Julie Bisland:Welcome to the GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group call on Tuesday, 01 August 2017 at 16:00 UTC

Julie Bisland:Agenda wiki page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__community.icann.org_x_VWfwAw&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=8xiMwbkCTIQGq0CaG_mL_HI2_-63KJLT4JJm-6Ow-iI&s=PnFD4KhHpsuUAH7NTALPB72EQkQJk0nUWMIvNixknG8&e=

Volker Greimann:Update: I am also Member of RDS Review team

Andrew Sullivan:When I was made IAB Chair a friend of mine offered "congratudolances", which I thought was an excellent word.

Alan Greenberg:Indeed! I like that. Will need to file it away for future use.

Lisa Phifer:RDS-WHOIS2-RT membership: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__community.icann.org_display_WHO_Review-2BTeam-2BComposition&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=8xiMwbkCTIQGq0CaG_mL_HI2_-63KJLT4JJm-6Ow-iI&s=uSoEnOsBE5ztWCEZEu9zjSdzCg3iP6Qu5eUdHkaVs0I&e=

Michele Neylon:Andrew - that's a wonderful word

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):hello all, sorry for being bit late

Stephanie Perrin:apologies for being a couple of nnnutes late

Vicky Sheckler:apologies for being late . . . and having to leave .5 hr early today

Lisa Phifer:From RAA: The Registrant is the entity that has acquired the right to use the Internet resource. A Domain Name Registrant is the person ororganization who has registered the domain name, also referred to as a Registered Name Holder.

Stephanie Perrin:I do think it matters legally what your arrangement is with the entity who is the registered name holder

Michele Neylon:Marc's correct

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):We might exect large amount of trusties also(persons whom registrants trust to register on their behalf), as a part of efforts round GDPR issues

Michele Neylon:in a privacy registration the registrant name is listed in the whois output

Alan Greenberg:Yes, correct. Privacy reveal the name and but not the contact info.

Michele Neylon:or can be

Lisa Phifer:@Marc is correct, the proxy is the registant but in a privacy registration, the registrant is not the privacy provider

Alan Greenberg:However, are there actually any privacy providers? Lat time I looked I could not find one.

Stephanie Perrin:Do we know much about lawyers who act for clients? My thought was no...

Michele Neylon:Stephanie - there's no way to know

Alan Greenberg:We know they exist...

Stephanie Perrin:Exactly, we are not privy tt the contract

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Stephanie, in case where it is not the only service (registrsation of domains), we will not see them as privacy proxy , I think

Michele Neylon:and they don't identify themselves as lawyers acting for anyone in the registration

Michele Neylon:TBH we also have designers / developers / IT service companies registering domains for people - we've no way of knowing

Alan Greenberg:At one point, the case was made that a lawyer acting in this way MUST register as a Proxy provider, but that is clearly not practical or going to happen.

Michele Neylon:Alan - there's no way to police it

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):currently it is possible to use email+1contact@gmail.com and email+2contact@gmail.com when really it is only one

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Michele

Alex Deacon:Agree Michele

Vicky Sheckler:re email address, if the email provider goes down, can't the registrant update his / her information w/ an updated email address?

Greg Shatan:This is why we need email AND phone AND physical address.

Michele Neylon:Vicky - depends on whether they can login to change it - they can end up in a catch 22 / circle of hell

Michele Neylon:ie. login is tied to the email that isn't working + the reset stuff goes to the dead email

Andrew Sullivan:I think it is entirely reasonable to suggest that you can't have a domain name if you don't have an email address

Lisa Phifer:"At minimum" is not "At most" - option a) states that email address to reach the Registrant is mandatory to collect and include in the RDS

Lisa Phifer:option b) states that one or more email address(es) to reach contact(s) serving in certain roles is mandatory to collect and include in the RDS

Vicky Sheckler:+1 andrew

Marc Anderson:+1 Rod - that addresses my hesitation

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Andrew. Wea re talking about an audience who is opting for a domain name registration -- the very basis for email addresses.

Tapani Tarvainen:A registrar or domain reseller could offer contact email management as a service (which they'd presumably relay to the actual registrant somehow).

