

**ICANN
Transcription
Next-Gen RDS PDP Working group call
Wednesday 17 August 2016 at 05:00 UTC.**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-nextgen-rds-17aug16-en.mp3>

Attendance is located on the wiki agenda page: <https://community.icann.org/x/ZgisAw>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Coordinator: Excuse me. The recording has started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much Veronica. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the Next-Gen RDS PDP Working group call on August 17, 2016. In the interest of time today there will be no rollcall taken although there are quite a few participants. We'll be taking attendance to (unintelligible). If you are the audio today please let yourself be known now by speaking into the phone and announcing your name.

Jeff Moss: Jeff Moss with Symantec.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you Jeffrey. Anyone else? Thank you. As a reminder also to the participants please state your name before speaking for description purposes. Also please keep your phone and microphone on mute and not speaking to avoid any background noise. And with this I'll hand it over to Chuck. Thank you, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much Nathalie. Much appreciate it. Welcome everyone to this call today or tonight or whatever time it is for you. I see a lot of people in Adobe that have very undesirable time. Thanks to all of you for joining in the middle of the night. I appreciate that. I hope we have a few people on the call that are benefiting from the alternate time today. I know some of our regulars aren't on right at the moment from the Asia-Pacific area.

You can see the agenda on the upper right there in Adobe. We've already done the rollcall so I will open it up and ask if there are any statements of interest updates. Please let us know if you have a statement of interest update.

Okay, not seeing anyone. Before we go to Agenda Item Number 2 if anyone has any comments or question on the agenda, feel free to communicate those now.

Okay. Let's jump right in to the agenda. And let me -- in Item 2 --a review of the draft problem statement that has been distributed. And again I want to thank all the members of the little working group that developed that statement. If we can bring that up into Adobe, that would be great.

And Alex has volunteered to go over that with us. And I think it's sure enough I'm not that anybody can read. But Alex I'll let it be your call whether you want to read through the whole thing or discuss it. It's short enough but its okay if you would like to read and then comment on it. You're up Alex. Make sure you're off mute.

Alex Gakuru: Hi Chuck. Can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Alex Gakuru: Okay, great. So I won't read this. This is Alex speaking for the record. I want to read this. I will say that it took a little bit of time for the time to get on the same pitch. To get a common understanding of what we needed to write. And we ended up with what you see on the Adobe connect before you. I'm about to summarize what we ended up and once I'm done I'm happy to take any questions.

In the first paragraph we described will that we were tasked with the RDS working group is really tasked with those fighting the policy which is associated with the RDS and meet the needs of existing and ever evolving Internet. And we agree that really the core problem that needs to be solved is really resolving the tension among the varied and competing views of the stakeholders within ICANN.

While accounting for rules and regulations and laws that vary widely from region to region this is the core problem that we've been tackling and I assume we'll be tackling moving forward.

The second paragraph really describes how we are. All the stakeholders have a vested interest in the RDS system which contained accurate complete registration data and which is secured performance resilient accessible and audible.

And in this paragraph goes on to say how there are artistic requirements around data. What data should be collected? When it can be viewed? We talked about the desire for anonymity and privacy. And sometimes these are at odds amongst the stakeholders.

And then finally we basically end up saying that in order to support each stakeholder, each constituency within the future RDS fairly and problematically, we are required to review the purposes of the DNS and the purpose of the RDS which supports it. And understanding that will enable us to ensure the policies that we come up. An able and affect the RDS and to

find a secure a safe environment for commerce and communications which is really the basis of the Internet if you will as a whole.

So that's where we ended up. I think – well I know the members of the team and the subgroup were happy with that which is why we felt it was time finally to send it to the full working group. So I'll stop there and I will open up for questions if there are any.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. Thank you very much Alex for the good introduction to this. And let me first ask if there is anybody else who was on the small working group who would comment on this? Please raise your hand. Or if you are not in Adobe speak up. Okay. Not seeing anyone or hearing anyone. Let's go ahead and open it up for discussion by the full working group. Anybody on the call? Comments? Questions? Jim, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: Thank you this is Jim gallon for the transcript. I do have to three questions but if I see another hand up I'll pause and move to the end of the line here so that others can speak. So my first question here is do I understand correctly in reading this text that anonymous users are not actually a stakeholder? It seemed to suggest that they are not.

Chuck Gomes: Alex, this is Chuck. Would you like to respond or anybody else in the small group.

Alex Gakuru: Yeah, this is Alex. Yeah, I don't believe the intent was to leave them out or to exclude them. So there could be updates adjusted or made to address that point.

Jim Galvin: Okay. I want wordsmith here. It's just good to know there was no intention to exclude them. Another clarifying question. In the last paragraph there is a phrase that requires us to review the purposes. I assume us is the working group? But since what does he talk about stakeholders and constituencies

and such I just wanted to be clear about that and wondered if we could update that if I got that right.

Alex Gakuru: Yeah, again this is Alex. It's if it's unclear which "us" we're talking about that we can fix it. The "us" here is the working group itself. Because this is a problem that we've defined and we've been tasked to address. So again we can fix that also.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Thank you. I'm wondering why the purpose of the DNS became important in this. Could you expand on that a bit?

Alex Gakuru: Hi this is Alex. I'm not too sure I could expand on that. I do see why you would raise that as a question or ask us to end on it. It would seem to me that the RDS is an important part of the domain name system. Understanding the purpose of both the DNS helps us understand the purpose of RDS. But again, I think if there's confusion or disagreement there personally I'd be happy to hear updates or suggestions on how to clarify that. And I can't speak for the rest of the team but yeah, if that needs to be clarified that would be something else we could do.

