Michelle DeSmyter:Dear All, Welcome to the Next-Gen RDS PDP
Working Group call on Tuesday, 30 May 2017 at 16:00 UTC.
   Michelle DeSmyter:Meeting agenda page:
https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-
3A__community.icann.org_x_IMPRAw&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSV
zgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe
_5iHWGlBLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=gu_xEc0jIs-
PVSa5yroc8eEfOjJfVo3EC4pHM_zlePM&s=ufGTX1fqLWMXlb4Z0cB1qHkIpQD-
8ArT4lIrL9BJxd8&e=
   Chuck Gomes:Hello all
   Lisa Phifer:Document currently displayed:
https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-
3A__community.icann.org_download_attachments_64078622_AnnotatedRe
sults-2DPoll-2Dfrom-
2D17MayCall.pdf&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl
4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe_5iHWGlBLwwwehFBf
jrsjWv9&m=gu_xEc0jIs-
PVSa5yroc8eEfOjJfVo3EC4pHM_zlePM&s=x5hsuUZWzQ4oP4DhClgm3vt5pODGKY
08o9xRa_CBudc&e=
   Lisa Phifer:Q3 starts on page 4
   Juan Manuel Rojas:Good morning/afternoon/evening
   Rod Rasmussen:In now - looks like I have a bad link that still
works for getting "close" to logging into this meeting. Odd
   Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB:could someone close the Poll 2
window
   Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB:thanks
   Stephanie Perrin:apologies for being late.
   Lisa Phifer:If anyone does not support option A) please raise
hand
   Lisa Phifer:Q3) option a) is A minimum set of "thin data"
elements must be accessible by unauthenticated RDS users.
   Greg Shatan 2:@Stephanie, Huzzah! Let's set a new Canadian
holiday.
   Lisa Phifer:Agreement #20 was discussed for the past few weeks,
and is: "gTLD registration 'thin data' must be accessible without
requestor identification, authentication, or stated purpose."
   Lisa Phifer:Charter question on data elements is intended to
address what data elements are needed
   Lisa Phifer:The EWG defined a "minimum public data set" in its
answers to the Data Elements charter question
   Lisa Phifer:The EWG did not deal with "thin data" as a category
but today's thin data elements are in the EWG's minimum public
data set
   Greg Shatan 2:But none of us know what it means....
   Bill Fanelli:Substitute "as yet to be defined" for minimum.
   Michael Hammer:Regardless of whether we leave it in or take it

out, we are going to have to cross that bridge.
   Stephanie Perrin:Thanks and sorry Lisa, I dont pay enough
attention to how we number things....
   Greg Shatan 2:"defined" would be better than "minimum."
   Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB:Suggestion: A minimum set of "thin
data" elements, agreed on as a minimum standard, must be
accessible by unauthenticated RDS users
   Stephanie Perrin:Yes it would be better, I agree with greg
   steve metalitz:+1 Greg and Stephanie (another rare entry!)
   Michael Hammer:Does "defined" allow additional data elements
beyond "defined"?
   Greg Shatan 2:Defined set can always be redefined, by the same
process.
   Lisa Phifer:Proposed alternative: A defined set of "thin data"
elements must be accessible by unauthenticated RDS users.
   steve metalitz:"At least a defined set..." ?
   Stephanie Perrin:Bearing in mind that we have not described the
mechanism by which we make the data elements accessible
   Lisa Phifer:Proposed alternative redux: At least a defined set
of "thin data" elements must be accessible by unauthenticated RDS
users.
   Michael Hammer:I could live with this...
   Greg Shatan 2:I suggest reading "A Framework and Standardized
Methodology for Developing Minimum Clinical Datasets" by Swenson-
Ranallo, Adam & Sainfort.
   Greg Shatan 2:"The term "minimum dataset" or MDS is a commonly
used, but poorly defined, term...
   Lisa Phifer:Q5 starts on page 8
   Lisa Phifer:I think people are reading "stated purpose"
differently - 1) must a purpose be stated in policy, vs. 2) must
a purpose be supplied with each query
   Volker Greimann:the purposes for the requester must be aligned
with the purpose of the collection/provision
   Lisa Phifer:Note that we already agreed to these concepts:
   Lisa Phifer:WG Agreement #2: Every "thin data" element should
have at least one legitimate purpose.WG Agreement #3: Every
existing "thin data" element does have at least one legitimate
purpose for collection.
   Lisa Phifer:Do we need to re-poll or do we have sufficient
agreement?
   Lisa Phifer:Proposed WG Agreement (to be confirmed by poll):
"To deter misuse and promote accountability, RDS policy must
state purpose(s) for public access to "thin data."
   Michael Hammer:deter is not the same as prevent. Probably
closer to mitigate.
   Lisa Phifer:Requestors could be presented with terms of

