

**ICANN Prague Meeting
SSAC updates Discussion- TRANSCRIPTION
Sunday 24th June 2012 at 09:00 local time**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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

Stephane Van Gelder: Okay, good, thank you very much. Welcome everyone, good morning, good afternoon, good evening.

So this is the second day of the GNSO council working weekend and to start with we have asked Patrick Falstrom the SSAC chair and Jim Galvin the vice chair of the SSAC is also here, we have asked Jim and Patrick to come in and have a bit of a conversation with us, an update on what they have on their agenda and what's - what issues they are looking at currently.

And then a general discussion between the GNSO council and the SSAC chair and vice chair so Patrick, Jim, thank you very much for coming in today and speaking to us, it's always a pleasure to see you guys and try and see - take a closer look at the issues that we're working on together, or the issues that we're working on separately to each group.

So with that let me hand the mic over to you Patrick and let's find out what SSAC is up to.

Patrick Falstrom: Thank you very much Stephane. So I will try to go through things pretty quickly to actually leave some time for some questions because we only have now about 20 minutes.

We are though just like you, we are SSAC, we are here all weekend, we're happy to talk with each one of you separately as well on the various issues that you might have as well.

So what we have done, next slide please, so if you look at the reports that we have been writing the SSAC 54 about domain name registration data model is the latest report.

Jim will explain that shortly and then we have a bit - present a couple of other reports that have to do with - that are related to the domain name registration specifically related a little bit to the applicant guidebook and the new gTLD process.

We also sent in some comments on the fiscal year '13 budget just to make the community aware that we do have a discussion with ICANN regarding the budget - the way we are operating in SSAC.

Next slide please, so the current work parties and working group and committees that SSAC is participating in is our internal membership committee, we are now moving into cycle of renewal and review all the SSAC members.

Just to remind people, people and members is appointed on three year terms, we started that a couple of years ago and so every year we are reviewing one third of the SSAC members.

Jim my vice chair is the chair of the membership committee, that is how we have divided our work inside SSAC, that I'm the chair of SSAC where Jim is

the vice chair is chair of the membership committee and Ram Mohan is the liaison to the board.

So we have three distinct roles to separate the work between us. We also participate in an international registration data working group.

The DSSA and I am part of the board, the DNS risk management framework. We have work party on the impact on DNS blocking which is a continuation of the report SAC 50.

We are - we claim that we are looking at a little bit at duly unclaimed that we are actually really close to release a report that I'm very happy with.

So I hope that you will be as well, unfortunately it's not ready yet. And then we are - have one work party on root key roll over because there are some working in agreements, for example the commerce and ICANN and regarding change of the root key in DNS, for DNS.

So we are looking at how that should implement it. Next please. We have the various regular meetings, for example with you here, we have quite - we have intense cooperation with law enforcement, we have meetings together with them tomorrow, we also try to help them come into the ICANN context and participate in the various groups.

And we think that that goes pretty well. We have a couple of other things identified from future work, I'm happy to talk about that but this is also a place where we would like to hear from you, for example in GNSO if it is the case that you have future work items where you really do believe that there is something for us to look at.

We don't mind getting information about that as early as possible because then it might be the case that we actually can produce a report that can be used by you before you as it's part of your policy development process.

Next please. So with that brief overview I'll hand over to Jim.

Jim Galvin: Thank you Patrick. So this is a recent publication from the SSAC, and we - so next slide please, what is it? We had the document SSAC 54 presents a draft domain name registration data model.

The intent here is to establish a base line for community discussion and consideration. And we're hopeful that if we can get you know community support to engage on this particular topic that it's a basis for some ongoing work.

It would help drive registry and registrar agreements, escrow agreements and of course international data requirements.

The important thing to note about this document is it is just a technical document, it's just a proposal for a data model and it makes no particular policy assertions since that work probably would belong with this body in the CCNSO. Next slide.

Now why is this important? I think that we are all in agreement that there is no data model today that exists for domain name registration data and this has been a problem for many years and for a long time, arguably since - especially since all the WHOIS discussions have started.

A lot of the baseline today in discussions about what to do about WHOIS, they're really just based on the WHOIS protocol and what it does.

And we seem to always start from that point and our proposal here is that the discussions really should start from a data model.

We really should look at having a standards based structured extensible data model itself where we all agree on what it is we're collecting and why we're collecting that.