Lisa Phifer:a) and b) are really different requirements

Rod Rasmussen:@Tapani - yep, that's thinking outside the current registration paradigm "box"

Roger Carney:+1 Michele

Andrew Sullivan:It seems to me that someone who doesn't have an email address is pretty unlikely to need a domain name. Perhaps such registrations ought to be discouraged!

Michele Neylon:Andrew - I'd disagree strongly - sorry :)

neil schwartzman:"I think it is entirely reasonable to suggest that you can't have a domain name if you don't have an email address" +1

Lisa Phifer:@Alan, the need for alternatives is covered by poll question 30

neil schwartzman:why infantize domain registrants. do they have credit cards? bank accounts?

Andrew Sullivan:I think it would be a bad idea to disallow in-bailiwick email addresses

Andrew Sullivan:People used to try to do this for nameservers, and we discovered that what people did was make circular references

Alex Deacon:agree with andrew and it is yet another reason why we need multiplc contact mathods (email AND phone AND physical address.)

Andrew Sullivan:My MX record for anvilwalrusden.com and crankycanuck.ca is mx4.yitter.info

Andrew Sullivan:but of course, yitter.info and anvilwalrusden.com and crankycanuck.ca are all on the same machine

Andrew Sullivan:so this policy would actually provide no protection but would be another barrier.

Michele Neylon:Andrew - years ago we had two nameservers running on the same physical server :)

Lisa Phifer:Note that alternative contacts are covered in the next poll question, so any new concept should dovetail with that (if agreed)

Lisa Phifer:Anyone opposed to b) please raise hand and explain why

Andrew Sullivan:A TLD of my acquaintance had out-of-baliwick name servers "for safety". Unfortunately, the name servers for the out-of-bailiwick name was beneath the TLD :)

Michele Neylon:haha

Vicky Sheckler:i am ok w/ B

Andrew Sullivan:when the Bad Day happened, it was a lot more work to figure out what was wrong.

Andrew Sullivan:I'm ok with B

Michele Neylon:well the TLDs that use their own TLD for their own DNS are kind of asking for trouble

Kris Seeburn:i'm also ok with B

Michele Neylon:the DNS swapping that some of the ccTLDs do makes a lot more sense to me

Andrew Sullivan:@Michele: I disagree, actually. That glue is all over the place for any TLD that is in widespread use. But it does no harm, either

Michele Neylon:Andrew - one of these days we'll agree on something :)

Lisa Phifer:(Revised) WG Agreement #29: At a minimum, one or more e-mail addresses must be collected for every domain name included in the RDS, for contact roles that require an e-mail address for contactability

Volker Greimann:the registrar may need it and collect it, but why would it need to be included in the rds?

tim obrine:hello all, appologies for the tardyness - flight from Vegas was late, and conflicting call :/

Andrew Sullivan:@Volker: I am trying to understand what the RDS is that is not what registrars collect. But the need is because, if your domain is spewing stuff onto the Internet and I need to reach you, I'm probably not going to be able to use the Internet to do it.

Michele Neylon:Volker - exactly

Lisa Phifer:GregS: In addition to email address, data enabling two alternative methods of contact must be collected and included in the RDS.

Lisa Phifer:Question: Does a requirement for one preclude two?

Lisa Phifer:DONE, see GregS above

Greg Shatan:This is hardly "every possible risk," Also, you can't publish data you don't collect.....

Alex Deacon:Greg A. comment is important IMO - existing policy requires email and two other required contact methods (postal address and phone #)   I don't see any reason to change that policy..

Vicky Sheckler:disagree w/ stephanie. see comments in poll for rationale for having multiple forms of contact

Michele Neylon:I'll slip Stephanie a fiver later for all those nice comments :)

Herb Waye Ombuds:Folks, I must drop out for another commitment. Wishing you all a productive meeting. See you next time.

Michael Hammer:That still doesn't address the issue of fake information provided.

Lisa Phifer:@Alex, could you provide rationale for why those other contat methods are required? So that we can move beyond "it's that way now" to "it needs to be that way because..."

tim obrine:disagree w/ stephanie

Vicky Sheckler:disagree again - there is a need for information to be accessible to others outside of the registrar. that is part of ther eason for having the RDS in teh first place.