Jim Galvin: So I'll just briefly state and look for discussions from others. It surprised me to see that in there. It's not at all obvious to me why that needs to be a part of this. I mean I do appreciate that to the extent that the domain name is considered an element of registration data and thus part of the RDS. That it feeds the DNS. But it's not clear to me why that the purpose of the DNS is an important part of drawing that domain name out of the registration data system. And with that I'll just pause and hear what others have to say. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. Thanks Jim and thanks Alex. And we'll come around to the suggested three items before we're done with this. But let me turn it to Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I also had a concern with the reference to the purpose of the DNS. The DNS is a far more constrained with respect to what we're talking about. The DNS is far more constrained and we've already seen a number of examples where people seem to be confusing the two and saying if something is not needed in the DNS it's not needed in the RDS. So make the reference to the DNS here. I think obfuscates things and will make our job harder not easier. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Alan. This is Chuck again. Andrew I guess you dropped your hand so I assumed your point was made. Hopefully you haven't had to drop off or fall asleep already. But certainly if you have something to say you're welcome to say it. So go ahead Alex.

Alex Gakuru: You know I would be fine addressing people's concerns would be simply to remove that purpose of the domain name system. And I think that would be an easy fix and I would be okay with it.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. Is there anyone who would object to removing the purposes of the domain name system "and." Not hearing or seeing anybody if staff could create a redline of the changes. It doesn't have to be shown right now. If you can show it right now that would be fantastic. But if that's possible good. If not; we could live with it. But after the meeting it would be good if we could have or maybe even later in the evening if the redline can be distributed that would could be fantastic. Andrew, go ahead.

(Andrew): Thank you. I guess this is sort of a metapoint. But how constraining on what we're doing is this problem statement? That is I am worried that that this becomes a reference document by which future disagreements are adjudicated. And if that's the case then this becomes a super important statement to get perfect. And if it's really instead just a sort of aspirational guidepost for us. And when we run into something that doesn't conform to this then we can say oh, okay. Yeah, yeah. I get it. The problem statement isn't perfect. Then we don't have to get it exactly right.

And there are two ways to run. There are two ways to run this kind of working group, or any kind of working group. And that is to cleave strictly to a problem statement that it develops in which case the statement is super important to get it exactly right. Or we could just have like this is aspirational thing and it's roughly what we think we're talking about but it doesn't become a club by which we can be people who need objections. And I'm not sure which way it's going to go. And maybe that's my uncertainty. The reason why you see my hand go up a couple of times is because I'm not sure that is what is the force of this problem statement is going to be. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Andrew. This is Chuck. And I'm really glad you did ask that question because it's a great question. And let me say that we are constrained by the charter because the charter has been approved by the GNSO counsel. And the Council of course represents the broader GNSO participants in the GNSO. So we are constrained about the charter but we are not constrained by this problem statement.

Now the purpose of doing this problem statement really came about in our face to face meeting in Helsinki when quite a few people thought it would be helpful for the working group to formulate a problem statement. In my own opinion and I certainly welcome disagreement on what I'm going to say. But on my own opinion this is the latter of what you said Andrew. In other words this is an aspirational statement in fulfilling our charter. So I think this problem statement needs to be consistent with the charter; at least not inconsistent. But it's not something we're bound to like we are the charter.

Now the charter, and you'll hear me say this many times. Charters can be changed but to do that we have to go through a process and go back to the GNSO Council to give charter changes. So hopefully that answers your question. Certainly if somebody disagrees with my assessment they're welcome to do so. Rod you're up.

Rod Rasmussen: Yeah, I was going to agree with you there they are Chuck. To your meanings for this problem statement is more of a clarification and the tools for people to use and understand what we're trying to do rather than as a set in stone we have to make, hit this mark. And I have the same concerns Andrew does about people beating others over the head with the problem statement if we don't clarify that.

So I would propose that we might add some text either to the problem statement or somewhere that would say this problem statement, as a working tool, an aspirational goal, or whatever verbiage you want to come up with. But make it clear that it is not the "be all, end all" of what we're trying to do it with the charter and the guide. Thanks. Good job for asking (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Rod. Chuck again. And Marina had pretty good language in the chat which she referred to. I think a little bit just now. And so we can add that as an add on sentence before we start doing any editing. Let me go to Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. This is going to be a "me too" statement but I'll give a reason why. I participated in a good number of other groups where we developed things that might be called principles. Sometimes they went by other names. They were developed somewhat informally. But then a month later when someone said something that would be ruled out of order essentially because it violated one of the principles. And they become cast in concrete with gold plating. And I think the words you gave to answer Andrew have to be engraved in stone and put on the plaque over at the door or something like that to remind us that we can't use something that was developed somewhat informally as part of the process to suddenly be the golden rule that we have to adhere to. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Alan. Chuck again. So working backwards and I'll ask the staff to help me here. I'm thinking that maybe a paragraph at the end; although it wouldn't have to be at the end. It would have to be at the beginning along the lines of

what Rod suggested and what Marina wrote in the chat. If staff could capture that as part of the redlined document that would be good.

Going back then to some of the concerns that were raised by Jim and others. There didn't seem to be any objection to deleting the purposes of the domain system "and". I threw the "and" in there 'cause that would we need to be deleted as well. So that could be a red line. And then it's an easy edit if no one objects to that last paragraph, first sentence to the last paragraph to replace "us" with "the working group". So that will remove any possible ambiguity that's related to what I think is a simple edit to make.

So Jim, I would like you, and you can do this while we're talking what do it in chat if you'd like or if you prefer to do it after. It would be nice if we could do during the call just to ensure that there is no objections on the call itself. But if you can come up with some suggested rewording or editing for the first concern you raised that would be very much appreciated.

Now you heard me say that I think this has to be consistent with our charter. And I noted just one area where I thought it was a simple edit needs to be made and it's in the very first sentence. And because it's not up on the screen right now I'll read the first sentence. It says the next generation registration directory service to the PTP workgroup has been tasked with defining the policies associated with an improved RDS that will meet the needs of the existing and ever evolving global Internet.

I would suggest the following edit there which I think makes it consistent with our charter. So after "has been tasked with" right on the first line on the screen there I would add "determining whether a new RDS is needed and, if so, defining the policies, etc." So if you go back to our charter you'll recall one of the first big decisions we have to make and will grapple with that after dealing with the first five questions is whether or not a new RDS is needed.

