

# TRANSCRIPT

## Contact Repository Implementation Working Group Meeting Durban

*14 July 2013*

### Attendees:

Cristian Hesselman, .nl  
Luis Diego Esponiza, expert (Chair)  
Antonette Johnson, .vi (phone)  
Hitoshi Saito, .jp (phone)

ICANN Staff:  
Bart Boswinkel  
Kristina Nordström  
Gabiella Schitteck

Luis Diego Esponiza: This is the contact repository implementation working group. We have Hitoshi on the line. Hi, Hitoshi.

Well, we will start. Okay. I sent a document, the last version of the document draft version of the document. And Cristian is here. He has some comments on the document. He sent out the comments to the mailing list. And I want to discuss a little bit about these comments of Cristian.

The first issue Cristian mentioned is about the (unintelligible) of the ccTLD community.

Unidentified Participant: Sorry. Nancy told us that we have to make sure that every recording starts with an announcement that says what the session actually is.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: Yes. I'm sorry to interrupt. So, we're streaming now?

Unidentified Participant: Yeah.

Unidentified Participant: Yeah. If you want to just announce what it is and go.

Luis Diego Esponiza: This is contact repository implementation working group meeting.

Well, then, as I said, the first issue mentioned by Cristian is about the (unintelligible) of the central authority of this repository. And the propose of Cristian is to think about the accommodative repository (unintelligible) across the ccTLD community.

If I understand well, the idea, as we mentioned before in the past meeting in Beijing, is, instead of have a central repository, having a distributed repository based on (unintelligible) ccTLDs. At the beginning of the working group,

I have an approach of that kind thinking about, example, the original organizations because the original organizations-- they're not really grouped (unintelligible) way. For example, the Latin American people-- there's a lot of countries that speak Spanish there. And, in Asia, they have some more close related things about the ccTLDs - close to the region, for example, of the original organizations.

But, during the working group, we realized that the problem would be if we-- maybe we are relying on original organizations on a task that maybe they're not called for that. Maybe it's not their responsibility. Maybe the responsibility can be spread and some kind-- difficult to track. At the beginning of the working group, I was thinking that way. Split the database. And the easy way I found is using something like LDAP. You can split easily a contact database through many LDAPs.

And keeping up-to-date information. I was thinking about this. It's easy, by example, for the (unintelligible) organization to contact each ccTLD that is part of each organization than company, by example, contact each ccTLD contact.

But I don't know. Maybe you want to add something to this point or explain a little bit more.

Cristian Hesselman:

Okay, Luis. Thank you for summarizing that. Basically, this was a newcomer's view on what the contact repository is supposed to be about. So what I gathered from the Beijing meeting was that the current model, which is somewhat centralized with the CSC (ph) in the middle, so to speak, might be a little bit difficult in terms of the different views that the ccTLD members or the ccTLD operators have of who should run this initiative and who should finance it.

So, based on that thinking, I thought, okay, maybe we should in an extreme case cut the CSC altogether and try to come up with a fully distributed approach, not only in terms of technology but also in terms of processes and procedures so that these two issues of the different views of the ccTLD community would be not as dominant (ph) in this discussion.

And, also, the fully distributed approach, in my opinion, is also more appropriate for an incident-response kind of system like the contact repository.

Also, I think there's-- in my third remark, I made a reference to the DNSorg (ph) contact repository, which is also based on a fully distributed approach. So there's no central authority that decides who gets into the database and who does not.

I was unaware of a previous discussion on this matter-- on this topic.

Luis Diego Esponiza:

I don't know how DNSorg works distributing. Maybe you can explain a little bit to understand because I don't know.

Cristian Hesselman: I don't know the details either. But I included two screenshots of the DNSorg database. So it's actually in the document somewhere. So the first one is a screenshot of (unintelligible) contact information, and the second one is the profile of our contact person. And, actually, all the things that are in there are basically also the things that should be in this contact repository we're discussing in this working group I think. The difference is that, with the DNSorg approach, there is-- they use the concept of vouching force. If you want to join the group as a new member, than five or some other number-- let's say five-- five other existing people, users of the database, have to vouch for you, meaning that they have to indicate that they trust you. And then you can join the system. So, taking that perspective, there is no central authority, and everything is actually being done by the, in this case, DNS operators themselves. The members of the DNSorg database are DNS operators in the broadest sense of the word. So that also includes ISPs and all that sort of thing.

