

AC Attendance - 37 Members

Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong	GZ Kabir	Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign)
Alan Greenberg (ALAC)	James Galvin (Afilias)	Silvan Gebhardt
Alex Deacon	Juan Manuel Rojas	Steve Metalitz
Andrew Sullivan	Kal Feher	Tapani Tarvainen
Avri Doria	Klaus Stoll	Tim Chen
Benjamin Akinmoyeje (Nigeria)	Krishna Seeburn - Kris	Tim OBrien
Benny Samuelson / Nordreg AB	Marc Anderson	Tomslin Samme-Nlar
Brian J Winterfeldt	Maxim Alzoba (FAITID)	
Chuck Gomes	Michael Haffely	
David Cake	Michael Hammer	
Dina Solveig Jalkanen	Michele Neylon	
Fabricio Vayra	Nathalie Coupet	
Greg Aaron	Otieno Antony	
Greg Shatan	Rod Rasmussen	
Griffin Barnett	Sara Bockey	

On Audio Only: Sara Marcolla, Michael Palage, Evan Smith

Apologies: Rubens Kuhl, Susan Kawaguchi, Bastiaan Goslings, Daniel Nanghaka, Sam Lanfranco, Marina Lewis, Farell Folly

Staff: Karen Mulberry, Lisa Phifer, Marika Konings, Dennis Chang, Fabien Betremieux, Herb Wayne Ombuds, Julie Bisland

AC Chat

Julie Bisland:Welcome to the GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group teleconference on Tuesday, 12 December 2017 at 17:00 UTC

Julie Bisland:Agenda wiki page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_MgByB&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=3977MVgAD6PMKPbNyQhkVZFb-46Gym0zKiGakXrHrzo&s=NdP4H1f5MQEPvaR8sCQDq04vo4t17A38RQWVXfyF4bk&e=

Krishna Seeburn - Kris:hi julie

Krishna Seeburn - Kris:hi Julie

Krishna Seeburn - Kris:i will be online for a few minutes and then may need to go

Julie Bisland:hello Kris!

Julie Bisland:ok, good to know. I'm not on audio yet, but will join shortly.

Krishna Seeburn - Kris:ok...

Krishna Seeburn - Kris:just letting you know....my granmother was burried yesterday...so we are just catching up slowly

Julie Bisland:oh no, Kris, I'm very sorry to hear this.

Krishna Seeburn - Kris:well thanks for the kind concern..we are holding...

Krishna Seeburn - Kris:but that does not stop the good work

Julie Bisland:my condolences to you and your family.

Krishna Seeburn - Kris:thank you...

Krishna Seeburn - Kris:every one has been kind she passed at 89 next year she would have been 90

Krishna Seeburn - Kris:but it is ok

Krishna Seeburn - Kris:we come and go....in this lifetime

Julie Bisland:I know, but still sad to lose someone we care about.

Krishna Seeburn - Kris:yes holding the fort

Krishna Seeburn - Kris:my mother and uncle are heart broken but we sticking together

Herb Wayne Ombuds:Greetings everyone... condolences Kris

Krishna Seeburn - Kris:thanks

Krishna Seeburn - Kris:thanks for the kind words

Krishna Seeburn - Kris:hi chuck...

Lisa Phifer:Call Handout: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_download_attachments_74580018_Handout-2D12Dec-2DRDSWGCAll.pdf&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QIF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=3977MVgAD6PMKPbNyQhkVZFb-46Gym0zKiGakXrHrzo&s=WHnpxCr_cniQYupfrtR4ZbeuBrbD62ZskJAOADxJq4k&e=

Michael Hammer:My condolences, Krishna.

Michael Haffely:No updates to SOI

Juan Manuel Rojas:Hi everyone

Lisa Phifer:Poll results are on slide 3

Lisa Phifer:Slide 4 gives Stephanie's comment and Option (b) which Chuck is now discussing

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Hello all

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Marika, I have minor update to SOI - moved UCTN CWG (dismissed) to past groups

Lisa Phifer:@Maxim, we will record that under SOI updates

Marika Konings:@Maxim - I presume you have also made that update to the SOI that is on the wiki?

Michael Haffely:We have that issue today.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Marika, I made the change

Marika Konings:thanks Maxim

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Alan. We have plenty of clients whose names are used to register and fraudulently use domains.

Fabricio Vayra:+1 Michele -- 100% correct

Michael Haffely:I like statement combined w/ option B, trying to build some semblance security into RDS from the beginning.