Now I'm sorry – you'll heard me say the lot and you'll hear me say it again. I understand fully and am one of those two that probably already believes I know the answer to that question. But still that's the way our charter is worded and I think it would be helpful to add that to the first sentence. Andrew, go ahead.

(Andrew): While I would agree that would be great to put that in the first sentence, as a friendly amendment I would like to move it to the end of the sentence so that we do all of the analysis as a primary goal and then evaluate with a new RDS is needed thereby setting up the requirements for determining the need and then saying "and who is such" rather than making the determination first. It's mostly a style thing though so I don't feel strongly about it.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Andrew. This is Chuck. And I don't have any problem with your suggestions at all. But I think the sentence would read as it is and then we'd modify my edit just a little bit and say "if it is determined" or "if the working group determines that a new RDS is needed." I think that is what you're saying. Is that correct?

(Andrew Coombs or Andrew Mack): Yes, exactly. We serve that as a throwaway on exactly the principles that you are suggesting. Like once you've set up the actual requirements then it becomes the, to be honest, the conclusion. I admit that I've got a bias here. That it becomes a fore grown conclusion that you actually need a new thing because the existing one doesn't - but I'd rather not sort of frontloaded that so that people can't later claim, oh well, you didn't do this like this complete decision tree about which technology is required before you decided what things were supposed to appear in that. I'd rather than all of the discussions about what we need from the system. The primary and then the how you deliver that to be secondary because I think the secondary step becomes sort of self-evident once we evaluate what we're doing. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Heather. Chuck again. Let's go to Lisa and they we'll go to Stephanie.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks Chuck. This is Lisa Phifer for the record. So just a subtlety I guess. Our charter actually does require since they want to establish the requirements for an RDS and whether a new system is needed to fulfill those requirements. But we don't actually define policies unless a decision is taken that the new RDS is needed. So it is not probably accurate or consistent with the charter to say that redefine the policies first and then decide if a new system is needed.

Chuck Gomes: So this is Chuck. And Andrew said that he hardnosed about this. This is his term, about the change. But I'm not necessarily sure that if we put the "if" at the end it means that we do the other first. I think the condition is a condition whether it's in the middle or at the end. But again I'll go with the majority feeling on this. I do think we need to have that qualification in there somewhere. So let's hear what Stephanie has to say and then we can decide that.

Stephanie Perrin: Oh, thanks Chuck. Stephanie here, and for the record. I hope you can hear me.

Chuck Gomes: We can.

Stephanie Perrin: I just want to express my worry and I don't have words to fix it about the expansiveness of that. Or perhaps I should say optimist of that statement that says we have to do define the policies associated with an improved RDS. That will meet the need of the existing and ever evolving global Internet given the number of fairly and intractable problems on the existing evolving global Internet. That's a tall order I would suggest.

You know, we're not going to solve all the cybercrime issues and all of the privacy issues. So I just like to mitigate that bold challenge that we set

ourselves up somewhat. Possibly the same legal words to the extent possible. But meeting the needs of the evolving Internet be in things like a wide-open door to me. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Stephanie. This is Chuck. I think you make a good point. I'm not sure this really solve the problem. I mean obviously the ever evolving global Internet needs are way beyond the scope of our working group. So I think your point is valid. What if we were to put a qualifier in something like the domain name needs or maybe applicable domain name needs of the existing and ever evolving global Internet? With something like that cover it in your opinion?

Stephanie Perrin: It was certainly makes me feel a little more comfortable. It's just too wide open a door at the moment. Like the house just got blown away. You know.

Chuck Gomes: And – position. And I think this is a valid point. I suggest that if the small group didn't intended to be beyond the scope of this work. I know they did it. I don't have any doubt in that at all. So I think it's probably a relatively easy fix or at least we can make it sound a little more comfortable and accurate. Jim, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: Thank you. Jim gallon for the transcript. I made a suggestion in the chat room for this particular issue where I said, "You know, change meet the needs to, meet the needs, you know, as described further below." My intent there was to recognize that we do use phrases like fairly and pragmatically with their varied priorities, you know, later on. Last down in last paragraph and of course resolving the tension among the varied and competing views.

I mean I think there are as we are so fond of calling them legal words in other places already in this charter. So I think Stephanie makes a good point and we just need similar kind of weasel words there at the top either pulling something up or just referring to what's already described below. That was one thing.

Second thing is I just wanted to call out to you Chuck I made a comment in the chat room too that the change that I believe it was Lisa and if it was someone else I apologize but thank you for this. My first concern that I had raised in the beginning is answered by changing the aforementioned to the word other. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much Jim. And thanks for calling my attention to the chat because I haven't been able to keep up with it very well the last few minutes while I've been trying to lead this discussion so appreciate that. And I'll let Lisa or Marika -- whoever one's doing it capture that, the aforementioned change. Let me ask Stephanie. Stephanie does Jim's suggestion work for you making a reference to the...

Stephanie Perrin: Yes I think so. Why don't we do it offline though? We don't need to hammer out the words here. I think we can get that worked out pretty quickly on list.

Chuck Gomes: Normally I would agree with you. If we can do it in a brief amount of time I'd kind of like to distill the changes so we at least get a level of concern on this call, not final concerns. So if - does anyone object to the change that Jim suggested? Okay, so let's see what we've got here. Everybody take a look at that first sentence. We still need the conditional clause in there. Oh no, it's in there where I put it. Do people - Lisa go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Yes I was just going to point out since I had to pick one of them to put in the red line I chose your original proposal Chuck. But if we want to modify that that would be the open item.

Chuck Gomes: Do - thanks Lisa, Chuck again. Do - does - do people have a preference where it's at or at the end per (Andrew)'s suggestion? Anybody have a preference? (Andrew)?

(Andrew): Well so I do have a preference that I can do this bold given that it's kind of late to just move that determining whether a new RDS is needed, you know, sort of end of that entire debt so tasked with defining the policies associated with an improved RDS that will meet the needs as described further below, maybe in parenthesis -- I don't care -- of the existing and ever-evolving global Internet and determining whether a new RDS is needed to satisfy that or something along those lines. The idea is that, you know, you sort of front load the requirements of what it is we're trying to do and then decide what the technology is.

