

Terri Agnew:Welcome to the next GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group teleconference on Tuesday, 13 June 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_JMPRAw&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=LBM6zGaffzB1Q7jd7dVXrqWvEY6TeQXW4oJpxl8Dbpc&s=cOjnrAO2nwEyt60to-Gp6A5q_hwaugaDyGYVeOO-ObA&e=

Chuck Gomes:Hello all

Farell Folly:Hello Chair

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Hello All

Alex Deacon:morning all

Benny / Nordreg AB:sorry for being late

Volker Greimann:Vote for Public

Amr Elsadr:Yes, Chuck. Will pull it up.

andrew sullivan:I suggest we call it "sparky the wonderdog" and move on to a different topic. I'm pretty frustrated with the endless discussion of what seem like peripheral issues when we can't apparently agree on some simple set of things that are just going to be available to everyone.

Lisa Phifer:In short: Seeking a term to encompass the set of data elements deliberated on thus far and referenced in Wg agreements thus far, replacing "thin data"

Michael Hammer:I'm in chat only as I have a conflicting meeting but wanted to follow what's going on in the call.

Alan Greenberg:I thought that was what we were doing. Deciding if any other elements need to be available without authentication/identification.

Amr Elsadr:@Steve: See Lisa's comment in the chat above. It might answer your question.

Roger Carney:Agree with Greg. Thin Data is defined, some of which may be part of the Public RDS Data. And as Steve mentions other elements may be included in the Public RDS Data

Alex Deacon:+1 greg. the sparky the wonderdog data set is specific to RDS.

Lisa Phifer:@Greg S - Public data set (new term, to replace "thin data" wherever used in WG agreements forged to date), which is new set of data elements containing existing "thin data" elements plus/minus what this WG agrees should be in that set. Is that it?

Greg Shatan:@Chuck, agree with that concept.

Ayden Férdeline:Sorry to arrive late

Stephanie Perrin:My apologies for being late as well.

Alan Greenberg:Whether the "thin" data is personal is not the issue. It is necessary for the system to work and must be un gated. We already decided that.

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Andrew

Greg Aaron:+1 to Andrew and +1 to Alan

Lisa Phifer:Raise hand if you strongly object to using "public data set" in existing WG agreements about "thin data"

Greg Shatan:That was a couple of minutes. On Jupiter.

Lisa Phifer:Displayed now: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_download_attachments_64078628_AnnotatedResults-2DPoll-2Dfrom-2D6JuneCall.pdf&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=LBM6zGaffzB1Q7jd7dVXrqWvEY6TeQXW4oJpxl8Dbpc&s=DJ34zYtbIODY4jyrgr7ZXO9HsU7UkTe3VxtluBtqUi4&e=

Lisa Phifer:Raw results and summary from SurveyMonkey also posted on wik meeting page [https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_wik_meeting_page_64078628_AnnotatedResults-2DPoll-2Dfrom-2D6JuneCall.pdf&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=LBM6zGaffzB1Q7jd7dVXrqWvEY6TeQXW4oJpxl8Dbpc&s=DJ34zYtbIODY4jyrgr7ZXO9HsU7UkTe3VxtluBtqUi4&e=)

[3A_community.icann.org_x_JMPRAw&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=LBM6zGaffzB1Q7jd7dVXrqWvEY6TeQXW4oJpxl8Dbpc&s=cOjnrAO2nwEyt60to-Gp6A5q_hwaugaDyGYVeOO-ObA&e=](https://community.icann.org/x/JMPRAw&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=LBM6zGaffzB1Q7jd7dVXrqWvEY6TeQXW4oJpxl8Dbpc&s=cOjnrAO2nwEyt60to-Gp6A5q_hwaugaDyGYVeOO-ObA&e=)

Nathalie Coupet:I thought it had been consensus on the call last week that the exp date should be removed? The wording was confusing.

andrew sullivan:I don't think there was consensus either way last week, hence the poll

Lisa Phifer:@Nathalie, no there was both support and disagreement in last week's call - and in these poll results

Alex Deacon:no need for a poll on the poll IMO

Alan Greenberg:I thought we had ALREADY decided that all of the existing thin data was to be ungated!!!

vicky sheckler:no need for a poll

andrew sullivan:I think no poll needed

Roger Carney:No poll

Nathalie Coupet:no poll

Lisa Phifer:In short, the proposed WG agreement from last week is NOT accepted and will not be recorded as an Agreement

steve metalitz:Note that the following are already in the "public data set" in the existing registry Whois for (nearly) all thick registries: DNSSEC:signedDelegationDNSSEC:unsigned

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@andrew - +1

neil schwartzman:i agree with what andrew says about DNSSEC. it is a technical aspect that makes a domain much more secure when deployed. troubleshooting use is fundamental.