Michael Haffely:*of security

Lisa Phifer:@Michael: Possible alternative to incorporate comments into option (b): Information collected for the benefit of the registrant to create a new domain name registration, enable management of the registrant's own domain name registration, and ensure that the domain name records are under the control of the authorized party and no unauthorized changes or transfers are made in the record. This includes performing tasks that include creating the DN, updating information about the DN, transferring the DN, renewing the DN, deleting the DN, maintaining a DN portfolio, and detecting fraudulent use of a Registrant's own contact information.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):TM owners usually register for legal bodies and not for persons

Rod Rasmussen:Michele described why the EWG included this "control of your own contact info" - it may not fit precisely here, but was wedged in here as the best place without creating a separate category if I remember correctly.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):and company info is not a personal data (if there is no info of CEO or something like it)

Michael Haffely:Sometimes, I got scooped by someone in Sweden that claimed a trademark on "Internet" in sunrise of .email

Lisa Phifer:Susan is not on today's call but in the EWG she gave examples of registrations where Facebook's company name and address appeared in domain names they had not registered

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):but, actually it was a case in Russia, where some student from far away changed his name to OAO Gazprom (and even banking info was similar to the company name)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):a person can change his ID records of name and second name to some GreatCompany Ltd

Lisa Phifer:Chuck, that is option (b) as-is. Here is an alternative that combines the two...

Lisa Phifer:Information collected for the benefit of the registrant to create a new domain name registration, enable management of the registrant's own domain name registration, and ensure that the domain name records are under the control of the authorized party and no unauthorized changes or transfers are made in the record. This includes performing tasks that include creating the DN, updating information about the DN, transferring the DN, renewing the DN, deleting the DN, maintaining a DN portfolio, and detecting fraudulent use of a Registrant's own contact information.

Andrew Sullivan:The formulation on the slide doesn't use "registrant", so it doesn't have the problem I mentioned & that we discussed on list

Tim O'Brien:Hello all, apologies for the tardiness

Andrew Sullivan:also, I'm not sure why we need _new_ domain name registration. It seems to me it's any domain name registration -- if you switch all the contacts it's not a new registration but it's still a legit use.

James Galvin (Afilias):@andrew +1 - it should not be "new"

Marc Anderson:I don't feel strongly about these definitions but I think I prefer the poll definition: Information collected to create a new domain name registration, enabling management of the domain name registration, and ensuring that the domain registration records are under the control of the authorized party and that no unauthorized changes, transfers are made in the record.

Michael Haffely:GDPR is an issue, for sure

James Galvin (Afilias):@marc - +1

Lisa Phifer:@Marc, would you be ok with "changes or transfers" instead of "changes, transfers" - minor edit suggested by comment #2 in poll

Andrew Sullivan:What Rod is suggesting is a reason to separate the domain name and contact databases. This is technically possible, but it would be a big change and might create new privacy issues.

Krishna Seeburn - Kris:makes sense rod

Lisa Phifer:@GregS, are you asking for information collected for the beneficial interest of the registrant....

Lisa Phifer:Possible split: Domain Name Registration/Management vs. Domain Name Registration/Monitoring?

Rod Rasmussen:@Andrew - not necessarily separating databases, but creating independent contact data objects that can be modified independently of domain names themselves and associated via linkages (pointers). This is what the EWG proposed by creating "validators" for contacts and registrars then associating contacts to domains. Registrars could and would also be validators.

Lisa Phifer:Information collected for the benefit of the registrant to create a new domain name registration, enable management of the registrant's own domain name registration, and ensure that the domain name records are under the control of the authorized party and no unauthorized changes or transfers are made in the record. This includes performing tasks that include creating the DN, updating

information about the DN, transferring the DN, renewing the DN, deleting the DN, maintaining a DN portfolio, and detecting fraudulent use of a Registrant's own contact information.

Andrew Sullivan:@Rod: that exists today

Greg Shatan:Lisa - we could split DN Mgmt that way, though we would then need to flesh out monitoring a bit.

Andrew Sullivan:when you create a contact in an EPP registry it's completely independent

Lisa Phifer:There have been proposals to delete "new" to delete "for the benefit of the registrant"

Andrew Sullivan:many registrars don't like contacts not under their control because of their workflow, but in fact they're completely separate objects

Lisa Phifer:There has also been a proposal to split "detecting fraudulent use..." into a separate purpose

Lisa Phifer:To incorporate two of those edits into this alternative, here would be the result...

Lisa Phifer:Information collected to create a domain name registration, enable management of the registrant's own domain name registration, and ensure that the domain name records are under the control of the authorized party and no unauthorized changes or transfers are made in the record. This includes (but is not limited to) performing tasks that include creating the DN, updating information about the DN, transferring the DN, renewing the DN, deleting the DN, maintaining a DN portfolio, and detecting fraudulent use of a Registrant's own contact information.