service, for example, without having to state purpose on query

  steve metalitz:Can math majors confirm that 19-4 does not = 16?
  steve metalitz:(on page 6)
  Lisa Phifer:Ok steve, I double checked my math but you found one!
  steve metalitz:I figured there were not arithmetic majors on the call.....
  Lisa Phifer:@Steve, I happen to be a math major myself, but apparently one with increasingly poor eyesight :-)
  Stephanie Perrin:I will never forget the blessed relief of dropping stats at Christmas in first year.....
  Stephanie Perrin:(although I will admit to regretting not having finished it occasionally. Still, there is some pain not worth enduring,.......)
  Lisa Phifer:If I recall, this was to discourage tiered access - those who pay more get more access (faster, broader)
  Rod Rasmussen:@Michele - I prefer red wine as the best way to give yourself a headache. You're guaranteed one if you're drinking it while reviewing ICANN policy docs. ;-b
  Michael Hammer:Would that be QoS (Quality of Service)?
  Lisa Phifer:Note this is not yet policy - it is stating a goal for policy yet to be defined
  Volker Greimann:How about "non-discriminatory access for all permissable uses"
  Stephanie Perrin:you are a lot geekier than me Michele.....
  Stephanie Perrin:and I like Volker's formulation....
  Michele Neylon:we're still talking about thin data
  Michele Neylon:so I don't see the aggregation as an issue
  Michele Neylon:only for thin
  Michele Neylon:I do with thick :)
  Michael Hammer:Who decides what are "permissable uses"?
  Lisa Phifer:Volker's proposal: "RDS access to "thin data" must be non-discriminatory access for all permissable uses" (for consistency with other agreements that should be legitimate purposes not permissible uses)
  Stephanie Perrin:I am not sure that we do need it, once we have said that we must provide unauthenticated (non-identified) access to thin data. I agree with Lisa that it seems likely in the EWG that we were trying to make sure access was not tiered on the basis of $$ or power.
  Lisa Phifer:Red X if no principle is needed
  Lisa Phifer:Green check if some principle is needed
  Stephanie Perrin:Let the records show Steve and I agree, this is a red letter day indeed!
  Michael Hammer:I think a broad principle is needed but we shouldn't get in the weeds.

Rod Rasmussen:And does such a principle cause *problems* if included or is it just a confirmation of one of ICANN's AOC's?

Michael Hammer:RDS access to "thin data" must be non-discriminatory.

Stephanie Perrin:Having said this, I could live with Volker's language.

Michael Hammer:How do we know their "purpose"?

Stephanie Perrin:Non-discriminatory is a pretty big word. One has to be clear in policy that one can take action to deter misfeasance

Lisa Phifer:Proposed alternative redux: RDS access to "thin data" must be non-discriminatory

Michael Hammer:misfeasance?

Michael Hammer:I'd leave that to lawwyers and torts.

Lisa Phifer:Another: RDS policies for access to "thin data" must be non-discriminatory (i.e., create a level playing field for all requestors)

Lisa Phifer:Chuck with or without ie?

Lisa Phifer:Green check if you support: RDS policies for access to "thin data" must be non-discriminatory

Lisa Phifer:Red X if you do not support the above

Stephanie Perrin:for all permissible purposes

Lisa Phifer:@Stephanie, does for all legitimate purposes work? For consistency with other agreements

Michael Hammer:I have a problem with that modification.

Lisa Phifer:Green check if you support: RDS policies for access to "thin data" must be non-discriminatory for all permissible purposes

Michael Hammer:Putting a red X for the modification.

Nathalie Coupet:But, is it really necessary to add 'permissible puroses, if you cannot verify that such purposes are legitimate?

steve metalitz:are we re-polling with Stephane's modification?

Nathalie Coupet:purposes

Michael Hammer:Exactly what Nathalie wrote.

Lisa Phifer:Green check if you support: RDS policies for access to "thin data" must be non-discriminatory for all legitimate purposes.

Lisa Phifer:You can state terms of service with purposes that are allowed/disallowed and take steps to enforce ToS, just as WHOIS does today

Volker Greimann:But if we figure out their purpose, we then have a handle, in case it is abusive or illegitimate

Volker Greimann:who is King Canoot?