Lisa Phifer:There were 26 in support of this agreement, just 5 unsure, and none opposed

vicky sheckler:agreee DNSSec should be part of the public record

Greg Shatan:Someone needs to mute.

Alex Deacon:@stepanie - your mic is open - causing some feedback.

vicky sheckler:per Lisa's statement, sounds like there is rough consensus to include it in public data

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@chuck - no worries! nothing to add.

Jim Galvin (Afilias):it's not about bloat, adding it even though it's already there. the issue is providing an out-of-band check, which is important for security and operations

Stephanie Perrin:apologies for the mike, was not paying enough attention to it

Volker Greimann:If there is no potential for abuse, then ok

Stephanie Perrin:+1 Volker, and thanks for the excellent explanation Andrew

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@volker - no abuse p;otential

andrew sullivan:No objection here

Lisa Phifer:Page 3 is chart, page 4 provides comments which include a few suggested additions from 2013 RAA

Ayden Férdeline:Hasn't this been circulated already?

Lisa Phifer:What's currently out there depends to some extent on the domain being queried. The 2013 RAA list will be circulated on email.

Lisa Phifer:Displayed now: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_download_attachments_64078628_RDSPDP-2DHandout-2DFor13JuneCall.pdf&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=LBM6zGaffzB1Q7jd7dVXrqWvEY6TeQXW4oJpxl8Dbpc&s=rGIM7-xtrraAydk9s2DLT_WggH0n6_eGQ4iOQAxk1H0&e=

Greg Aaron:2013 raa is fine

Greg Aaron:but also look at the nLD Registry Contract

Volker Greimann:A purpose of public data is to allow the functioning of the internet

Greg Aaron:Put them on screen?

Lisa Phifer:Greg A - see slide 2

Lisa Phifer:for agreements thus far

Lisa Phifer:Note WG Agreement #2: Every "thin data" element should have at least one legitimate purpose.

Lisa Phifer:WG Agreement #3: Every existing "thin data" element does have at least one legitimate purpose for collection.

Lisa Phifer:WG AGreements 5-13 then enumerate the list of purposes agreed already as "a legitimate purpose for thin data collection."

andrew sullivan:I am in favour of Chuck's approach

Kal Feher:if a purpose can't be easily measured, is it worth documenting? AFAICT the purpose of purposes (pun intended) is to assess the appropriateness of a given level of access to RDS data. so if we can't use it for that, why bother documenting the purpose at all?

Volker Greimann:if we misdefine the purpose, we may limit the way the data can be used

Volker Greimann:if use case B does not fall under purpose A, we may have an issue with allowing that use case

vicky sheckler:generally, agree that we should accept EWG purposes,as a baseline

Kal Feher:no. misdefining won't limit its use. it'll only limit who has access or how we decide to allow access. once people have the data, it'll be used as they please.

andrew sullivan:If we have already determined that we're not going to discriminate on use (because we don't know who's getting the data), then the "purposes of use" and so on makes _no difference_, since you can't tell that the use isn't conforming with whatever use you decided on

Lisa Phifer:All, please refer to https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_HlZRAw&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmKXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0AIGN-H4xR2EBk&m=LBM6zGaffzB1Q7jd7dVXrqWvEY6TeQXW4oJpxl8Dbpc&s=pBzkvvaZQIY-uXoFJYmlTUuLoqXmSQA-sb_o7_CRCRU&e= for data protection law concepts around purpose, discussed by this WG back in February

Stephanie Perrin:1. Let us not make this sound harder than it has to.

Volker Greimann:caveat: this mainly applies to personal data. non-personal data does not really require a purpose.

tim obren:sorry for being tardy, client meeting

andrew sullivan:@Stephanie: too late!

Volker Greimann:having one though might cover our behinds if a court surprisingly finds data we assume to be non-private to be private

Stephanie Perrin:2. The data commissioners have been telling ICANN since 2000 that they need to define a purpose for collection and processing.

Greg Shatan:Defining a purpose is easy, defining all purposes is hard to impossible.

Volker Greimann:@Steph: For private data

Michael Hammer:+1 to what Greg wrote.

Stephanie Perrin:SSAC also told ICANN in SAC 55 that defining the purpose was important

andrew sullivan:So, we have purposes for all of this, which is supporting the operations of the Internet.

andrew sullivan:There is not going to be a point when any of this data is not going to be needed for that purpose, so long as we have a domain name system

Greg Shatan:Stephanie: "the" purpose(s) or "a" purpose?