What - I guess maybe it's just a fetish of mine that I'm concerned about, you know, worrying about the technology first and then the consequences of that later. And perhaps the reason for this is that, you know, a lot of the discussion so far has frequently foundered on, you know, well this is how you can do it in the Whois now. And it always feels to me like, yes but, you know, we want to know what problem it is you're trying to solve and then we can fix it with some technology. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you (Andrew). So he's the only one besides Lisa I think that expressed a preference on this. Anybody want to break the tie there? Again I can go either way. The - I don't think it's terribly significant whether it's at - if we move it to the end. One thing I would suggest though I'm not sure and I didn't think of that until we're looking at this right now in this meeting. But do we really need that of the existing and ever-evolving global Internet? Does that add any real value here? And maybe I want to ask Alex to comment on that. Is that an essential part of that sentence especially with the changes that have been made as described further below?

Alex Gakuru: This is Alex. In an essential part I don't know. But I think this really the sentence defining the policies associated with an improved RDS that will meet the needs as described further below I'm not too sure I think that needs some cleaning up. Again whether we do that here or on the list or elsewhere I guess could be debated.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Alex Gakuru: I think my point as I mentioned in the chat earlier is that, you know, the policies that we define and that may make its way into an eventual RD system will be in place and impact, you know, the ever-evolving global Internet for the next, what 20 to 30 years or longer. So I guess what I wanted to do or what I suggest what we wanted to do there was to make sure people kept that in mind and our polices didn't constrain artificially somehow, you know, future uses and innovation of the Internet.

Chuck Gomes: So I guess - this is Chuck again. Thanks Alex. I'd be a little more comfortable with if we put the domain name needs as described further below of the existing and ever-evolving global Internet so that we narrow it to domain names rather than the global Internet. As long as we restrict it to the domain name needs of the ever-evolving global Internet I'm a little more comfortable and getting back to the breadth of the statement that Stephanie expressed concerns on.

But again I'm not trying to dictate what that says. So why don't you put that in parenthesis there Lisa if you're the one that's doing the redline, the domain name needs. And then we can take it on the list as to whether we leave that determining whether a new RDS is needed either in the middle like it - or before the defining policies or after. I'm comfortable either way. And just glancing at the chat I don't think anybody's expressing strong opinions there so let's not spend any more time on that.

Taking a look at the red lines that are done understanding that we still - there were some edits made in the second paragraph. Jim did those take care of your first point? I haven't had a chance to study those so they may not.

Jim Galvin: This is Jim Galvin. Yes Chuck I'm good.

Chuck Gomes: You're good. Okay thanks -- appreciate that. (Andrew) did you have another comment?

(Andrew): Sorry old hand. But I was trying to write in the chat this very thing which is that you could just move that determining whether a new RDS is needed right to the end of that sentence. The - you know, after ever-evolving global Internet and determining whether a new RDS is needed period and it would work.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, anybody object to that? Now's your opportunity. And again we can change this on the list afterwards. But if we can get a pretty decent document it'll - to put out to the full list what we will do is probably carry this forward to our meeting next week to finalize it and have discussion on the list in the meantime. But if we can have a pretty reasonable redline to start with leaving this meeting that would be I think very helpful.

So Lisa why don't you move that to the end? The wording's got to be changed a little bit I think to move it to the end. The exact wording probably doesn't work. Certainly we don't need an if so. But if you could do that on the redline that would be great. And I don't think we're going to spend too much more time on this but let's see if we've got a good redline draft and staff can clean it up later.

Is any other suggested edits or comments before we wrap up this agenda item? Okay so Chuck still speaking and we will go with this red line and the action item is to distribute that to the entire list for discussion with the goal of finalizing this understanding that last added paragraph okay which we will emphasize in our meeting next week. Lisa you had your hand up and it's down. I assume you're okay now but certainly speak up if you have something to add. Go ahead.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks Chuck, Lisa Phifer for the record, just one minor point. The beginning of the second paragraph there's a reference to individual registrants. And I

read this as meaning in all registrants whether they're individuals or businesses or other kinds of organizations. Would that be a true statement Alex?

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead Alex if you want to respond to that.

Alex Gakuru: Yes sorry Lisa. I was distracted. Could you repeat that?

Lisa Phifer: My question is about the phrase individual registrations. I don't - I the beginning of the second paragraph I don't think you meant to limit that to registrants that were individuals but any kind of registrant?

Chuck Gomes: So in other words could we delete the word individual?

Alex Gakuru: I - intellectual property owners and individual registrants, yes I think we could delete...

((Crosstalk))

Lisa Phifer: The point being we have plenty of registrants but our businesses are non-profits or other kinds of organizations as well, not just individuals.

Alex Gakuru: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay?

Alex Gakuru: Yes I think we could delete that.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. And again anybody else who's on the group if you have a comment on that please let us know. Okay, so we'll delete the word individual. Okay. Good, good work. And, you know, I want to complement the group because, you know, we've made some edits here but I don't think we changed the thrust of what you were saying in that second paragraph and even in the last

paragraph which really is a goal for us as we do our work in fulfilling the charter to work together and to try and find solutions to our competing needs and differing interests and so forth. So I think you did a really good job of communicating that to you certainly get my complements on the work that you did.

Okay let's move off that. We have an action item from there. And let's go continue our review of some example use cases. And the first one's going to be reputation services. The first three are going to be by Rod. And those may be the only ones we get to today because of not only time but available writers of the use cases on this particular call.

We will continue discussing uses cases the next two meetings. And my own personal goal is hopefully we can wrap it up in the next two meetings which would be on the 23rd and 30th. That doesn't mean we couldn't consider a new use case later on if we discover there's value in that. But if we can shoot for wrapping up our discussion of use cases the 23rd and 30th and we already have some use - a few use cases lined up for both of those meetings.

So all right, so hopefully the first use case here is being brought up right now. And Rod when it comes - you can start before it comes up if you're comfortable with that. But if you want to wait that's okay too. Just let us know.