Luis Diego Esponiza: Okay. I understand. I think the DNSorg repository is wider. It's other infrastructure operators, like (unintelligible). But, in this case, we need to focus on TLD. I think it's a different model of approach. And I think it could work in some way. But we have an advantage in the way that the ccTLDs are, in fact, trust organizations, well known organizations for other reasons, (unintelligible); by example, (unintelligible) or the original organizations. This trust community or this trust (unintelligible) for other proposals; by example, the IANA (unintelligible) is one of these trust contact's information that is in place. Then I think we can take advantage of that model of trust that is in place right now by (inaudible). If we talk about other entities - by example, ISPs or governmental or any other private, by example, sector - that could be more difficult to establish this trust.

Cristian Hesselman: I understand that this DNSorg data-- there is a difference. So it's a different user base so to speak. But I think that we can learn from what they have already done in the past. So that's basically my point. If we want to do something with a contact repository within ICANN or within this working group within the ccNSO, then we need to look at the OR database and collect-- reuse whatever is, I would say, usable for this initiative.

Also, I think that the discussion on whether or not we should have a central authority, so the CSC, that should also be a conscious decision and should be well motivated. That's my main point. This is something I, with all due respect-- which I didn't see in the document. So what I was missing was a motivation for why we chose for the model that we apparently have chosen in the document.

Luis Diego Esponiza: Yes. I understood. Then we can include the (inaudible). Maybe we can leave it a little bit open (inaudible).

There are some guidelines that have been established by the working group, the use and response working group that create this working group-- that established the creation-- for the repository. I think-- I'm not so sure about this, but I think we cannot separate too much from that point-- that guideline.

Then we have a mandate in terms of this contact repository. And what is not established before we can adjust it, or we can complement it in some way. But what is there I think we cannot change too much in this way. But this is not-- I'm not telling you that this is not writed (ph) on stone. We can change it. We can adjust it.

This is the idea. I think we can work on your comments. None of the other members of this working group I think-- I'm not that sure. But no other members

of this working group have (unintelligible)-- so has information on that. Maybe your experience or your contact will be helpful to provide input to (inaudible). That would be helpful because I'm not-- I have no experience with the NSO player that way (ph). We can adjust that.

The second issue.

You want to say something about it?

Unidentified Participant: I just see Bart raising his hand all the time.

Bart Boswinkel: It's more a question for Cristian. Cristian, how long do you think it will take to say-- if the two of us would work together, to come up with--? We got the-- some of the specifications is already available. You're very familiar with, say, the NSO work. Otherwise, one will be. So we can add this as an alternative-- my guess is relatively quickly, especially in terms of the like for like of the duration of this working group to the document as an alternative approach.

And we know, say, the differences. Say the governance model is one. The second difference will be, definitely, in the cost model and in maintaining stuff, DNS or distributed model as well.

So I think we should be able to put it in as an alternative relatively quickly and provide this to the working group as an alternative, so there is for the community something to choose from as well.

I wouldn't get so hung up about the charter because it's all about getting a repository up and running and say that the pressure is increasing to do it.

Cristian Hesselman: I agree that we can do that quite quickly because, as you said, (unintelligible)-- he's a colleague of mine in my team. He knows a lot about DNSorg work. He's a board member. So he can tell us all about this.

But what I think is more important is the first issue I raised, which is we need to motivate why we want to use a centralized model or not. And I think that's like the starting point for this work. And, if we don't get that right, then we don't have-- we cannot really refine the concept of the contact repository. And, as a result, deriving requirements from it will be difficult. Do you understand what I mean?

Bart Boswinkel: No. If I understand it correctly, it's more or less the choice-- put it in my own words. The choice is between a centralized or a distributed model.

Cristian Hesselman: That's maybe a little bit too much because those are two extremes. Right? Maybe there is something in between. So what I'm saying is we need to come up with the model that we're going to use within the working group, and we need to write down what it is, whether it's a centralized model or whether it's a distributed model or something in between. And we need to be motivated why we chose this model. Once we have that, then we can proceed with the requirements.

Bart Boswinkel: And I think what we started off-- or the working group started off with is the proviso of, say, what we said in the previous working group of, say, the requirements documented there. And this wasn't discussed. It was always the assumption of more or less centralized in order to reach-- and, hence, you've got the governance model, et cetera, based on a more centralized one. But we can take a step back. And the easiest way, in my view, is that we write up-- so you do

it. We've got the centralized now. The reasoning and the rationale for a centralized is not in the document, as you said. So what is-- And, if you start documenting, say, the distributed one, which can be done relatively quickly because you've got the requirements of the previous working group what needs to be included-- you've got the use cases, everything else.

