

AC Attendance - 23 Members

Alex Deacon	James Galvin (Afilias)
Andrew Sullivan	Klaus Stoll
Avri Doria	Marc Anderson
Ayden Férdeline	Mason Cole
Benjamin Akinmoyeje (Nigeria)	Maxim Alzoba (FAITID)
Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB	Sam Lanfranco
Chuck Gomes	Sara Marcolla - EC3
Daniel K. Nanghaka	Stephanie Perrin
David Cake	Steve Crocker
Dina Solveig Jalkanen	Tapani Tarvainen
Greg Mounier	Tomslin Samme-Nlar
GZ Kabir	

On Audio Only: none

Apologies: Rubens Kuhl, Kal Feher, Greg Aaron, Michele Neylon, Steven Metalitz, Fabricio Vayra, Erica Varlese, Kathy Kleiman, Kirk Hall, Greg Shatan, Sara Bockey, Alan Greenberg, Tim O'Brien, Michael Hammer, Andrew Sullivan, Rod Rasmussen, Lisa Phifer (staff)

Staff: Caitlin Tubergen, Marika Konings, Julie Bisland

AC Chat Transcript:

Julie Bisland: Welcome to the GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group teleconference on Wednesday, 21 February 2018 at 06:00 UTC

Julie Bisland: Agenda wiki page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_ngu8B&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=EVC9mDVERkld_8Qh4V5UGkml_pghs5IG0oe6gp2PI88&s=SVvoz-2-MO4F4g8TjaanKxUkxZfQj96m1YHiQcvW-IY&e=

Julie Bisland: If Adobe Connect is not functioning properly, please check your plug ins:

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A_tinyurl.com_icannactest&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=EVC9mDVERkld_8Qh4V5UGkml_pghs5IG0oe6gp2PI88&s=sytodsl-CbhIS9xCJXtKNwdtPgg7CIXtqG4vY3NUDJ8&e=

Andrew Sullivan: Turns out that Adobe Connect still requires Flash. If you don't have Flash (such as on my new laptop), you're dead

Andrew Sullivan: I sure hate Adobe Connect, for whatever it's worth.

Marika Konings: @Andrew - we'll take note of your feelings towards Adobe Connect :-)

Andrew Sullivan: Fell back to the iPad, which means the mobile app, which is almost worse than nothing at all. I hope these remarks are passed along to Adobe. :)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): Hello All

Alex Deacon: I suspect the "update adobe connect to use HTML5: is pretty low on Adobe's feature list.

Andrew Sullivan: @Alex: yes, right after updating it to Stone Tablet v 0.1

Alex Deacon: I'm super excited for the stone tablet version....

Marika Konings:Correct, you all have scroll control

Marika Konings:Note that we are now on slide 3 of the hand out

Andrew Sullivan:Is it only my own lousy Rogers connection or is Chuck dropping in and out for others?

Marika Konings:@Andrew - audio on the phone bridge is stable

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Andrew : sound is Ok in Adobe

Marika Konings:We are now on slide 4 - data needs associated with DN Cert

Marika Konings:We are now on slide 5 - deliberate on data processed for DN Certification

Alex Deacon:No additional comments from me.

Marika Konings:Note that this table should be read in conjunction with the notes on slide 6

Andrew Sullivan:But my impression is that different CAs use the info differently

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):e-mail can be compromised

Alex Deacon:i think "hint" is a good term to use. the CA/Browser Forum guidelines that details how verification/authentication happens does indicate that WHOIS information is not guaranteed to be accurate.

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB:But CA's can use whatever emailaddress they want or do not even have to use it

Alex Deacon:@andrew - agree CA's have different policies - but for the most part the CA/Browser guidelines describe guidelines/best practices on how this can be done.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Why not having optional elements, which can be chosen by Registrant, and only then added after a separate consent ? (so these elements are not to be obligatory for all Registrants)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):so those who need special level of certification can have those fields

Andrew Sullivan:@Maxim: That was approximately what I had in mind in my remarks. We could provide a mech. for pass-through low-grade authentication

Tapani Tarvainen:I see no reason not to leave it optional to registrars to offer it - which I believe would be the default if their contract with ICANN says nothing whatsoever about it.

