullivan:Apologies for tardiness -- my previous meeting ran long

Roger Carney:+1 Chuck

Lisa Phifer:proposed alternative: A purpose of RDS is to facilitate possible dissemination of gTLD registration data in accordance with applicable policy.

Greg Aaron:"possible" adds nothing. Either an RDS disseminates data, or it does not.

Greg Aaron:Either an RDS disseminates data, or it does not. WHAT data is as per policy.

Fabricio Vayra:COMMENT: Aren't things like "accuracy", "accordance with applicable policy" etc. requirements in support of a purpose "Purpose of RDS is to support domain name registration and maintenance by providing appropriate access to registration data to enable a reliable mechanism for identifying, establishing and maintaining the ability to contact Registrants"

tobrien:+1 Greg

Greg Aaron:To say "possibly" is the same as saying that an RDS MIGHT display data.

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Greg

Fabricio Vayra:and I'd say "display" is also a possible requirement in support of a purpose

Amr Elsadr>Note that "access", whether it be public or gated is a future task for this working group to tackle as per the workplan.

Greg Aaron:An RDS WILL display data. What data, and how much, is per policy to be decided. But we know that an RDS will display data, and "possibly" confuses things.

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):I don't think I like "display". A sign displays information. An RDS returns information in response to a query.

Stuart Clark:how about dissemination of selected registry data?

Vicky Sheckler:sorry i'm late

Lisa Phifer:Alt D: A purpose of RDS is to provide an authoritative source of information about, for example, domaincontacts, domain names and name servers for gTLDs, [based on approved policy].

andrew sullivan:I continue to find it bizarre that we talk about the RDS in terms of collecting the data, since that's what registration systems do. We seem to be equivocating on whether we are making new registry policy or are not. I think what we're saying is that the data-collection side of the RDS is the union of data in the registrar and registry databases. Is that right?

Stephanie Perrin:Can you see my hand up? (once bitten with adobe problems, always shy.....)

Amr Elsadr:We see it, Stephanie.

andrew sullivan:@Stephanie: yes

Stephanie Perrin:thanks :-)

Carlton Samuels:@Scott: +1 - the RDS is an authoritative source of DNS data in that it collects, stores and ultimately disseminates that data in keeping with policy. So both purpose statements are needed

Lisa Phifer:Reminder charter asks us to defined requirements and purpose of Registration Data and Directory Services in phase

1, followed by detailed policies to support those in Phase 2

Carlton Samuels:@Greg: yes, two verbs may make two statements or conjoin them

Lisa Phifer:Proposed split: A purpose is to provide an authoritative source... separate from A purpose is to facilitate dissemination....

Greg Shatan:Disseminate: "to spread or disperse"

Mike Hammer:provide access or make available?

Carlton Samuels:'disseminate' = spread, communicate, put out, etc.

Stephanie Perrin:@Lisa yes.

Michele Neylon:disseminate is active

Jim Galvin (Afilias):+1 michele

Lisa Phifer:Here is a combined option: (1) A purpose is to provide an authoritative source... separate from (2) A purpose is to provide access to...

Lisa Phifer:Note that "Access" is to be addressed by this WG per our charter

David Cake:+1 Michele

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@lisa - yes

Carlton Samuels:@Michele: This word presumes an affirmative response to a request; the RDS is queried.

Amr Elsadr:To add to Lisa, working out the details on "access" is task 12c in the updated workplan, where the nuances of public and gated "access" will be discussed.

Michele Neylon:Carlton - which word?

Carlton Samuels:@Michele 'disseminate'

Lisa Phifer:@Carlton It doesn't say how access is provided (direct query, referral, etc, all on the table for Phase 2)

Stephanie Perrin:+1 Marc

Carlton Samuels:@Lisa; Very true!

Michele Neylon:Carlton - no it doesn't

Tim O'Brien:appologies

andrew sullivan:I thought in CPH we said 'in the technical sense' or 'from an authoritative source' or something like that for this authoritative business

Michele Neylon:I'd hire a PR company to disseminate our news ..

andrew sullivan:the point is that we want the authoritative data in the data-theoretic sense -- not from a cache, not from a stale source, &c &c.

Jim Galvin (Afilias):+1 andrew

Jim Galvin (Afilias):+1 chuck to poll

Lisa Phifer:Note last week

Lisa Phifer:call ended with an action to WG members to volunteer to define "authoritative"

andrew sullivan:Let's punt

Theo Geurts:agreed Andrew
Maxim Alzoba

(FAITID):https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.ietf.org_rfc_rfc1035.txt&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrw113mSV_zgfkbpSS6sJms7xc14I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe_5iHWG1BLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=Lt5HL89F0a9oXqWXjeWJwZFctTnTxFd2qxRihgIW90c&s=yL2CE6gpzGxqdy1B8Q3GKYkJ7rBz6plgMbGYjLQQ9Kc&e= ?