Lisa Phifer:Green check is you like listing tasks in the definition

Lisa Phifer:IF

Lisa Phifer:Red X if you oppose listing example tasks in the definition

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):tasks might change over time and changing definitions each time does not look good

Rod Rasmussen:@Andrew - yep, precisely - already technically not a big problem, but is an operational change and definitely a mindshift change. The key win to me is that people can control their information directly independent of domain names, and a domain "record" then becomes a collection of the technical stuff like nameservers and status for a domain plus pointers to contact records. That can then solve a whole lot of these jurisdictional issues around contact data.

Andrew Sullivan:In general, I think policies that are too closely aligned to specific practices are bad, because inflexible

Lisa Phifer:Please clear red Xs and green checks

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):which page is it?

Lisa Phifer:Slide 4, under Option (b)

Lisa Phifer:Also appears on Slide 3 in poll results chart

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):thanx

Lisa Phifer:Proposed WG Agreement: Domain Name Management is a legitimate purpose for collecting some registration data, based on the extended definition: Information collected to create a domain name registration, enabling management of the domain name registration, and ensuring that the domain registration records are under the control of the authorized party and that no unauthorized changes or transfers are made in the record.

Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong:to create and to update

Lisa Phifer:The above formulation deletes "new" and replaces "changes,transfers" by "changes or transfers"

Lisa Phifer:The changes to option (b) are minor editorial updates, not substantive

Krishna Seeburn - Kris:don't think we take a poll...

Krishna Seeburn - Kris:thanks lisa it is just a minor change

Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong:I support option b)

Lisa Phifer:We are now on slide 5 - moving to agenda item 2c) data elements needed for DN Management

Krishna Seeburn - Kris:i will like to support marc
Andrew Sullivan:On list would be good. I'm travelling starting tomorrow and it'll be difficult for me to promise the time
Marc Anderson:thank you Kris
Andrew Sullivan:But if it's on list I can probably comment
Krishna Seeburn - Kris:i volunteer
Dina Solveig Jalkanen:I volunteer to help.
Krishna Seeburn - Kris:to support marc
Lisa Phifer:We will discuss on-list within the full WG rather than creating a new drafting team
Krishna Seeburn - Kris:ok no issues
Lisa Phifer:We are now on slide 6 - list of tasks that are part of DN Management as a purpose
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):slide 5: Original Registration Data is still borked ... I am not sure we have a clear definition and most probaly lots of old domains do not have this info avaiable
Michael Haffely:or is false
Michael Haffely:or out of date
Michele Neylon:technical contact most of the time is the registrant
Michele Neylon:and no - you don't
Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong:technical contact of registrant or registry?
Lisa Phifer:Specifically for this Task: Create registrant Id; create DN; add DNS data for DN -- what data is needed?
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):my point is : if the domain can be used, just registered - then Tech contact does not required
Lisa Phifer:Remember that we have already agreed to collect a Tech Contact for Technical Issue Resolution associated with DN resolution
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):*can not be used
Lisa Phifer:If there is an issue with DN resolution after the DN is registered, that falls under a different purpose
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):but if we add Name servers - then we need to add Tech contact
Lisa Phifer:@Marc, currently either Registrant Name or Registrant Organization must be supplied
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Have we sorted out Originaal Registration Date issues?
Krishna Seeburn - Kris:they could be just say --- abuse@something.com / or technical@something.com
Krishna Seeburn - Kris:they could just then make it an alias
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Krishna, issues started when it points to e-mail of the same domain they register
Michele Neylon:+1 James
Michele Neylon:So damn true
Michele Neylon:and ONCE
Michael Haffely:abuse@ security@ are suggested by RFC2142
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Registry collects such registrar abuse contacts offline or via SRS
Michael Haffely:so not needed for RDS
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):or as part of the info from RRA
Lisa Phifer:@Maxim, regarding your question: Have we sorted out Originaal Registration Date issues? WG Agreement 44. There is no requirement for the Original Registration Date as proposed by the EWG Final Report.
Michael Haffely:....:/
Michael Haffely:While not required as a Security person Orig Reg Date is useful to detect new domains being used for malicious purposes
Michele Neylon:.travel is another example

Tim Chen:+1 Michael

Tim Chen:creation date is used very often by security practitioners and in general a *very* recent reg date can be an indicator for technical issues

Tim Chen:i'm not clear why we are working so hard to remove it? i think somewhere someone tried to tie it to PII which seems like a real reach to me. is there another reason for leaving it out?