Andrew Sullivan:It would be better than the TXT records that Google services (and other such things) ask for in the DNS. Requiring the ability to provision it would be good.

Andrew Sullivan:And I agree with Steve that this is our problem to solve.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Andrew, I think we need to avoid situation where info collected for one reason and never used for lagre amount of participants for this particular reason, but widely used of other reasons (kind of violation of consent)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):*large number

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB:An emailaddress in whois doesn't tell anything and surely not demonstrate control

Andrew Sullivan:This seems like a bad false dichotomy to me — either “hint” or “totally reliable”. It could be that an element could be a positive confirmation without it being a negative one. Think of a second-step login such as Authenticator.

Tapani Tarvainen:@Maxim yes: using for other purpose would require separate consent.

Steve Crocker:The key point here is contact information is supplied by the account holder, and it doesn't look like there's any required connection/obligation between that information and authority or responsibility for the domain name.

Steve Crocker:TYrying to list purposes without dealing with this question seems fatally flawed to me.

Andrew Sullivan:My conversations with CA/B Forum people is that they're frustrated about how bad the tools are, and would like something better given the practical needs of the Internet.

Stephanie Perrin:Is ICANN in the business of certification? If not, why list this as a purpose for collections?

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB:Then they should make a wishlist or a system for doeing it better

David Cake:@Andrew I think it will be really interesting to have someone from the CAB forum in the WG to discuss those issues.

David Cake:please ignore typos I had eye surgery this morning!

Andrew Sullivan:@David: agree. @Stephanie: ICANN is at the root of the DNS, on which the CA system depends.

Steve Crocker:Dzvid, you're doing fine. I hope the surgery was completely successful.

Steve Crocker:Email contact ensures the email is being received. It does not, by itself, confirm the person receiving the email has control of the account. Exactly what Jim Galvin just said.

Steve Crocker:If I wanted to know for sure if the person I'm communicating with has control of the domain name, I'd ask him to do something visible that requires access to the account. For example, I might ask him to insert a text record with a confirmation code that I just sent him. When I see that show up in the name server, I know he's got control.

Steve Crocker:This may seem extreme, but it's essentially the same sort of verification that everyone uses when they send a confirmation code to your phone.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Steve, it is the way PublicDomainsuffix works

Alex Deacon:Some certs indicate more than domain name control. These certs require additional authentication and verification steps and can require manual checks, references of 3rd party db, and ensuring WHOIS info matches (or is consistent with) the certificate requestor.

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB:And this is already widely in use for some Certificates

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):where you need to prove that you have control over the domain or TLD

Alex Deacon:baseline requirements for this additional verification is defined by CA/Browser forum...but additional steps can be required.

Steve Crocker:I will look into PublicDomainsuffix. I am not familiar with it. Is the URL easy to find?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__publicsuffix.org_list_&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=EVC9mDVERkld_8Qh4V5UGkml_pghs5IG0oe6gp2PI88&s=hSaZYpwNUukHZGzk1wE63fjJpvhDTR_DzPp6z3HjD_Q&e=

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB:And there are registries providing Certificate of owner for CA's when requested .be as an example

Stephanie Perrin:What Andrew is describing does not make this a purpose for data collection under DP law.

Steve Crocker:Thanks!

Marika Konings:@Stephanie - but would it be a purpose for processing (especially thinking of access)?

Alex Deacon:@maxim - its not clear to me what publicsuffiix has to do with DN certification.

Steve Crocker:@Stephanie, it seems to me the account holder has the option of publishing or not publishing this information. I think the DP authorities have no complaint if the account holder chooses to publish some information.

Stephanie Perrin:yes, this is the problem we are getting hung up onpurpose of collection v processing.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Alex, I referred to the method they use to assure you have a control over DNS record

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):not to what they do

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):where you need to add a particular TXT record into your record

Alex Deacon:+1Andrew - see the single sentence definition. "Information to enable contact between the registrant, or a technical or administrative representative of the registrant, to assist in verifying that the identify of the certificate applicant is the same as the entity that controls the domain name."

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Alex, it does not work when Registrant does not need a certificate

Stephanie Perrin:Is Andrew fading out now and then or is it my lousy connection?