Mike Hammer:Is the sense that authoritative=source of record?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):that RFC 1035 has some kind of definition

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):of authoritative data

Carlton Samuels:@Mike: Yes, that is the sense I understand it.
In context, the data is verified and verifiable

Amr Elsadr:Definition of "authoritative" as per the "thick" WHOIS PDP: "Authoritative, with respect to provision of Whois services, shall be interpreted as to signify the single database within ahierarchical database structure holding the data that is assumed to be the final authority regardingthe 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 ofrecord through their registrars."

Stephanie Perrin:@Amr yes!

Amr Elsadr:The proposed shorter version was "the data set to be relied upon in caseof doubt".

Carlton Samuels:@Amr: +1. No need to reinvent the wheel here!

Jim Galvin (Afilias):+1 andrew

Stephanie Perrin:Right and it has no relation to accuracy

Lisa Phifer:All, refer to ICANN58 and last week's call notes for discussion about the Thick WHOIS definition and other interpretations given by WG members

Amr Elsadr:@Stephanie: Actually, there is reference to the assumption of accuracy of authoritative data in the "thick" WHOIS definition.

andrew sullivan:For geeks. "authoritative" means something like "data-theoretic canonical source", not "accurate picture of the world", which is why "authoritative" is in use in the spec for RDAP. But I appreciate that other communities use the term in a different way, particularly with the connotation of data accuracy

Carlton Samuels:@Amr: Which is why I used the word 'verified' since it includes the notion of accuracy and 'ftiness'.

Alex Deacon:+1 andrew

andrew sullivan:accuracy. For nerds like me, authoritative data is by definition accurate in the sense that it's the real data, but it is not accurate in the sense of capturing the world

Mike Hammer:+1 Andrew

Theo Geurts:Agreed Andrew

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):+1 Andrew

Michael Palage:Here is the reconsideration request I just referenced - https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_resources_pages_reconsideration-2D17-2D1-2Dsmith-2Drequest-2D2017-2D03-2D16-2Den&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl13mSVzgfkbpSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe_5iHWG1BLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=Lt5HL89F0a9oXqWxjeWJwZFctTnTxFd2qxRihgIW90c&s=0cb22avyy0PJ_skXdFUbqFGhi5z9IH1myIF_B_hBtyE&e=

Lisa Phifer:Authoritative IS the goal of 2a, if separated from 2b, hard to poll on 2a without it

Roger Carney:@andrew I like the nerd definition except I would say "may not be reflect the real world"

Stephanie Perrin:The problem with any use of the word accurate assumes verification, a function which we have not yet got to.

Lisa Phifer:C: A purpose of RDS policy is to facilitate the accuracy of gTLD registration data.

Lisa Phifer:A: Same thing, plus footnote

Stephanie Perrin:Amr yes, Thick was not doing what we are doing. We are doing a more or less de novo review of RDS. Thick was not., am I right? It assumed the verification requirements already pushed into the 2013 RAA?

Amr Elsadr:@Stephanie: Correct. It was also meant to be helpful in eventual migration to a de novo RDS, especially from a consistent labelling and display perspective.

Jim Galvin (Afilias):+1 on A and delete

Lisa Phifer:How many people on this call would prefer to delete 5) entirely?

Mike Hammer:Not meant as a troll - Is accuracy important?

Greg Shatan:Yes

Lisa Phifer:Does "set this aside" mean delete 5 or keep as A (with footnote deferring "accuracy" to that charter question)

Vicky Sheckler:i don't understand concept re: accuracy is outside of RDS

Mike Hammer:The discussion has been about information going in but what if "We" know that there is inaccurate data in the RDS?

Vicky Sheckler:agree with chuck

Lisa Phifer:Our charter asks this WG to identify requirements for accuracy - that could be none, or a specific set of requirements

Lisa Phifer:RDS policy covers what data is collected and maintained, not just what data is accessed and how

andrew sullivan:I'd just as soon delete 5. My "don't care about this" remark is basically that I think the policy is crazy. If we had proper controls on access the incentive to lie

wouldn't be there except for criminals, and any policy attempting to make them behave is doomed

Theo Geurts:+1 Jim Galvin

Alex Deacon:lol

Bastiaan Goslings:I agree with Jim: the RDS is the repository that contains registration data. It would be agnostic with regard to the accuracy of these data

Vicky Sheckler:disagree re: accuracy outside of RDS. whether it is a purpose or requirement we can discuss, but suggesting that some diligence / safeguards to improve accuracy in registrant data is important

Mike Hammer:@Alex, I think abuse and criminal activity is a much larger cause of bad data.

Sam Lanfranco npoc/csih:Sorry to arrive late. Read Chat - Working on Discussion Notes:

Lisa Phifer:Alternative A: 5) A purpose of RDS policy is to facilitate the accuracy [#] of gTLD registration data. Footnote: [#] "Accuracy" as it pertains to the RDS will be defined later in this PDP (see Charter question on Accuracy).