Stephanie Perrin:I am certainly not arguing with the riskiness of reliance on email

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):spam filters sometimes fail even for working e-mail

Alex Deacon:@lisa - basically to ensure chances of contactability are high.

Greg Shatan:I was going to suggest 13 alternative methods of contact, but I decided not to try and address every possible risk.

tim obrine:There, name fixed

Lisa Phifer:@Alex, can you differentiate between a need for 2 alternatives (of any kind) versus the two alternatives you listed? Which should be required and why?

jonathan matkowsky:I am also mystified by how a distributed database would be guarded by the RDS

tim obrine:or not :/

jonathan matkowsky:Guarded by the registrars, and not in the RDS is what I mean

Otieno Antony:@FAITID That depends with how it has been developed

Stephanie Perrin:Lots of   stuff in the RAA not included in the RAA

Stephanie Perrin:RDS that is

Lisa Phifer:Scope of RAA is not simply RDDS reuqirements - RDDS requirements are a subset of the RAA requirements today

Andrew Sullivan:Since we're talking not just about the stuff that is exposed but also the stuff that is collected, we extended the traditional meaning of "RDS", IMO

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):what ID's, scans of the passports e.t.c. has to do with RDS?

Andrew Sullivan:Apparently I am being hobbled by my history with database design :-/

jonathan matkowsky:Registrars have to disclose all contact information to the Dispute Resolution Providers, and that correspondence is provided to the Complainant anyway, so it should be publicly available to begin with as it needs to be verified in a UDRP, for example,

Andrew Sullivan:Anyway, I think this is my problem and not one for anyone else, so I'll shut up and stop distracting us

Lisa Phifer:Recall a year or so ago when we discussed SAC054, Report on Domain Name Registration Data Model (June 2012) and noted some data is collected that is beyond the scope of RDS data

Fabricio Vayra:@Michele - What types of info?

Lisa Phifer:https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-054-en.pdf

Michele Neylon:Fabricio - IP addresses for every login

Michele Neylon:usernames

Michele Neylon:full list of other services

Michele Neylon:payment methods

Michele Neylon:failed payments

Michele Neylon:a lot of things

Greg Shatan:Lisa did!

Lisa Phifer:Yes, the alternative is in chat and notes

Greg Shatan:Thank you, Lisa.

Otieno Antony:Should we have local/national internet registries that aim at ensuring clean databases of domain names and their entities?

Andrew Sullivan:Note that I was _not_ suggesting "the RDS" should have everything in it. But we got here because people were talking about contact info that registrars were to be required to collect, but that "wasn't in the RDS". I don't understand what that means.

Lisa Phifer:Suggest staff recirculate slides developed for our first F2F meeting based on SAC054 which illustrated the universe of data and the difference between that and WHOIS (RDS) today

Stephanie Perrin:Good idea Lisa

Andrew Sullivan:I know what SAC054 says & the distinction it makes

Andrew Sullivan:Nothing wrong with recirculating them, but it's able to make that distinction because of how WHOIS works.

Lisa Phifer:@Andrew, I know you do but we need to all get on the same page w/r/t scope

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):collected items should be justified by a reason

Alan Greenberg:@Andrew, sorry for expanding on what you were saying, but as an example, there are domains under my Registrar account that do not have me as the registrant. So in the correct circumstances, the regisrar can contact me or provide my contact info. But I am still not the registrant of record or in any way associated with the current WHOIS.

Andrew Sullivan:We have been debating whether some of the data that is collected now ought to be collected at all, and we've been talking about that as "collected in the RDS".

jonathan matkowsky:There is no one law governing data protection and varying views and even principles and philosophies of privacy.

Andrew Sullivan:It now sounds like there's some other database we have in mind that, taken together, is a superset of the RDS -- that is, the RDS is a proper subset of the distributed database that is all registration information

Andrew Sullivan:Keep in mind that "in the RDS" does not necessarily mean "under ICANN's control". This is a distributed database

Stephanie Perrin:What a registrar lcollects that is not in the RDS is under the Registrars sole controllership. I think the DPAs were sayingthat the data they collect for ICANN is under joint control.