Julie Bisland:his line did break up

Stephanie Perrin:Thanks Julie

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):I think we have here a situation with optional fields required for a particular reason for part of registrants

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):which needs to be collected and processed only if the Registrant decides to add these fields and files a separate consent

Steve Crocker:@Maxim: I agree. We can streamline the "additional consent" by simply making it clear that if the account holder supplies the information, she has implicitly consented.

Andrew Sullivan:I apologize if I fade in and out. I'm still struggling with USB-C-only phones and Bluetooth headsets :(

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):+1 Chuck

Tapani Tarvainen:Implicit consent is a bit dangerous, especially when same data can be used for multiple purposes. An explicit consent, even if just tick box, would be better.

Andrew Sullivan:makes sense to me (what Chuck said)

Tomslin Samme-Nlar:+1 on data minimisation

Andrew Sullivan:David is right that the current protocol (ACME) is to show control over DNS. Those are DN Validations. The OV and EV validations don't work that way

Steve Crocker:Much of this discussion applies to all of the uses, not just certificates, and I think it will be helpful to focus on this underlying functionality instead of having to repeat this discussion for each possible purpose.

Daniel K. Nanghaka 2:The assurances is based on validation of ownership, and this is just one way for resolving domain disputes

Daniel K. Nanghaka 2:Just like the GDPR is aiming at protection EU Citizen data which cuts across all the companies that involve collecting data

David Cake:OK, I understand the issue Andrew is bringing up, I'm not sure it is relevant to this purpose but it is a useful broader issue to consider

Andrew Sullivan:I think there are two classes, the more I think about it. (1) things that are collected with some assurance about them being "accurate" and (2) things that the two ends agree they're trying to exchange

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):in many cases - tech = adm = billing just due to registrants not willing to type in too many things

Daniel K. Nanghaka 2:What is Steve is taking about takes us to verification of data elements

Andrew Sullivan:I think Steve and David and others are correctly worrying about the predefined cases, but it seems to me that many of the use cases (and CA is only one) could be satisfied with the end-to-end proof use,

Daniel K. Nanghaka 2:Some of the information was discussed back in the use cases

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):I think there are not many of us to have meaningful poll here :(

Stephanie Perrin:+1 Steve.

Stephanie Perrin:The problem is that some of us insist on arguing from the status quo, not what we need for ICANN's narrow remit. Same struggle we had in 2006, not to be depressing or anything...

Stephanie Perrin:Tabula rasa is hard to achieve, when lots of folks like what they got....

Steve Crocker:We need to set aside the status quo, the ICANN contracts and the GDPR and think this through from first principles.

Andrew Sullivan:But I am now (for instance) quite explicitly suggesting that the status quo is the wrong start. And I think Steve is saying something in the same direction.

Steve Crocker:Yes, I'm in agreement with Andrew

Stephanie Perrin:Indeed, this is progress from my point of view...

Marika Konings>Note, we are now on slide 6 - related WG agreements

Steve Crocker:How is the information called for in the agreements related to the account and control of the domain name?

Stephanie Perrin:I believe the term is registered name holder....

Andrew Sullivan:I think the key thing in most of these was that, if you didn't do this as a DN registrant, others might have trouble. For CA cases, it's not like that.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):for example https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_resources_pages_transfer-2Dpolicy-2D2016-2D06-2D01-2Den&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=EVC9mDVERkld_8Qh4V5UGkml_pghs5IG0oe6gp2PI88&s=xxStC9JJznqkJJaY0XA-xcYDv87xaa_IRL6qzR6i8M&e=

Tapani Tarvainen:I guess the registrar could require their customer data to match what's in RDS to the extent they overlap.

Daniel K. Nanghaka 2:@Tapani, you are right but then customer data is not adequate at times

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):I think we still need to replace Criminal Activity as a purpose with prevention of Criminal Activity :)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):at least it sounds better

Stephanie Perrin:several of the definitions in the RAA are circular...which suggests that noone has thought enough to go back to first principles and actually describe the function of the term.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):bye all

Benjamin Akinmoyeje(Nigeria):we were suppose to present the DT4 work

Marika Konings:@Benjamin - unfortunately we didn't get there today, hopefully during the next meeting!

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB:bye

Daniel K. Nanghaka 2:Thank you everyone

James Galvin (Afilias):bye all thanks

Benjamin Akinmoyeje(Nigeria):bye