We believe that if we were to have this it would improve the user experience, internationalize registration data, we have the recommendations from the IRD working group, the final report which was also just recently published.

And also the WHOIS review team has made its suggestions about a data model and for other issues around that. Next slide.

So the methodology that we chose in trying to figure out what exactly should be in this data model and what people would want to include was we decided to step back and look at what would be a typical life cycle of a domain name.

One of the things that's interesting right away is you realize that there really are differences between gTLDs and ccTLDs, and even amongst the gTLDs themselves although they're all you know contracted parties to ICANN, there's not - there's a certain amount of uniformity.

But there are certain gTLDs that have additional requirements. So the lifecycle itself is also not a standardized or uniform idea but we chose a typical lifecycle and we decided to enumerate events inside that lifecycle and then choose the data elements that would be important to those events.

So here is a look at a typical lifecycle, the name comes up for registration, it's obviously registered, it's going to go through a series of events until at some point it becomes expired.

Presume there's some kind of grace period associated with that and then it's released and moves back up to being available for registration. So fairly straight forward, sort of obvious kinds of events than one would expect.

Next slide, this is a little bit more detailed look at some of the elements, you know presuming that a registrar exists in your registry system, you have a

registrant who wants it, they look first to see if the name is available, it is, they register it and then it obviously goes up to the registry.

And what's important down here at the bottom is recognizing that there are at least three different things that have to happen with a domain name when it is registered.

It obviously has to be in a registry database of some sort, within registries some of those elements obviously exist in the registrars, not in the registry.

It has to be published in a DNS database of some sort, made available to the community and then of course there's the whole WHOIS, the domain name registration side of this, how does the information about the registration become available and who gets to see it?

Next slide. So what is the data model? It is just a descriptive enumeration of elements that fit with events that go with the lifecycle.

What we did is create work in which we're calling profiles of the data registration model, again going back to the fact that there are differences among registries, about what kind of data they need, because it depends on what kind of events that they might have.

We realize that from our point of view from a purely technical point of view, a lot of the data is optional, where you need to create some policies around when you require data and when you don't.

So for the point of view of what we documented it's all about all of the elements being optional.

If the event occurs then this is the data that you need to satisfy that event. If you don't have that event in your particular lifecycle for your registry then you wouldn't need those elements.

And that's the discussion that we figure that this group and ccNSO, their group really needs to have that discussion around what elements are required and when.

What you get with the profile is a set of elements and then you get to have standardized uniformity about the attributes of those elements, the encodings of those elements, language tags and any additional rules that might go with them.

This allows you to have one data model, if you need that data then everybody implements the data the same way, it's always carried the same way and you have the opportunity for dealing with display in a variety of different ways.

Once you have all these attributes and parameters defined then it defines your display situation. And this really gets at a lot of the issues that the WHOIS protocol itself has and in a lot of this historical legacy kinds of problems.

So the specific recommendation is to ask this group you know various SO's and AC's to really look at this data model and comment on its completeness and whether or not you could use this and in fact we really would seek to work with other groups, this group in particular and any other group that would like to engage on this topic, we'd like to see some additional work going forward, really looking at these data elements and considering whether or not it's complete.

And if we can adopt this baseline and then create an appropriate set of policies around it to manage the elements and next slide.

And of course as I said in the beginning the one big potential issue that does exist is - and this is why we created the framework in which it's a series of

collections of elements and each little collection corresponds to a particular event in the lifecycle.

And so the framework and what we're proposing here as something to consider in future work recognizing that ccTLDs and gTLDs will probably have different data models and even some gTLDs will have slightly different elements in their data model.

This is just an issue that needs some discussion and so we've kind of proposed a framework that we believe will help in those discussions and seek advice and working with this group to get past all that.

And I think that's it, right? Oh well yes, so I've kind of said all of that already, thank you. Patrick?

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks Jim, thanks Patrick. Some interesting topics there. If I can just come back Jim before I open it up for questions and discussions, two things that I wanted to add from the GNSO side, one thing I wanted to add and one thing - a question I wanted to ask.

If I can maybe start with the question, on the data model and the registration data work that you just discussed with us Jim, you seem to be very non-aggressive in the way that you are suggesting that we work together and look at these critical issues.