Rod Rasmussen: Looks like it just came up so I guess I don't have to worry.

Chuck Gomes: Okay good.

Rod Rasmussen: Rod Rasmussen here. So through - took a few uses cases we used in the EWG that people have asked me about and I've kind of dusted them off a little bit, updated a couple things and submitted those so people could take a look at that. I think these overlap to some extent some of the things that were already mentioned but given the conversations on the mailing list this first one

in particular I want to make sure people realized how extensively information contained in the current

Whois system and then potentially in a better more efficient controlled, et cetera, way you can do that with an RDS that's actually, you know, 21st Century technology to do these kinds of operations that, you know, are - been on a very large scaled. And I'm talking millions of domains are examined daily by the large AV companies, AV being antivirus and other companies like that or antispam companies to, you know, tens of thousands or so domains being examined and treated for some sort of reputation by individual security companies.

And then baked in that and given this in a use case but baked in the security gear whether it be next generation firewalls or things like that when you're having communications with a host name or domain name you've never seen before some of these things will automatically do things to bring in context around that whether that's simply gee was this registered yesterday to more complex things that are covered here which would be taking a look at known patterns of abuse or, you know, what we call reputation in the industry.

And that could be - now reputation could be either good or bad by the way. In the context of security it's typically bad reputation you're looking for. But in the email context for example a good domain reputation is used to allow email to flow without getting further checks or scrutiny that you would otherwise do for something that is either what we call, you know, based within a black list we also have these things called gray list which mean that you get further processing involved and will slow down delivery of things or put it into a stand fold or something like that.

So all of these things are done in a way to - at Internet speed provide information to make decisions about what to present to users when it comes to things like search results or what to allow through for email or what to allow for connections from one network to another. And I'm not going to read

through the case and everybody can read for themselves on this stuff. But if there's any questions on how this stuff is used or the like beyond what I've describe in the document and what I've just described here verbally this would be a great time to ask those questions.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much Rod. So we'll just open it up for discussion and questions on this use case remembering that our goal is not to write perfect use cases but rather to understand a lot of the key needs, different needs that people have for an RDS. So...

Rod Rasmussen: And Chuck this is Rod again.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yes go ahead Rod.

Rod Rasmussen: Let me just - but let me just add to that. I - I've mentioned it on my - in my mailing but (unintelligible) may have seen that. This use case was designed with - at a stage in the EWG work where we had kind of determined some things about having components like gated access, credentialing -- all that kind of stuff as kind of base parts. So when you read this you'll see things like, you know, there's a process involved where you have access rights and things like that which don't exist obviously in today's system right? But that's why the - I didn't modify that because, you know, we'd have to totally rewrite the thing so I just - I left that in there.

But I also wanted to leave that in there pointedly so it shows kind of the mindset of what you need to - what you need to do and the capabilities you might be able to take advantage of in the modern RDS systems. So when you read this use case keep that in mind. It is not a one for one kind of here is what we do today. It's a what we do today but in the context of how we do it with a better RDS. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks for that clarification Rod. And let me clarify as well that use cases don't need to focus just on what we have today. So uses can introduce us to things that a new RDS could facilitate as well. (Andrew) go ahead.

(Andrew): Thanks. This is not in any way to suggest that the use case is wrong. But we've had a little bit of trouble in this group with distinguishing between, you know, what it is we're trying to have happen and what we're specifying the new system needs to provide. So as long as everybody reads this with, you know, here are actually conditions that we're trying to achieve I think that this is a great use case.

But maybe it's just that my software engineering hat is not that easily removed. I read some of this as a kind of specification for system performance rather than something else. And I know that's not what it was intended to do. So I want to make sure that people don't read it that way that what we're really saying is like there's only really, you know, it pretty much requires that you have this sort of differentiation in order to achieve this use case but we're neutral as to how it happens. I think that's a fair description of what I'm - of my reading of this but maybe Rod can tell me whether I'm wrong.

Chuck Gomes: Rod would you like to respond?

Rod Rasmussen: Sure, thanks. And I think that's a good observation (Andrew). And I think that ties to that - your point there gets to my attempt at a clarification at least in how - when in the process this was written up because we assumed - so some of these steps that are in there we would talk to a process and stuff this gets into more, you know, as your software engineer ears were tingling it actually is written more that way and that's kind of my background too so hence the way it was written.

But the - what the goal here when I wrote this was about how to leverage the concepts to accomplish this overall use case around reputation service which

is something that exists today. I mean it's just it's done today and it's done by, you know, people hitting the Whois services that exist today, people hitting services like domain tools or others that store historical data and that also combining that with looking at other things like the configuration of DNS potentially services being offered underneath the domain. There's a lot of other things that go into a reputation service.

But those things do exist today. And this is written from the perspective of okay great we've got - we know there's this thing out there that people rely on this information for. Here's how you would do it in a new world where you have this - these kinds of concepts that we're - we'd agreed were important principles to have. And so it's kind of a how do you apply today's current use case in a potential future world? Does that make sense to you (Andrew)?

(Andrew): Yes, thank you.

Rod Rasmussen: Cool.

Chuck Gomes: And this is Chuck. Thanks to both of you. Any other questions or comments on this use case before we go to the next? Lisa?

Lisa Phifer: Thanks Chuck and this is Lisa Phifer for the record. Just one quick question for you Rod. Under data elements you mentioned email addresses but then you also and you rate some other contact information like the phone number and the physical address. Are those other elements of contact information commonly used by reputation services or does - is it primarily the email address associated with the registrant or the technical or administrative contact?

Rod Rasmussen: There are different levels. So most reputation services are fairly light in that they'll look at things like a registration date perhaps a registrar. So if you think of the old, you know, and I guess still current under comment that's in your list people have built systems designed towards that and still use them. And

that provides a very valuable set of information. More sophisticated models will use more information. It's just more expensive to get more - and you have to use different kinds of machine learning and other techniques in order to manage that data over time.

So it gets - other field become more problematic whereas things that are tied more easily as unique identifiers and the like or, you know, it'd have to be precise. And email address for example has to be precise to operate to work whereas a physical street address you could have misspellings or different spacings or things like that.