Alex Deacon:@mike agree

Mike Hammer:The solution to "true" privacy concerns is to make private registration services responsible for the domains they are listed as the registrant of.

Lisa Phifer:Policy was added after discussing this same point previously (RDS involvement)

Lisa Phifer:Green = delete now

Stephanie Perrin:we do not, in my view, have decent metrics on accuracy....where the inaccurate data is coming from, what the metrics of verification efforts tell us in terms of verification policy and implementation, what use LEAs get from bad data from criminals, what criminals will do if they cannot insert bad data in their registrations, etc. SO I am not optimistic, absent unavailable data, that this will be an easy discussion.

Lisa Phifer:Red = retain for future discussion

Mike Hammer:Perhaps set it aside for a specific time frame.

Tim O'Brien:from my own analysis, accuracy is horrid (depending on the region/country/registrar)

Jim Galvin (Afilias):+1 to chuck proposal to defer on this for now

Greg Aaron:wait... if you're opposed? Please make choice clear, Chuck.

Lisa Phifer:Proposal: Lacking clear direction, and unlikely to get clear direction from poll, retain Alternative A for now and include clear notation there is divergence on this, will revisit later

Vicky Sheckler:apologies but I need to leave early.

Marika Konings:Please make sure to mute your microphone when not speaking.

andrew sullivan:agree w/ Marc but don't care too much

Mike Hammer:Agree with putting a placeholder

Tim O'Brien:same thing

Tim O'Brien:put placeholder, and table conversation

Lisa Phifer:Alternative is placeholder: "Accuracy as it pertains to the RDS will be defined later in this PDP (see Charter question on Accuracy)."

Lisa Phifer:That's Alt A without the actual purpose

David Cake:The term tabling doesn't mean the same thing to everyone, best avoided for international meetings

Sam Lanfranco npoc/csih:Inaccurate sources: typos, out-of-date, deliberate. To minimize inaccuracy typos can be auto-caught.Out-of-date means periodic registration data confirmation. Both have technical solutions. Deliberate falsehood is an issue in itself and beyond this wg.

andrew sullivan:Ok with me

Rod Rasmussen:Green checkmark is there :-)

Juan Manuel Rojas:+1

Rod Rasmussen:I'm always last on roll call...

Lisa Phifer:sync off, you can scroll yourselves

Lisa Phifer:This is merge of

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_download_attachments_64076964_Sullivan-2DSuggestionForPurposeInDetail.pdf&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrw1l3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe_5iHWG1BLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=Lt5HL89F0a9oXqWXjeWJwZFctTnTxFd2qxRihgIW90c&s=8Rd-AjafXuG50EOGpq-DKee002a04UJRbKxyQk6_JwU&e=

Lisa Phifer:and Annex D of EWG report for thin data elements only https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_en_system_files_files_final-2Dreport-2D06jun14-2Den.pdf&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrw1l3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe_5iHWG1BLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=Lt5HL89F0a9oXqWXjeWJwZFctTnTxFd2qxRihgIW90c&s=v5mnTVHgVi3NblxEZxNjCoUJGeYi6JrjosdUH1wE04&e=

Lisa Phifer:The merged doc being displayed can be downloaded from https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_download_attachments_64078512_Merged-2DThinDataPurposes-2Dv1.pdf&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrw1l3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe_5iHWG1BLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=Lt5HL89F0a9oXqWXjeWJwZFctTnTxFd2qxRihgIW90c&s=vEMKVcEwpapnIP6AxFX9ctePwhDBWhNgbWhzLGUIHNA&e=

Chuck Gomes:Let's bring up annex D

Lisa Phifer:@Rod, @Andrew - Andrew worked from specific

purposes in the RDS statement of purpose. Rod worked from individual purposes for collection/access. Which is the better starting point?

Lisa Phifer:Or both

andrew sullivan:I don't care -- the idea that I had was to demonstrate, really, that one ends up at the same point :)

Benny Samuelson / Nordreg AB:speak up please

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):low volume :(

Marc Anderson:I have to drop. Thank you all

Bastiaan Goslings:When we are talking about 'privacy'we are talking about who has access to data and under which conditions right? That is a separate question IMO from the one which (categories of) data the RDS needs to contain based on the purposes we come up with

Theo Geurts:we talking about what is accessible at a "basic" level, gated access comes later.

Alex Deacon:gotta run...thanks!

Bastiaan Goslings:@Theo: thanks. That suggests to me that 'privacy' should also come later

Chris Pelling:Thanks all :)

Sara Bockey:thanks all

andrew sullivan:thank you all and bye

Nathalie Coupet:Bye all

Theo Geurts:cyas

Patrick Lenihan:Thanks to Each and All!

Juan Manuel Rojas:Thanks all, bye all

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):bye all

Amr Elsadr:Thanks all. Bye.

Sam Lanfranco npoc/csih:bye