Especially the critical issue for me and the one that you've been the least aggressive about for understandable reasons which is the harmonization of gTLDs and ccTLDs, because that I think is especially forward in this new era that we're about to embark in with gTLDs that may be managed by ccTLD registry back end operators with one would expect, and this is pure conjecture at this point on my behalf.

But one would expect similar data models to gTLDs as they are running gTLD back ends, is that an opportunity to try and integrate the two even to a greater extent, is it an opportunity technically I mean obviously to try and integrate the two models?

There's a standard that is dictated by the new gTLD applicant guidebook which ccTLD operators would have to adhere to for gTLDs. Have we tried and push that wider towards the existing ccTLDs and try and harmonize the complete model.

Is that something that you've looked at at all?

Patrick Falstrom: Let - before Jim jumps in or while he is thinking of a proper response let me explain inhere we are in the whole WHOIS work with where this is coming from.

One of the first reports that we wrote in SSAC when we were created in 2001 was that we brought up this problem and asked the community to please work more together.

And then we had written more and more reports that pointed out in a stronger and stronger fashion and now we have come this far. So I think if you follow the history of SSAC and WHOIS or registration data, you will see that the crank has been turned up gradually over time.

There are some problems we have with the unification which is not only policy and that people are (suckers) and don't really want to do any change and that is that we do have some of these formats and variables are also fixed and format what data it is also in the ITF protocols and other things that the ICANN policy development process do not control.

So when doing this harmonization it is a much more global thing so we don't believe that we can solve all the problems we point out by just aligning policies across ICANN.

We actually do need that everyone in the ICANN it cannot be just a top down enforcement. It must be the case that everyone participating do see a value in this.

Because people participating in ICANN also need to do the same work when they participate in the ITF in the local like legal or jurisdictional legal processes and the development of jurisdiction within their countries.

I need to bring it up there as well.

Jim Galvin: So I would say the short answer to your question is yes, this is very definitely an opportunity to look for some harmonization. Having given all of that some thought, as a practical matter we sort of recognized up front that gTLDs and ccTLDs the policy side of all of this is likely to be different.

And once we had gotten to cross that line and realized that, I think what's important here is the technical details of the individual elements really can and should be the same across the two bodies.

We had started our discussion at one point with the idea that we could create a core common set of elements that everybody would have and would always have and that would I think go a step too far in the uniformity that you're suggesting.

I think from a technical point of view the focus that we're proposing here in this document and that what I would suggest in going forward is you can agree that if you have an element this is what this element looks like.

And you can secondly decide whether or not you're going to have that element together. And as long as you're all using the same element then you get the uniformity and consistency that you're looking for.

And I think once we had gotten even in our own group to that point that would be the advice that I would bring to this which is I think what you're reading as being non-aggressive, we're just thinking in advance that there's no way to bring common policies to the groups.

And we realize that we don't think we have to. And so that would be maybe the principle contribution that we're making to the discussion.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks Jim, I mean that's exactly the point that I was getting to is that I don't think the way into this is policy at all because it's impossible to reconcile.

But I do think the way into it is technical.

Patrick Falstrom: Yes but we also do recognize like you pointed out that you will see more and more back end registries, sort of driving all that they can but you see also (unintelligible) so I think I see some interest but not enough on harmonization around certain things.

So I think maybe this will actually evolve in a good way and we don't have to use the (width), it will access sort of itself, I hope so.

Stephane Van Gelder: Okay, thank you very much. SO I will open this up for questions and I did want to say something about the IRD as well, because we're working on that but let me open it up and come back to it at the end.

So Zahid, Joy, Wolfgang, Zahid please go ahead.

Zahid Jamil: Thank you, just I work closely with our ccTLD and I just wanted to say there are times where a lot of ccTLDs haven't been involved in gTLDs and I've also noted that some ccTLDs have been involved in gTLDs so you know there's sort of a mix in that.

So it might not necessarily be the case that a ccTLD is powered by someone who is an outsourced gTLD provider or not in all cases.

I think that the fact that you're not being aggressive about this as far as the (unintelligible) is a good thing. There's a sovereignty issue, there's a - all sorts of issues within the ccNSO itself and I think addressing this from a technical standard point of view as opposed to policy may be more helpful.

So I think that may achieve more by way of harmonization, that's just a suggestion. Have you had any discussions in ccNSO about this yet?

Jim Galvin: With the ccNSO, no. Obviously we have some ccTLD people who are related to those registries in the SSAC and they were part of the discussions when we were having - developing our document.