Cristian Hesselman: What we need to do is we need to do the analysis of what the pros and cons are of the different--

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. But, in order to do it as a working group, you need to-- because I think, as Luis said, you need the two extremes. And then, based on the two extremes, you can do a pros and cons analysis that benefits, let's say, the first step in my-- to make it easier for the whole working group is that you document what is along the same lines as we got right now. So you've got how it works or the required-- some of the requirements. It's 27, a very high level. And you've got the issues around governance, and you've got the issues around funding.

Cristian Hesselman: I think those all derive-- all of them will pretty much follow from which model we choose.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Cristian Hesselman: So, I think, once we start with, let's say, select-- sketching what extreme-- what kind of models there are, the two extremes are distributed and centralized, then do the analysis-- okay, what does it mean? What are the pros and cons of these models? And which one we choose for this working group and why--

Bart Boswinkel: We don't actually choose it. We-- (technical difficulties).

Antonette Johnson: Good morning. Good morning. Can you hear me?

Bart Boswinkel: Good morning, Antonette.

Antonette Johnson: Hi. Good morning. It is interesting discussion. I'm sorry I joined you late. My alarm didn't go off. It's an interesting conversation. And I'd just like to throw in my two cents worth. And I think, listening to you, Cristian-- I think, in all fairness, it would be probably more equitable if both models are put in that DNSorg you were speaking of and do the rationalization of both models because I think that, to present it to the community-- the community needs to see-- the community should be making the choice, not the working group.

Cristian Hesselman: I agree.

Antonette Johnson: Okay. And I'm hearing that you're letting the working group make the decision on which model we present. But I think, in all fairness to the community, both models, since this new-- since the DNSorg is also being considered now-- both be presented to the community.

Cristian Hesselman: I agree. That's a better approach.

Antonette Johnson: That would be fair, impartial.

Bart Boswinkel: That's why I say documenting, say, how such a distributed model would look and then coming up with the same types of-- say what we said, the same thing. But it's how would the governance model look like or a distributed one. So these are

the criteria or-- for choice. And then, afterwards, based on that, you can see comparing the two. Then you've got your rationale for both. So it's the first step, in my view, to document.

The two of us could do this because we are living in the same country and almost in the same city. It wouldn't take us that long to document it--

Cristian Hesselman: No.

Bart Boswinkel: -- and then provide it to the working group and then say add, because we've got the major criteria already in there. And then we can do the comparison on, say, the model itself, on the costs, on the governance structure, et cetera. And, based on that comparison, you get your rationale for what you want.

Cristian Hesselman: That sounds perfect.

Luis Diego Esponiza: I want to add something. The rationality of--the reason why the model proposed or the model (unintelligible) from the document is a centralized model can be justified in some way. There's some practical reasons why this model-- that is not right in the document. Maybe we can add these reasons to. Maybe we don't need to create a new choice for the community. Maybe we can decide in this approach what--

Bart Boswinkel: I think, because Cristian raised it already, others will raise it already because this is a high-level definition. And you go down a path of a centralized repository. And that's a very fundamental choice, whether-- because that means creating an organization that needs to run it. If you do it in a different way, then the whole governance structure will change. And, say, what I could imagine, for example, is that people would prefer from a governance point of view a more centralized because then it's very clear who controls it. But it's prohibitively expensive. If you just look at it-- say the-- what was it? The intruder-- what they charge-- yeah, clustered into two-- it's something like this. It's what they charge on a monthly basis. It's almost prohibitive.

But you need to document this in a fair way in order for the community to have a choice and have a full discussion about it-- what they want.

Cristian Hesselman: Okay. I'm agreed.

Luis Diego Esponiza: Then, after the document, the order (unintelligible) provide to the community the choices about the fundamental model of the working (unintelligible).

But the thing is many of the specifications are completely generic about the contact management, not about the model of handle this. By example, from the point of view of the system-- the technology system, it doesn't matter. It would be managed centralized or not. The requirements for the system would be more or less the same. This approach about the how to manage the contact-- it's centralized or not-- could be more-- could be open to more discussion on, by example, governance model (inaudible).

But let's add all these things to the document and provide the-- because input from the community about the definition of the model--

Well, the other issue Cristian mentioned in his mail is about the realistic use case scenarios. About the use cases, use cases was provided by the past working

group, the debated use cases. But, for (unintelligible), I think we can create the scenarios and complement the information with examples-- (unintelligible) examples. I agree with that. We can-- it will be (unintelligible) the document.