Volker Greimann:all of them:

Volker Greimann:ICANN's purpose for mandating the collection
andrew sullivan:having defined it that way, and given that we can't tell what actual thing someone might do with the data, I can't see that _any_ of the rest of it matters
Volker Greimann:registrar purpose would be limited to their own use
Greg Shatan:Andrew's point is fundamental. How specific do we need to be about purpose?
Volker Greimann:registry similarly
Roger Carney:@Volker, agreed
Greg Shatan:Defining all purposes is about as easy as moving a beach with tweezers.
Lisa Phifer:Pages 3-7 of the slides now displayed give Andrew Sullivan's suggested purpose for each "thin data" element, which was developed shortly after our CPH meeting in response to feedback that we needed to drill more into purpose
Rod Rasmussen:Dang - sorry I was late due to another call - I *strongly* object to calling a specific *limited* set of data the "public data set" since there will be many registrants that will want *ALL* data that is currently public to remain so (think large enterprises who want to ensure consumer trust). Perhaps "Minimum Public Data Set" to allow for public release of additional data at the request of the parties in question. Don't want to run off on a tangent to where the call is now, but want to get this point in there. so it isn't lost.
Volker Greimann:we can, by agreement
Greg Shatan:If we can be higher-level about purpose then it can be easier (or at least possible).
Greg Shatan:Of course, we are missing the question. of whether the privacy concerns about "purpose" are even relevant to "thin data.". It's my understanding they would not be.
Lisa Phifer:@Rod, I think we landed on "public data set" and not "minimum public data set" for this WG
Rod Rasmussen:@Lisa - and that's a big mistake.
Stephanie Perrin:Which data set are we talking about here, in terms of purpose.
Chuck Gomes:We are talking about the Public Data Set as defined to date
Rod Rasmussen:@Jim - a process to update purposes was included in the EWG report. :-)
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):periodic review - I think it was in the new bylaws
Stephanie Perrin:The one that Rod would like called the minimum public data set
Volker Greimann:Let us not assume our policy to be immutable.
Lisa Phifer:@Rod, it was stated that the public data set may be added to as WG deliberation continues on to additional data elements
Volker Greimann:Why not bake in a process on how to add and/or remove purposes based on technical requirements or legal issues
Volker Greimann:+1 Rod
Stephanie Perrin:I have given up trying to explain how this would be interpreted under data protection law, so I am not going to intervene any more and slow this process down. Go for broke.
Rod Rasmussen:@My point on "public data set" is that it will be *different* depending on the nature and wishes of domain holders and their associated contacts. A private person may wish to take advantage of just having their minimum data published, whereas a company may want to have all kinds of data published in the publicly available data. So there is no "one size fits all" on what is available as data elements to anonymous public access as we were talking about when we were calling this "thin".
andrew sullivan:I think Lisa captures exactly what I was trying to do in proposing those bits of text. Please note that I don't feel super strongly about the particular words, but it was all just to give the concreteness that the DP experts who came to talk said we had to offer.
Lisa Phifer:@Rod, I get you but won't that come into play as we deliberate on additional data elements? (that is, we've agreed it doesn't apply to the data set discussed thus far)
Jim Galvin (Afilias):@rod - I would suggest we look to create credentials that can be used to assert access to different data sets. folks who want access to more than the "public data set" would need to

create an appropriate credential management system and then RDAP servers would only need to validate credentials and then provide the data.

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Vicky

Fabricio Vayra:no need to duplicate

Stephanie Perrin:The EWG report listed use cases. ARE you calling those purposes?

steve metalitz:@Rod isn't it up to this group to recommend what elements will ultimately be included in the "public data set," considering but not being controlled by "the nature and wishes of domain holders and their associated contacts."

Lisa Phifer:@Stephanie, I think the reference was to what appears in the "EWG Prupose" column which were "permissible purposes" in the EWG Report

Lisa Phifer:(not use cases)

Rod Rasmussen:@Jim - nope, not my point. As say Facebook, I don't want to limit access - I want the whole world to know everything about the domains I own (except maybe new cool trademark terms I've yet to release) and I don't want it gated at all. That will allow automated systems that already exist to properly score my domains for anti-spam and other reputation without me having to worry about it. In other words, I want more disclosure to unfettered access to provide me with better results for many of the purposes we've ben talking about here.

neil schwartzman:well that was fun. must run to a conflicting meeting to fight some abuse. TTFN, see you all in J-burg.

vicky sheckler:apologies - i need to leave early

Jim Galvin (Afilias):@rod - interesting use case - I have to think about that.