So one extra data point then that I'll toss in here is one of the other things that became interesting is realizing that not even the ccTLDs know everything about what each other does and once we discovered that we couldn't create a harmonized model anyway because we didn't have access to what everybody was doing, you know you sort of have to find a different kind of solution.

Stephane Van Gelder: Joy?

Joy Liddicoat: Thank you, Joy Liddicoat for the record. Thanks Patrick and Jim for your presentation, I had two questions, one was just in relation to the work that was done last year on security, stability and (DB skill train) and blocking on

this one and if there's any follow up work that might be under consideration in relation to that paper.

And while you're thinking about that in relation to your domain name data registration work I mean I think that's an excellent initiative and I think one that would like to follow closely.

Just wondering if you're aware of the IETF's work on privacy and internet protocol. They released an updated discussion document in March this year basically focusing on trying to get a common mix amongst the IETF about privacy when it comes to the architecture of internet protocols.

And it's an interesting paper, quite an interesting input into the technical community discussions and I'm just wondering if you're aware of that.

It's certainly something that we're also discussing in policy teams obviously with the new GNSO but at least in your perspective amongst technical community discussions about that. Thanks.

Patrick Falstrom: So I can try to answer the first thing about blocking, so yes we are doing a follow document which is quite extensive regarding the blocking (unintelligible) our finding as to what is actually going on in the world.

Because we are - there are so many rumors out there to what's going on in claims so we are trying to - so I hope that you will be happy but we will as always release a paper and we will - won't have feedback to be able to but if need to create yet another one.

Jim Galvin: So continuing in the non-aggressive stance I'm going to dodge your question about privacy and observe that that's a policy question not a technical one and...

Patrick Falstrom: But we are aware of that document but to - but I also want to say that no we have not in SSAC picked up that document to use their terminology but there is absolutely something that we are looking in to doing.

So we also of course want to sustain kind of terminology across and if there's something that we don't have to invent that's a good thing.

Joy Liddicoat: Great, and just as a follow up I do think that it's quite clear that the IETF is not straying into policy. But rather trying to get an understanding in the technical community about what we're talking about in relation to data protocol development. Thanks.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Wolfgang and we'll close off with Jeff.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: Yeah Wolfgang Kleinwachter. My question goes in a similar direction like Zahid's one about the harmonization and gTLDs, ccTLD. My question is how realistic is this and what is the time frame?

Because ccTLDs operate under national jurisdiction and I remember in the early 2001 or 2002 when ICANN tried to harmonize the contractual relationship with ccTLDs this became an issue.

Because you know the ccTLDs checked any contractual arrangement but then we have variations of arrangements within ICANN and ccTLDs. That means if it's just a technical approach as mentioned by Zahid probably this could be realistic.

But you know on the other hand if it comes to policy, I think that it will be very difficult to harmonize. I say all this let's say environment you know as it comes to the national jurisdictions of 100 or 90 states.

And my second point is Patrick mentioned the discussion with the law enforcement agencies so that means the GNSO council is working with the

recommendations, (unintelligible) you know what are the specific points and what are the - the controversial issues you have in your discussions with the law enforcement (unintelligible).

Jim Galvin: I'll just add the comment that I made before, I think I agree. From our point of view if we start and take this at a technical level I don't think we need to have harmonized policies and uniform policies, as long as they're all based on the same set of technical elements.

I think there's an opportunity for communities, well defined communities, the obvious choices are you know gTLDs, ccTLDs but there are probably other communities to have their own policies.

So I'm not sure if that's a complete answer to your question or comment but that's what I would say.

Patrick Falstrom: And regarding the discussion with the law enforcement the current discussion we have tried to for a couple of ICANN meetings define common areas where both SSAC and law enforcement have - do have issues on the current architecture of the internet or the way it is implemented.

So for - so where we have honed in has to do with IP address allocation and IP address usage issues where law enforcement and also the technical community had issues with (carry grade mapped) and address mapping in address translation boxes on the ISP or service provider layer.

So that's together with the source address validation issues that we in SSAC have been working on because we have a little bit from our point of view too much traffic on the internet with fake sender IP addresses.

So at the moment that is where we are looking into whether we can come up with some kind of shared document where it tried to describe the problem and also tried to describe how it is the case that ISPs and the ones that

actually implement things regarding character grade map, why are they doing it, why are they not implementing source address validation vis-à-vis 38 and also SSAC Document 4.