And, you know, and those can be inconsistent between different data, you know, entries so that's harder to work with from a just from a processing perspective so it's less common. But there are - there was argues by the more sophisticated models out there that people use. So it's kind of long-winded to say it depends.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Rod. Any other questions or comments. Okay well let's bring up the next use case which I think is to investigate abusive domains. So if we can bring that one up and we'll let Rod introduce that to us and give everybody a chance to discuss it.

Rod Rasmussen: Sorry I was on mute there, Rod Rasmussen again. So and this one was kind of focused on trying to find a potential owner/controller of a domain name which may or may not be somebody who's intentionally abusing them, maybe - you know, maybe unintentional if their domain was hacked or taken over or something like that. That's why it says potential in this grid in the description.

But the - this is, you know, this is the kind of - and this - we've had other submissions that are similar to this. I don't think we need to spend a ton of time on this since we've had other stuff looked - other entries looked at this. Again this is with that kind of futuristic look to it.

So you might think about - this might be a good mental exercise for folks to go to thinking about gee if we had these concepts around gated, you know, access with credentials and all the like that you would need to have to get this to - get access to certain kinds of data depending on who you are and what your state of purpose is that's - that leads down that road. But, you know, that's - we're getting a little ahead of ourselves at our current level but that's just, you know it is extra information for you.

And then, and the idea here being is that I can kind of pivot my way through information so that for example, if I know that I have a series of domain names

I can get information about who might, you know, be associated with that domain name and I might be able to take that, some association there and then pivot to other domain names that they should be using as well to, you know, basically build up, I won't call it evidence.

It's more of, because you have to, evidence is a legal term. It's more of information, clues, et cetera informing your opinion no matter what you want to be, you know, be investigating or taking further action on. And another important point to remember here too is that while we think, for folks not in the industry, you think of this as a law enforcement primary activity.

The vast majority of this kind of work is actually done by private sector individuals who are working for security companies or, you know, some of the kinds of companies already mentioned or are response personnel for banks or other people who get attacked quite a bit.

So a lot of this kind of work is done in order to establish what's going on, who may be actually trying to do abusive things to individual organization. That could be everything from, you know, a top bank to an NGO that's being, you know, that's trying to, you know, people are trying to hack into to get, you know, this and that information. Things like that.

So (unintelligible) again, the people who are doing things like setting-up malware or data exfiltration using domain names and things like that. These are the things you're typically investigating and trying to figure out what they are and put the puzzle pieces together.

I'll leave it at that for now.

Chuck Gomes: If I can get that on mute button. Sorry about that. Thanks Rod. And I'll open it up for questions and comments on this one right now. And I'll kick it off. Rod, is this one where, would this be a use case that would, could be a case when the domain name registration may not be the abuser but the domain name is being used for that. Or is this, would that not fit this particular use case?

Rod Rasmussen: No, that could set this use case. You don't know until you've actually gone in and looked at - and part of what this is covering was in the case of having abusive registration, one of the things you want to be able to do is contact people who are actually not just, you know, kind of in an ownership position.

But maybe, you know, more the traditional technical contact where you, you know, if you think of the use case that we had in the first example was, hey, there's a problem with your domain name. It's doing something that affecting the internet whether it's, I don't know, it could be anything.

But it's just doing, it's got, there's traffic coming from it for some reason. You have to do something about it. It's misconfigured and I'm, you know, relies on - we have the same issue here. You need to, oftentimes you want to get ahold of, it may not be the registrar because registrar is in a separate category.

Maybe somebody who's got a sort of posting or other responsibilities for the domain and this ties back to some of the different contacts we had, identified

as potential contacts, (optional contacts) to have in the EWG's proposed framework.

And this tied that together. You need to actually be able to, if you are investigating someone who is being abusive, you need to be able to get ahold of different kinds of contacts for that domain in order to move that investigation forward.

So and that could be that hey, somebody went and got into, broke into your registrar account and took over your domain name and is spamming everybody. That happens, you know, thousands of times a day, you know, these days. You know, obviously you may in the talking to the registrar be hey, talking to a hosting company or somebody, a Web master who built a Web site and maintains it.

Those kinds of contact details are potentially obtained via even today in the (who is). And obviously, in an RDS going forward.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Rod. (Andrew), you're up.

(Andrew): Thank you. I think that what Rod is saying here is critical in a couple of different dimensions and I'm not sure how to capture this. I think that this is, I think that Rod is right, that what we're talking about here is a sort of different gloss on a previous discussion we had.

But maybe that previous discussion didn't fully capture what it is that we're trying to get out of this and so maybe attending to the way that this interacts with some of the previous use cases will help us. And that is you've got sort of two really critical, maybe three really critical different entities associated with a domain name registration.

One of which is the registrant, who it is that that holds this. And maybe what we need to do is work out some stories around why we want to contact the

person who registered the domain. And then a second thing is the technical ones.

If you're the technical contact of this, I need to contact you for various reasons in this particular case because you're spewing spam at me, you know, whatever there is this technical issue. And then there's a third contact that shows up in some of the traditional approaches that we've had t this which is the administrative contact.

And it isn't clear to me whether the administrative contact is ever a thing that we actually need to reach out to or is instead just a sort of administrative convenience that has been registered already in the registries involved with this. And I think that, you know, if we could highlight this questions about registrant versus administrative contact that would be a positive and useful inquiry that we could make for what the RDS has to do. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you (Andrew) Let's go to Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I think there are a couple of things in this use case that are really important. The first one that struck me is we've often heard the discussion, the argument, whatever that if we really need information, then law enforcement will have access to it. And you can always go to law enforcement, you know, and get it if someone is doing something nasty.

The real world case is in many cases, at much of the time, the investigation is done before you have, you're in a position to prove to law enforcement that something is going on. And an awful lot of the investigation is getting done not within law enforcement but within various other bodies.

So I think that's a really important thing to remember as we're going forward. So this use case brings that up. The second one, I'm not sure if it's in the use case or is part of the discussion, is that at times the registrant is not the malfeasant one.