Rod Rasmussen:@Steve - precisely - I'm just saying that it isn't going to be the same set of elements for all domains, so let's not label a concrete set as "public data" to avoid confusion. "minimum public data" would probably work to cover this issue.

Stephanie Perrin:NO

tim obren:restate the approach please?

Stephanie Perrin:It really does not matter Chuck. I have explained this too many times.

Lisa Phifer:To summarize my sugestion: The poll would ask if you're in agreement with each table row, if not, what do you feel needs to be explored further - to inform next call deliberation

Ayden Férdeline:I think we are giving too much credence to the contents of the EWG report. It feels like it is being treated like gospel.

Lisa Phifer:@Ayden, this text is actually largely from Andrew Sullivan

Lisa Phifer:The second column is the EWG Report column

Lisa Phifer:But Andrew went further into rationale for each data element

andrew sullivan:And note, I made the text up on a plane. It can probably be improved :)

Kiran Malancharuvil:Regarding EWG report content, when used... there has to be something to start from. If you give a compelling reason to reject, then we can reject.

Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong:sorry i need to leave ;thanks

steve metalitz:@Rod, I see your point, "minimum public data set" might be better, but I dont think the shorter phrase is inconsistent with a specific DN registrant deciding to allow other elements outside the "public data set" to be accessible without authentication.

Rod Rasmussen:Just one more point to raise on the "public data set" being set in stone on particular elements issue before I shut up about it, is that some registries have unique data requirements that they collect and display today - some of those may need to be published in their unique registry RDS "public data set" that will differ for them vs. "regular" registries.

Lisa Phifer:slides 10+ do give a brief description of each listed EWG Purpose, but the table Chuck is referring to contains text proposed by Andrew Sullivan

Greg Shatan:Which data protection perspective are you referring to? The minimum legal requirements of a jurisdiction (and if so which one) or a data protection advocacy perspective?

Greg Shatan:That was @Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin:thanks, that helps

Lisa Phifer:Referring to tables on pages 3-7, from Andrew Sullivan's email in March: To summarize my suggestion: The poll would ask if you're in agreement with each table row, if not, what do you feel needs to be explored further - to inform next call deliberation

Ayden Férdeline:it sounded to me before that we were looking to accept the entire EWG report, not just the contents of this table

Stephanie Perrin:Exactly.

Lisa Phifer:For reference, the definitions given on pages 10+ for the EWG purposes will be included - but only for reference

Lisa Phifer:+1 Alan

Lisa Phifer:DO you agree with listed purposes? Do you agree with rationale for collection? Do you agree with rationale for publication?

Stephanie Perrin:Thanks to Alan for the clarification.

Tim Chen:sorry, bouncing bw two calls and not following as closely as I'd like to here today. obviously late but did want to +1 Rod's point on 'minimum' public data set and the Facebook example he sets out. More specifically, a company might launch a new service or marketing campaign and want its users (those that care to) to be able to verify that the domain is indeed owned by the company. and not some spammer. hence a preference for the whois data to be public.

andrew sullivan:gain's too high

Greg Shatan:Rod, back off the mic

Terri Agnew:@Rod, turn down the volume, this should help

Greg Aaron:So to address Rod's concern: it should be "minimum public data set" -- which means a list of fields that will always be public no matter the TLD

Greg Shatan:or roll off the gain...

tim obren:voice is cutting out for me

steve metalitz:minimum not minimal

Lisa Phifer:@Greg A - gTLD

andrew sullivan:minimum, minimal, or sparky the wonderdog -- I am not opposed to any of these

Greg Aaron:"minimum public data set" not "minimal"

Lisa Phifer:WG Agreement: "Minimum Public Data Set" to be used as a replacement term to what had previously been referred to as "thin data"

Lisa Phifer:Red X if you think we need to poll

Lisa Phifer:Green check if attending ICANN59 in person

Lisa Phifer:For those unable to attend in person, there will be remote participation by AC available

Fabricio Vayra:Thanks!!

Alex Deacon:thanks chuck!

Nathalie Coupet:Bye

andrew sullivan:bye

Terri Agnew:The next GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group teleconference will take place on Wednesday, 21 June 2017 at 05:00 UTC for 90 minutes.

Patrick Lenihan:Thanks to Each and All!

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):bye all

Lisa Phifer:Hopefully we will spend at least part of our F2F starting Thick Data!

Daniel K. Nanghaka:The audio bridge was terrible

Chuck Gomes:Sorry Daniel.

