

**ICANN Prague Meeting
Registrar Meeting 3rd Session- TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 26th June 2012 at 13:30 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.

Coordinator: ...is being recorded. If anyone has any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may proceed.

(Matt): Thank you, we're just working on getting Jim's slides up but if you want to go ahead and get started - introduction while (Malcolm) gets everything up we'll go from there. Jim?

Jim Galvin: Okay, thank you, (Matt). I'm Jim Galvin, Vice Chair of the SSAC and I have been leading our work related to Whois and all Whois related matters, various activities going on in SSAC.

I'm joined here today by a number of SSAC members. We have (unintelligible) sitting in the back here, (Jeff Betzer) over here, (Warren Kamari), and Rod Rasmussen also.

So I'm here today to talk to you about a registration data model. The SSAC has responded to the fact that this - a request was made multiple times over for the existence of a data model, most recently it was in the IRD working group report. It certainly was part of the Whois review team work as suggested for a data model. And SSAC has itself referenced the need for a

uniform and extensible and standardized expression of the data used in domain name registration historically in several documents that it has published.

So what we've done in this particular document is to propose a starting point for discussions of a data model. It's important to understand that our presentation is a technical presentation. It's intended to represent, you know, what a data model could look like and it's framework for how to use the data model.

It is not a policy document. It's not in anyway assert any policies. The primary reason why we are here today to this group, we've been to the registry group and also over to the ccNSO, is in fact to come to you and ask to - you know, for you to review this document for its completeness and to engage with you in whatever way is appropriate to you in your processes to progress this work and to move forward with it.

We'd like to see the community, you know, really put the effort that it needs to into the policies that go around a registry data model. And I'm still waiting for the slides to come up, at this point you probably want to see the slides.

So our methodology that we chose for doing this was to start with a typical domain name lifecycle. This was just a way to show an example of how this process could be used and what we are expecting in terms of how this might work and is not intended to be a complete description of all possible data models. You're going to need to scroll forward about 12 slides.

You'll see the picture of the domain name lifecycle, that will be the one you want to stay on.

The lifecycle - there you go, back one. So just a typical domain name lifecycle. A name becomes available for registration, it's registered, it gets

used, it's expired. You know, there might be some grace period associated with that and then it's released and available again for registration.

One of the things that we recognized fairly quickly when we were putting some time into this work was that there is no single domain name lifecycle.

Different registries - I mean there's probably more uniformity in the gTLDs as far as the domain lifecycle is concerned although there are some registries that have some special requirements. But there's a fair amount more variability in the ccTLD market as far as what the lifecycle looks like.

And so realizing that was one of the things that motivated the way in which we approached this work. So next slide is a slightly deeper look at the domain name registration process itself. A registrant wants a name, they're going to ask if it's available.

A registrar may or may not be present depending on the registry and the market in which it exists. If it's available they're going to create the registration. And this also demonstrates that there are at least three information stores that have to be populated given that a registration is coming to existence.

There's a Whois information store or directory services activity for, you know, access to seeing who owns the domain name. There's the DNS data so that the name can resolve and actually be used to do something useful. And of course, there's a registry database where the actual information about the whole transaction exists.

And in a (Thick) registry, you know, that would obviously be the registry. If it's in the registry that information would be partly in the registrar.

Next slide. So what is the data model? Again, we're not at all trying to be prescriptive here. This is intended to be a starting point for discussion and it represents a framework by which one could use a data model.

So our goal here was to create an enumeration of data elements, a menu if you will of choices, of things that could be useful to support the lifecycle of a domain name.

The purpose of this is - we believe, that we could - we, meaning everyone could agree on the set of elements that might be needed to support their domain name lifecycle. And this way if there was commonality, if there are two or more registries that had the same kind of element, they would always use the same description of that element.

And this would get to the place of having a uniformed and standardized set of data elements and would allow you to address the issues in particular that are highlighted by the internationalized registry working group in its final report about dealing with internationalization issues.