That their domain name is being used without their knowledge or control. And contacting the registrant is an important part of addressing the problem. So I think both of those are things that we need to remember as we're going forward. So I like this use case. I think it's a good one to make sure that we consider as we move forward. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Alan. (Stephanie, your turn.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. My question is really, I agree it's a very interesting use case. I apologize for trying to make it more complicated. But I'd like to see kind of a bright line between what is within ICANN (unintelligible) and what isn't.

In other words, regulating the internet service providers and the companies that offer Web site hosting and management is not within ICANN's (unintelligible) yet. And I realize this must get complicated because, let's pic on Tucows. They don't seem to be here right now.

If I register my little domain with Tucows and I hire them to do all the Web site management. And, you know, all the rest of it, security and everything, if you're Rod and you're going into investigate when my domain gets taken over, (unintelligible) we'll leave you to the original registration we hope assuming I still own it.

But some of the data that you're looking for to help figure out who took it over is going to be held by Tucows' Web hosting area, not their domain registration area. Am I correct? And if so, isn't it important to draw these lines because jurisdictionally it's different.

And to the extent that any of this comes under the force of law in terms of evidence and there are distinctions, right.

Chuck Gomes: Rod, would you like to respond to that?

Rod Rasmussen: Sure. Yes, I think those are important points. And so one of the, and this gets to the comment I was going to make to the last thing (Andrew) was talking about as well. So yes. In fact this use case points out that using the information available in RDS isn't going to answer all of your questions.

But what it's going to do is give you pointers to who go to as questions. So there's this concept of rules and to expand upon what (Andrew) was talking about and what's implied here but you need to, I should put this back together with the (EWG) report which is that we came up, we actually subdivided that rather nebulous concept of an admin context that exists in the current system into many more rules depending upon what you as a, what you look like as a registrant.

So for example, we had a legal contact so if there are legal matters to deal with. We had a DNS contact, if there's just DNS issues to deal with, et cetera. Those are all listed as optional contacts but in a large organization, those are ones that you would want, that you may very well want to fill because you have different kinds of people who want to get ahold of you.

One of those things would potentially be hosting, right, so you could say hey, if you want to talk about who's responsible for my Web hosting or for my email, it could be different, right, (unintelligible), at least if you're a corporation or you're somebody who's got a fairly sophisticated need.

If you're just an individual who's got a Web site that's got, you know, pictures of kittens or, you know, a little at home business, you're probably using a turnkey service and that's all in one place. And so a reasonable investigator, it would make it great if I can to a role where I can actually have an interaction with somebody who is responsible for that particular area.

And if it's a turnkey shop, well that's going to be obvious anyway. So for the most part, depending on the kind of domain and use you have and the kind of registrant you are, you can get the kinds of answers you're looking for by taking advantage of just some kinds of contacts.

So and that's again, I'm referring to things that on the (EWG) report. We haven't got that stuff yet. It's kind of inherent. This is one of the things the use cases drive. It's like gee it's, you know, if you want to be able to do these things as (Andrew) was saying, like when would you want to talk to the registrant?

And then you start defining parsing that and say well, we want to talk to him about these legal matters. Well, gee, the legal matters, we just really want to talk to an attorney or to a general counsel or a legal representative of some sort.

But it would be great if I could designate that especially if I've got things like privacy setup Say, so if you want to talk to me about legal stuff like the (RDS) thing, well great, here's my lawyer, right. I don't have to be a lawyer. Talk to my lawyer, those kinds of things.

So its starts getting you thinking about how to parse the different types of uses where you may need to make a contact with what right now is a very limited set of people. And so you're jamming all these different roles into single things. I'm way far afield from this use case so I'll really move on.
Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Rod. Stephanie, go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks. I think that's really interesting. And I think that, as we have frequently heard, I'm quoting someone here so I won't identify who it is. But really what investigators need is one stop shopping for the internet. And I guess my

concern is we don't want the RDS from a civil society perspective, we don't want the RDS turning into everything having to do with your internet (hosting).

However helpful that might be for investigative purposes, I might have a reason for not going to Tucows for my turnkey system. I may want, I don't know, Acme Human Rights Organization to be doing my Web hosting. And that's not, that shouldn't be in the RDS.

That should be somewhere else. So drawing the bright lines around here, that doesn't mean that if you, and I guess this is a question. I realize that a lot of big businesses are well served by having all of this information in one place so that they can be harvested electronically subjective to machine learning so that the instant that somebody impersonates Facebook for P&G, they get nabbed,

Those are different things and I wonder if it is appropriate even for ICANN to be managing an RDS system that permits that kind of essentially an expansion of the RDS. This is a hypothetical. I'm not accusing anyone of pushing for that at this point. It's a hypothetical.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Stephanie and of course defining bright lines is probably going to be one of the fun things we're going to try to do. Whether we'll be able to find them in all cases, remains to be seen.

But good points and I want to call attention to lots of good discussion in the chat including like quite a few people who haven't necessarily spoken up audibly but are making some good comments in the chat. I'm not going to try and read all of those but let you do that on your own.

So any other comments or questions on this use case? Lisa.

(Lisa Siden): Thanks Chuck and (Lisa Siden) for the record. Rod, I just wanted to ask a quick question about in the list of data elements, you have a few elements

here that are not normally accessible to a couple of (unintelligible) today, that says the IP address that was used at the time of registration or credentials that the party that performed the registration might have used.

Are those normally accessible to (OPS) personnel today? I understand that sometimes they're available to law enforcement but can (OPS) usually get to that kind of information today?

Rod Rasmussen: Sure. Usually no. But it depends on if there's a terms of service violation or something along those lines. Then, you know, in other words, somebody stole a credit card or impersonated somebody's ID, created a name and registration which happens all the time, right.

There are, in that case, registrars typically have it built into their (TOS). They can do whatever they want to with that information because you've tried to defraud them. And so in that case, in fact the, one of the things, there's an organization called The Secure Domain Foundation, which is actually gotten a lot of that kind of data together that's providing that to registrars so that they can in turn be on the lookout for fraudulent registration attempts.