The third issue-- yes. The relation between order and prosperity (ph). This is-- Maybe we can-- it's only a brainstorming. But maybe we can establish some guidelines on how to interact with this repository from other (unintelligible) or from other-- you mentioned response systems. But I think, if we try to get (unintelligible) on how is the repository related with any other repository on the internet could be delay a lot the implementation.

You want to say something?

Cristian Hesselman: Yeah. My remark was more at the level of what can we learn from these other contact repositories. And what can we reuse, not so much how do we interact with them. That might be a little bit more difficult.

However, I think that, if we do the analysis first with the two extreme models, then this one will automatically take its place in one of these two. So, for instance, if this one is a fully distributed model, which I think it is, the DNSorg is probably fully distributed-- follows a fully distributed model, then it will be an example in, let's say, the branch that the fully distributed approach and probably not in the fully centralized approach.

So, in my opinion, it's one of the alternatives that we might learn from or that we might reuse material from in implementing the contact repository for the ccNSO working group.

So I think my issues one and three are basically-- they're blocking effort (ph) somehow.

Luis Diego Esponiza: Okay. That could be helpful to have that input from experience on DNSorg. That could be helpful.

Well, there are some other-- there are other comment on the document, more like structure of the document, that, yes, can be implemented, and I'm agreed with that.

Cristian Hesselman: The other feedback, basically, is much more detailed. So I think that, first, we need to do the thing with the two models, so to speak-- so the fully distributed and centralized model. And then we need to look at the requirements. We need to take a look at the requirements again.

Luis Diego Esponiza: Okay. Do you know where in fact we define this centralized model in the document, maybe thinking about we need to work on that paragraph or the introduction? Where exactly is the finding that this model is centralized or distributed?

Cristian Hesselman: I'm not sure if I get your question. But I would-- Bart wants to say something.

Bart Boswinkel: Maybe it's an idea before we go into that details is that we first say Cristian and I start to draft the distributed model and try to follow the structure of the current model and see where we end up and what we can reuse from the current model and what is additional. But we've got the same-- we present it in two parts.

And then, after that-- after this is done, then we can do, let's say, revisit the current document again and see how to structure it and to present it in a proper way so they can be compared easily, because what you don't want to do-- ended up with apples and pears because one model was added later on.

It's more natural-- I think, if I understand you correctly, it's more restructuring the document as it currently stands. And so we have to say, if we present the centralized and de-centralized, you'll follow the same structure in order to understand where everything is.

Cristian Hesselman: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: So, before we do that, it's probably our homework that we come up with the, say, the second model, and then we revisit it again. We try to follow the structure as it currently stands as much as possible.

Cristian Hesselman: If the rest of the working group is okay with us taking that initiative.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. I agree with that.

Unidentified Participant: I agree with that.

Bart Boswinkel: And so, after we've done this, then we can revisit the document as well and then, say, do some fine-tuning. But, let's say, first, we need to add a whole new, even more than (unintelligible). But we got already the structure there. We can use it.

Luis Diego Esponiza: Okay. I think you have homework with this. And I think we are done here.

Bart Boswinkel: The only thing is, probably, Cristian, you going on holidays. I definitely will. But it would be early September-- a reasonable time for you that we produce something early mid-September for the working group?

Cristian Hesselman: Mid-September probably because I'll be on holiday at the beginning of September.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. And I'll be back early August.

Cristian Hesselman: We can discuss this offline.

Bart Boswinkel: Offline. So we set the expectations of the working group. That's the reason. So that's--

(Multiple Speakers)

Cristian Hesselman: That's going to be doable.

Bart Boswinkel: And so, by end September, we have a call again scheduled the next call of the working group. And so, by mid-September, we will send something to the working group-- other working group members.

Luis Diego Esponiza: Then the next call would be after this approach.

Bart Boswinkel: End September, because--

Luis Diego Esponiza: End September. Yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: -- because then you have time enough to look through it. And then we can start, say, first of all, discuss the second method. And, in principle, that should be run smoothly. And then we can start moving the documents around and combining into one document. But that's after that one. So this next working group call will be by the end of September.

Luis Diego Esponiza: Okay. I agree with that. Antonette or Hitoshi, do you want to say something?

Antonette Johnson: I agree. I agree with that. I look forward to the next call in September. It will be interesting to see the model.

Luis Diego Esponiza: Okay. Great. We're finished then. Thank you. Bye-bye, Antonette. Bye, Hitoshi.

Antonette Johnson: Bye-bye, everyone.