Stephanie Perrin:Exactly as Volker says

steve metalitz:@Volker, Canute

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB:sound drops

Michael Hammer:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/King_Canute_and_the_waves

Volker Greimann:IP addresses are personal data now

Bill Fanelli:Legitimate or permissable - we should use whichever term we can define

Volker Greimann:depending on how the data is used, this may become personal data as well

Stephanie Perrin:I am confident that there are some jurisdictions that will want to know the purpose. I am confident that an investigation into a data aggregation operation that is criminal in nature would inquire as to how the aggregator got the data, some of which can only come from ICANN accredited providers.

Michael Hammer:Then the jurisdiction should investigate the purpose.

Stephanie Perrin:Sure, the point is that there is merit in ICANN attempting to do the right thing

Lisa Phifer:Suggest we poll on the statement as last revised

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB:Have to leave this meating, conflicting meeting coming up. Have fun...

Nathalie Coupet:I have a sore throat

Nathalie Coupet:Can't talk sorry

Nathalie Coupet:I can type

Nathalie Coupet:I thought it would be best to include this principle as soon as possible, since it is central to the GDRP, and not wait until later

Tom Undernehr:I was in support of Natalie's recommendation

Lisa Phifer:Perhaps propose a principle on proportionality to the WG list for discussion

steve metalitz:@Nathalie, how does this apply to thin data?

Nathalie Coupet:Data that is not absolutely necessary for a query shpould not be shared

Nathalie Coupet:Data has to be useful for the query

Nathalie Coupet:efficient

Michael Hammer:not sharing and efficient are orthongonal issues

Nathalie Coupet:What I meant, that only the data needed should be shared.

Lisa Phifer:@Rod, is your goal to provide an overview of existing policy that would support this proposed requirement?

steve metalitz:@Rod how is it handled at ICANN's lookup facility, https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__whois.icann.org_en-3F&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe_5iHWGlBLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=gu_xEc0jIs-

   Rod Rasmussen:@Lisa - perhaps - it depends on what the "existing policy" actually consists of - you may have seen the write-up I did of relevant secstions of the RAA, RA, and ICANN Compliance reports, but the "ground truth" of what ICANN compliance is actually testing to/enforcing is murky at best. If there's good documentation that seems to cover this well, great. We may want to tweak something that exists and bring it into the light though to help guide implementations down the road.

   Rod Rasmussen:@Steve - great question! I'll add that to my research regime.

   Lisa Phifer:@Rod, my point was that we're not yet developing policy or implementation guidance on this requirement, but you're gathering current info to help us understand the proposed requirement, correct?

   Rod Rasmussen:Yes, but it ties into the current job of defining "reasonable access" while taking into account that data providers can use measures to protect their systems. It's an open question now, but that "meta principle" probably then has a pointer to whatever we decide on is guidance in this area.

   Lisa Phifer:@Rod, we still need to return to that proposed WG agreement to finalize it, once you deliver your summary - let's be sure to keep this tied to the proposed WG agreement when you email the WG list. Thanks!

   Stephanie Perrin:WE could certainly work on better questions and send them to the leadership team. Also happy to comment on which ones we should cull.

   Lisa Phifer:If we contract legal analysis on those questions now, we will have a chance at getting responses by fall, prior to trying to answer the foundational question in our first initial report

   Lisa Phifer:It does not preclude further legal analysis on additional questions later

   Stephanie Perrin:REsponses by fall? that seems awfully slow...

   steve metalitz:Have to drop off now, thanks all!

   Michele Neylon:I need to drop

   Michele Neylon:see you

   Lisa Phifer:@Stephanie, 2-3 months to select a legal team, contract with them, set SOW, and complete the work is pretty short actually

   Lisa Phifer:Please response to poll on screen now regarding ICANN59 F2F meeting date

   Kiran Malancharuvil:Is there a "submit" button?

   Lisa Phifer:Yes = changing to Wednesday would affect you

negatively
  Lisa Phifer:No = keeping F2F on Tuesday would be ok for you
  Amr Elsadr:Missing a comma.
  Marika Konings:Say no - if you can participate on Wednesday -
say yes, if you cannot participate on Wednesday :-)
  Amr Elsadr:"Should this change be made, would this affect your
ability to participate in the meeting..."
  Michael Hammer:Dropping off.
  Rod Rasmussen:I'm even more confused now. :-(
  Marika Konings:We'll send out a doodle poll after this meeting
with a better phrased question. Sorry about the confusion :-(
  Rod Rasmussen:Thanks!
  Nathalie Coupet:thank you! bye