Lisa Phifer:@Andrew, I know that wasn't the intent of at least the EWG, which had a principle to explicitly state data may be collected by registrars that is never shared with the RDS

Michael Hammer:In that case Tim, drop route. Have them added to RBLs.

jonathan matkowsky:Good point, Tim

Stephanie Perrin:Andrew, if ICANN compels it to be collected they are the controller of the data in DP terms....

tim obrine:that helps my org, but what of everyone else?

Michael Hammer:RBLs

Stephanie Perrin:I realize they do ntt have custody,

tim obrine:and that is only internal clients - what of those that are remote/on the road?

Lisa Phifer:suggest we re-poll on Q6 to separate concepts embodied: should alternative(s) be required, if so how many, what type, and why

Andrew Sullivan:@Stephanie: the point is that they won't necessarily have the data in their hands

Stephanie Perrin:Just to get this on the record as a reminder, we need to clarify that the data currently collected, disclosed, and escrowed as provided by the RAA may be surplus to what is permissible under the GDPR

Michael Hammer:"surplus to what is permissible"?

Vicky Sheckler:apologies but i need to drop off

Stephanie Perrin:too much being collected, disclosed and escrowed.

Sam Lanfranco:Ditto re: "apologies" - have to tend the fields - bye to all

Lisa Phifer:Note: we will keep "sync" on as Rod speaks to these slides, but you can download them from the wiki:

jonathan matkowsky:Let's leave that to the GDPR legal experts

Lisa Phifer:https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/66086741/PBC-Overview-1August.pdf

jonathan matkowsky:And GDPR is not the only law out there. Lots of others equally relevant.

Andrew Sullivan:In EPP, these contacts all have a ROID

Andrew Sullivan:So you can use that as the key

Andrew Sullivan:since ROIDs are unique, generated by the repository ('registry') using a base assigned by IANA, so they're globally unique identfiers

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Contact data better to mark " was validated"

Volker Greimann:I have no issue with the voluntary provision of these additional funcitional contacts, but I do object to any requirement to do so.

Kris Seeburn:some regitrars still do that with the nic-hdl

Andrew Sullivan:@Volker: in TLDs you have to have these contacts today

Andrew Sullivan:they don't have to be reusable, unfortunately, and they're not allowed to be inter-registry

Alex Deacon:does EPP and RDAP use the same structure for contacts?   (I believe RDAP uses vCard - no?)

Andrew Sullivan:The way the data appears is not the same, but that's the publication format

Andrew Sullivan:the data underneath it is the same

Volker Greimann:@Andrew: Legal contact, abuse contact? Where are thosetoday?

Andrew Sullivan:Oh, those two are new, yes

Andrew Sullivan:they're actually just new distinctions, of course.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):requireing Legal Contact from not so rich person is not realistic

Lisa Phifer:Abuse is not new, although it is done differently today that Admin/Tech, Abuse email and phone are in RAA now

Michael Hammer:LEgal contact doesn't necessarily mean "lawyer".

Volker Greimann:@Rod: I am worried about the Registrant ID field. That being public would allow anyone to figure out the complete set of domains owned by a registrant. And that may allow cross-referencing detective work

Kris Seeburn:Yes they are new.... but the issue is if you are a one man show.... it can be intteresting as to who would handle them

Kris Seeburn:but abuse is not new...i agree

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):most probably we will have lots of people adding local police dept there

Michael Hammer:@Volker, that is exactly what we do with abuse investigations.

Chuck Gomes:@ Volker: Please raise your question in the Q&A.

Alex Deacon:@rod - audio is fine. no noise on my end.

Volker Greimann:So if I owned dumptrump.com but still want to travel to the US in the near future without harrassment by border control and also greimann.org, those would share the same ID and therefore expose my ownership of the former

Volker Greimann:@Chuck: I have to leave early, so I wanted to put my concerns here to have them on the record...

Volker Greimann:I will listen to the answers in the recording later

Stephanie Perrin:I think Volker is raising a really good point.

Michael Hammer:@Volker, I'm sure you know how to register them differently.

Andrew Sullivan:It is part of the reason that people sometimes didn't use the handles

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Volker, you will need to use different Registrars to keep them with different IDs

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Simple, but important question - Who is goign to issue unique Registrant IDs?

Lisa Phifer:@Maxim, hold that question - Rod will answer

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):ok

Kris Seeburn:then we must have a field that defines indivudual, individual org and so on

Kris Seeburn:if you are small one...then you refill each filed all along...