Lisa Phifer:@Michele, you need the Registrant ID?

steve metalitz:Mike P makes a good point--- some DNS cannot be registered without additional data elements

steve metalitz:@Michele can you create a gTLD domain name without a registrar?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Some TLDs have obligations before local governments (GEO TLDs), and according to some of those anonymous registrations are not available (for public security reasons, for example)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):*anonymous

Lisa Phifer:@Michele, it sounds that the data is needed (maybe not collected, but needed)

Michele Neylon:Lisa - needed for other purposes - yes

Greg Aaron:You are not "collecting" but you are certainly "associating". So it's basically collection.

Greg Aaron:The registry must know what registrar created the domain. It records that at the time of the domain creation. Or associates it.

Greg Aaron:Collect (transitive verb): "to bring together into one body or place"

Greg Aaron:Or, "to gather or exact from a number of persons or sources"

steve metalitz:"need not be collected" should be equivalent with "need not exist". By this standard, is it accurate to say registrar name "need not be collected" in order to register a domain name.?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Lisa, please add my minor note about need of Tech contact in case where Name Servers are collected

Alan Greenberg (ALAC):I need to leave now.

Lisa Phifer:@Maxim, please repeat the point you wish recorded in notes?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Lisa, in cases, where Name Servers info is collected (ip addresses), Technical info is required (whom we might ask a question if something is wrong with those IP addresses), and in case where the domain name is registered without addition of Name Servers, then Tech contacts might not be required

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):*wrong with those IP addresses

Lisa Phifer:@Maxim, I will add that however, it has been noted that this case falls under Tech Issue Resolution for DNS Resolution

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB:@Maxim I can't see anywhere that is required today...

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Lisa, without it we are creating element with potential to be non-resolvable due to lack of info from the very beginning of the domain registration

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):*non-resolvable issue root

Lisa Phifer:Chuck could you please repeat your question?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):thanks

Krishna Seeburn - Kris:it could

Krishna Seeburn - Kris:yes but not absolutely essential

Greg Shatan:@Maxim, If they "might not be required" that implies they are likely required sometimes, which means they are required (on the basis that something is "required" as long as it is sometimes required).

steve metalitz:Isn't admin contact necessary for 3?

Abdeljalil Bachar Bong:hi I need to leave ,bye

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Greg, I think you are right and "might not be required" should be "not required at that stage"

Krishna Seeburn - Kris:that could work as well
steve metalitz:Disagree with excluding registrar
Lisa Phifer:Are you asking if a DN registration can be created without being associated with a Registrar?
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):we need to differentiate between collected and stored (about Registrar name)
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):it needs to be stored, but does not need to be collected from Registrant
Lisa Phifer:Perhaps we are just asking what data is needed to create the DN registration (no matter where it is obtained from)
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):I think from perspective of personal data laws it is important from whom the info is collected
Krishna Seeburn - Kris:i would tend to agree with andrew as well
Greg Shatan:@Chuck, thanks - "collected" shouldn't be limited to registrant collection. Anything that is stored, has to be collected from somewhere, unless you believe in immaculate collection.
Nathalie Coupet:@Greg:haha
Michael Haffely:I have to drop
Krishna Seeburn - Kris:at this stage yes
Greg Shatan:Can you state the 4?
Lisa Phifer:Steve Metalitz asked that
steve metalitz:What are the 3 that we "decided" need not be collected??
James Galvin (Afilias):@steve - I would say no.
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):without Admin - how do we know who has right to manage?
steve metalitz:I don't think that was our agreement but will respond to poll.
James Galvin (Afilias):to expand - the right to manage is the registrant
James Galvin (Afilias):the registrant has administrative control
Greg Shatan:I don't agree.
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):ok
steve metalitz:Answered but don't agree.
James Galvin (Afilias):it is a potential delegation option - not a requirement
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):if we divide it into two parts - registration of the name , and release to DNS
steve metalitz:If that is the poll question Greg will anser no and so will I.
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Greg +1
Nathalie Coupet:a lot of echo now
Michele Neylon:I need to drop
Michele Neylon:see you all
Benny Samuelson / Nordreg AB:Of here too...
Nathalie Coupet:bye
Krishna Seeburn - Kris:ok thanks...lisa perhaps we should include "neutral"
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):bye all
Andrew Sullivan:bye
Herb Wayne Ombuds:bye all
Greg Shatan:Bye all!
Lisa Phifer:Reminder - next week's call is at the alternate time
Lisa Phifer:6.00 UTC
Krishna Seeburn - Kris:bye all