Because one of the things that they're doing is sharing information around who's, you know, the kind of credentials that are being used are maybe an email address or maybe even an IP address and we use it like a VPN coming out of Germany which happens all the time.

There's a bunch of VPNs in Germany that (unintelligible) bad guys who use them. So it's like if you know those IP addresses, I don't take their registrations because they're bad guys and they're going to probably give me a stolen credit card. So that kind of information gets shared.

So an investigator can get ahold of that information, if it's in that kind of situation and a registrar that shares that kind of information. Law enforcement

can use the (unintelligible) process and things like that to get it in most cases. So you have to remember, this use case covered that as well.

So again the RDS itself was not designated as the place you got this. The idea was that you were conducting an investigation so you're looking towards trying to get that kind of information which might be available from a third party that is pointed to by an entry in their RDS saying okay, go here for this kind of information.

Does that answer the question?

Stephanie Perrin: It does. Thanks.

Rod Rasmussen: Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks for the question Lisa. And thanks, Rod, for the response. Any other discussion on this use case? Okay. This is Chuck speaking. I think all of you recognize my voice but people in the transcript might not be able to tell. So I got to remember to say my name too.

So I don't think it's wise to start a new use case. We have one more that we were going to try and get to today but I think it's better to defer that to next week. Rod, do you know whether you're going to be on the call next week on the 23rd?

Rod Rasmussen: Yes, I should be able to.

Chuck Gomes: Good. If you're not let us know, okay, just so we can try to make sure that the people who are going to provide the overview are on the call when we line them up on the agenda.

So we won't start a new use case. We will do two main things on our agenda next week. And that will be at the meeting at the regular time on the 23rd. We

will certainly pick up the third use case that Rod presented and we have some others that will be lined up for that one as well.

And then of course before we even start talking use cases, we'll try and finalize our problem statement next week. But please, please comment on the red line problem statement on the list between now and our meeting next week.

That way when we get to the meeting next week, hopefully we'll have pretty good agreement on the edits and that should be a fairly simply exercise next week, if people participate in the meantime. And of course we want the people on this call to participate as well.

So I think that wraps it up for today. Is there anything else? Marika, go ahead please.

Marika Konings: Yes. This I Marika. And I'm told there are some questions in relation to (unintelligible). I want to know what the latest status is on that so I thought it might be helpful to just give a brief update on that.

And it's currently foreseen that the RDSPDP working group will have at least a four hour slot on day one of the meeting which is Thursday, November 3. I think I saw some discussion ongoing on whether that will happen in the first part of the day or the second part of the day.

And I think that's probably something that will need to be sorted out with the other PDP working group who will also be meeting that day. And I know also there are some questions that have been raised in relation to visas. And I believe that further information on that will shortly be posted on the ICANN Web site.

And I think there's also a Webinar being planned for early September that will provide further details on logistics and any other questions people may have.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Marika and before I go to (Stephanie, a couple of follow-ups there. Number one, did you say the RDSPDP working group would have a full hour slot? Or did I mishear you on the first day?

Marika Konings: Four.

Chuck Gomes: Four hour. That's what I missed. Okay, that makes more sense. Thanks. And then with regard to the visas folks, I started mine yesterday. Really spent a little more time on it today. And it's quite involved. So don't put that off to the last minute.

I understand that can take a while. I haven't gotten that far. But it's not your typical easy visa process. So if you're even tentatively planning on going, I would start working on the visa as soon as possible. (Stephanie, your hand's up. Go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks Chuck. Stephanie Perrin. I hate to keep standing between people and the door here. But as long as we're discussing a use case on reputation and the exchange of lists of folks with bad credit cards who are likely to have stolen a credit card, I just wanted to mention that there are plenty of precedents here in the shall I say (unintelligible) case world where data protection laws prevented this kind of sharing.

And the only reason that anybody's getting away with this is A, it's not well understood. And B, the data protection laws have not been enforced in this respect. The actual emergence of data protection laws and the problems that go back in Canada and the civil code were part on the back on a bad tenant with that the landlords association wanted to share.

In places with winter like Canada, you can't kick a tenant out. If they stop paying their rent in October, you can't. You have to wait until March. So

tenants do really do this and the landlords logically enough wanted to share the risks of these tenants.

And that was a major data protection battle. And the same thing happened with cell phones, bad cell phones. Bad debt for cell phones. So I just wanted to put that in there that the fact that this goes on does not necessarily mean that there won't be privacy battles fought over it. And that doesn't mean that I don't have sympathy for folks who get their credit cards stolen under these circumstances. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you (Stephanie. And as I think everyone knows, one of the realities we're going to have to deal with and factor into our deliberations are data protection laws and how we deal with those in our recommendations. So thank you very much for that.

Back to visa just a little bit. Marika pointed this out to me. The type of visa that is being recommended is a conference visa. And what I, my first reaction when I was doing my visa was to put business. And it's actually a little simpler if you do a conference visa and it appears that that applies here. And that is a possibility.

The, so I encourage you, check it out for yourself. But I do think that a conference visa is probably the easier way to go. It certainly saved one step on my process that would have been a very difficult step. So just another tip on that and I'm sure we'll all get more tips and the Webinar will probably be very, very helpful in that regard.

Again, they will be, visa requirements, there's a little bit of information on visas but it's kind of skimpy right now. In fact I had to send off a question. But as Marika notes in the chat, more information will be available. And sounds like there's going to be a Webinar to encourage you to take advantage of that even if you're just not sure you're going so you at least know what you're going to need to do.

Anything else before we wrap it up? Okay, well thanks. I think a majority of us were at a not so convenient time. Some of you are at really bad times and yet the participation has been excellent. So thanks for the commitment. And looks like (Fabrish) is already sleeping.

I don't blame you. You had a worse time than me. So everyone, have a good rest of the week. Remember to comment on the problem statement and we will meet again next week. Meeting adjourned.

Woman: Thanks everyone for joining. You may now disconnect your lines and Operator, please stop the recording. Bye.

END