So that's where we're working together with law enforcement so it's not really DNS related. Thank you.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you, and Jeff and then we'll stop.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Patrick and James, I think it's an interesting time to come out with this data model and in fact as you're coming out with this now you've had close to 2000 new applications that have applied for new gTLDs some of which I know have suggested different variations of a data model.

And I think that's going to be pretty interesting, I don't know- I can't remember off the top of my head if that's one of the questions that's made public by each of the applicants or not.

So it's an interesting time for you to be coming out with this and so the question I have, I have a question and then a comment.

So I'll make the comment first and then I'll ask the question. I guess the comment is that ICANN staff usually likes to take these things and find some way to put it into someone's contract and make it that this is - we've got - once you develop the data model, this is it, this is what everyone has to do from now until forever.

And I think in a way it could stifle some types of innovation. And I know you talked about in here that there's some optional elements, things like charter eligibility or even different models of authentication.

I think it would still fit within this data model. So the question I have, well the comment is I hope ICANN staff doesn't take this and just automatically slam it

down and we have to figure out the right balance to not prevent certain types of innovation.

And the question is to what extent are you going to review after the new gTLD process works it out the different data models that have been proposed and kind of incorporate that into I guess the next formulation of this?

Patrick Falstrom: Let me start by saying that the general responses that we are trying to review and see what we should say in the six reports a year that we are writing and we do already, we have already allocated resources to actually in the middle or at the end of the first run of course I think SSAC will write a document on how did it go from our perspective.

And that could most certainly include issues like the ones that you brought up. Regarding the innovation and business model I would say that is the third thing, you have the legal issues that Wolfgang brought up, you have the different technical issues that you see.

But then you have different business models that have to be managed as well. One thing that we have heard though in the SSAC and that this is of course up to you and GNSO to say whether we have the right to do the same thing if that you sort of have if you look at EPP there is some kind of emphasis the E in EPP on extensible.

And we do hear from registrars that it's a little bit too much, the registries that at the moment are doing innovation that creates a little bit of cost from the - to the registrars because the registries are very different.

Now this is of course about where some kind of changes and harmonization's are good for registries and some for the registrars and that is also some kind of balance that also has to be found, and not only balancing different business models but you're absolutely right.

It's extremely important that any kind of policy do not impact the ability to innovate and specifically not only innovate from a technical but also business model.

Stephane Van Gelder: Okay, Jim do you want to...

Jim Galvin: I just want to add a little bit to the overall process to all this. I mean it's important to keep in mind that we are putting this out there as a draft and we're looking for the community now to pick this up.

And we're more than willing, in fact anxious to work with the community to develop this and take this forward.

Our recommendations were quite specific, we were not trying to make this something that everybody had to adopt whereas the recommendations are specifically to promote discussion and start work in that direction.

So you know the non-aggressive work, Stephane was using earlier is exactly the right thing. We're here to cooperate and be helpful and we really would like - try to contribute to the discussions and would like the groups to pick it up and work with it.

So just want to emphasize that.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you very much. Just before we end just wanted to touch very quickly on the IRD just to let you know that we discussed this in one of our working sessions yesterday.

As you may or may not know we have a motion that we're looking at on Wednesday at the open council meeting on the IRD to approve the final report which was sent to you, came back with a number of suggestions, suggested edits from you.

Was reworked by the group and has now been sent to us as a final report. There was discussion that I'm going to really gloss over it but there was discussion yesterday within this group on the reason - the rationale for us sending the report now to the board.

And then commenting on it, we have not had time yet to actually look at the report in there, so there were questions about that. We discussed it while we were discussing the motions that we have on the table on Wednesday.

We have a session every Saturday at the ICANN where we look at our motions and try and iron out any possible issues.

So that came up as a possibility, I just wanted to flag that for you, let you know that we are looking at this, we are trying to get something - get a result on that work.

We know and we understand that the work has been ongoing for a while and we have certainly not cast it aside, so just wanted to let you know that.

I also want to thank you both for coming in and very interesting discussion that we've been able to have and I look forward to seeing you both in Canada next time and in the meantime having lots of informal off the record discussions. Thank you.

Operator can you please end the recording here and restart GNSO council would like to restart immediately because we're running 10 minutes late, thank you.

END