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):this Idea is equal to creation to a registry of natural persons IDs

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):this idea will not pass GAC

Michael Hammer:Of course nobody will assume another persons identity...

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Which jurisdiction will trust the creation of a large directory of it's citizens to ICANN?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):the only way to establish identity is an ID or a passport, so the directory should have scans of them, and it is way over the top of what we do in DNS

Michael Hammer:@Maxim, you don't trust me when I say I am me?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):no, it might be not you :)

Michael Hammer:It really is, trust me.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):it is just pixels and sound

Fabricio Vayra:Thanks, Rod! Great recap!!

Alex Deacon:@ maxim - no one has suggested a passport would be required.

Lisa Phifer:Sync is now off, you can scroll to any slide you had questions about

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):than how do we identofy persons to be same registrant ID?

Lisa Phifer:Copying for Rod to answer: Volker Greimann: @Rod: I am worried about the Registrant ID field. That being public would allow anyone to figure out the complete set of domains owned by a registrant. And that may allow cross-referencing detective work

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):ROID = Repository Identifier as specified in EPP

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):Repository Object IDentifier to be specific

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):and if we do not identify Registrants, then value is minimal, so using ROIDs of Registry is more or less simple for this reason(and Registrars with Registrars, P&P have the full info, also it is in Escrow)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):and another concern is how good ICANN at keeping secrets? Historical records are not good for the latter

Andrew Sullivan:EV certificates have worked so well! Let's do it again ;-)

tim obrine:lol@ Andrew

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):at least one of the big companies could help with that

Andrew Sullivan:@Maxim: I think the idea is that you could do this cross-registry, though. That would be pretty convenient

Amr Elsadr:Volker Greimann: @Rod: I am worried about the Registrant ID field. That being public would allow anyone to figure out the complete set of domains owned by a registrant. And that may allow cross-referencing detective work

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Andrew, We will not trust another registry to held correct information until we have a contract with them

tim obrine:Which is something we need to have - to detect the full spread of malicious actors web sites

Andrew Sullivan:@Maxim: yeah, that's why I think this is a non-starter

Andrew Sullivan:but that's the underlying idea

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@tim you see only lazy ones this way

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):@Andrew @Maxim: The old Internic service could be used for something like this (again). it's in ICANN's possession...

Lisa Phifer:@Michael, IDs are used in gated access to query additional data, when you have permission to do so

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):...and registries and registrars already have contracts with ICANN...

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Scott, As I saw - usually ICANN hires some company to do everything from the scratch

Michael Hammer:Ouch!

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Scott, our contracts do not require blind trust to third parties

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):I'm not suggesting involvement of a third party

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):a registry/registrar to whom we do not have a contract - is a third party

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):I'm talking about ICANN and contracted parties - no other third parties

Alex Deacon:I don't see the concern as there is no requirement to re-use ID. you can always create a new one.

Andrew Sullivan:@Scott: so you're suggesting a single repository of contact information, and then separate registries for different domains, all referring to the central contact database?]

jonathan matkowsky:For compromised sites, would you reach out to the technical, admin and abuse contact? Maybe we should add a Security contact (thinking of this from the registrant's perspective)

Lisa Phifer:Note there are ways to map tokens to the same underlying contact - there are many ways to do this, if you have the concept of managing contacts, separately from managing registrations that use them.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):from ICANN's perspective yes, from a Registry/Registrar perspective - no, due to lack of agreements

Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign):@Andrew: yes, could be

Michele Neylon:Jonathan - the operational point of contact was floated in the past

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@jonathan , Security usually CC in all Aabuse contacts

Michele Neylon:Though I wish some infosec people would learn to use our abuse-c and not some $random email address

Lisa Phifer:Yes Rod

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):bye all, it was a good call

Nathalie Coupet:bye all

jonathan matkowsky:Great presentation, and call

jonathan matkowsky:I like the idea of a "Disputes" contact more so than a "legal" contact per se

tim obrine:+jonathan

Julie Bisland:The next GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group teleconference will take place on Tuesday, 08 August 2017 at 16:00 UTC for 90 minutes.

tim obrine:bye all

Andrew Sullivan:thanks, bye all

Kris Seeburn:bye