So the data - the data elements themselves would each be defined by their attributes. And there are obvious, you know, low level technical details like cardinality, you know, minimum, maximum length, you know, script and language tags, that kind of thing would all be associated with the data.

You can also imagine including any encoding requirements that need to be there. And there might be some protocol specific kinds of elements that are associated with the data.

So the idea is to create a single data model which is an enumeration of data elements. And then in order to accommodate the needs of different registries and different models, meaning thick versus thin registries, what we've proposed is a framework in which you define a profile.

And the profile is where you establish the policies that determine what's required out of the data model.

The data model's simple an enumeration of elements that may or may not be useful to your particular registry in your particular use of the domain name lifecycle.

And what you do in the model - so you can imagine having a separate model for gTLDs, a separate model for ccTLDs, and in fact there might be multiple data profiles, okay, for each of these particular cases. In fact, it's entirely possible that individual registries could have their own profile requirements.

So if everybody has the same data model then they know what the elements look like and in addition to having a particular profile for a registry you can imagine using this menu of options that you can chose from to create a profile for directory services as well as a profile for escrow.

And so you could separately define what's necessary, you know, to save in the case of disaster recovery.

In the case of directory services you can also imagine the possibility of having separate directory service requirements, separate multiple profiles there. You might have a separate profile for public use which defines the elements that would be visible to the public and how they might access something.

You could have a separate profile for the intellectual property requirements and their needs. You could have a separate profile for law enforcement and, you know, separately specify authentication and access control requirements for all of that.

The important element here is that you have one data model but you establish profiles for what's required out of that data model, whatever elements you need to pull in in order to support your domain name lifecycle.

Next slide. So our specific recommendations in this document and the principle reason why we're here is to ask various SOs and ACs - we were actually going to ask all of them but we're expressing reaching out to a number of specific ones, in particular the registrars here. We've been to the registries and the ccNSO also.

And asking you to review this data model and the framework that it presents and comment on it, both for completeness and its utility for, you know, further use in creating directory service profiles and as to create profiles for individual registries so - to support those registries and the transactions that occur in their lifecycles.

Next slide. We call out expressly as we - as I started with earlier, you know, recognition that although this probably, you know, more uniformity among the gTLDs and data models there are actually some differences today.

So, you know, we're proposing a single data model in which you could create profiles in support of the gTLDs. And of course, ccTLDs will have quite a fair amount of variability in what they would use from the data model, the elements that they would pick from.

So next slide. So the next steps here, again, are asking expressly, we are here and offering this as a starting point for discussions of the data model and we are looking to ask the community to comment on this model and the framework in which it would be used and whether or not it would work for you.

And we're also making ourselves available to work with you. We'd very much like to engage with the communities in the development of these profiles and the policies that go with them.

You know, we recognize completely that our role is just one of providing technical advice and that's where we want to be. And so we're here expressly

to bring to you the opportunity to start this work and willing to work with you to do that.

And that is it, I believe that's the last slide.

(Matt): Great, thanks, Jim. Any questions? Yes?

(Jeff): Yes, (Jeff) (unintelligible) speaking. It's a - I'm - I'd like to discuss (unintelligible). You might have said it before but what are the data models about? I mean why should we - why should ccTLDs (unintelligible) and do that? And what was the - what's the use for?

Jim Galvin: The data model is an enumeration of the elements that are used, okay. What you get from that is the ability to have a standardized description of the information that's important to a domain name registration.

And if you have commonality - so if you have more than one registry, a telephone number is probably a really good example. If you have a specification for what a telephone number is supposed to look like, if you look to the IRD report it actually talks about the (unintelligible) 164 standard, which specifies, you know, what a telephone number should look like and how to be represented.

And if you agree and you standardize in that particular element all we're saying is that all the data model says is that whenever you use the telephone number this is what it looks like, this is how you should store it, this is how it is represented.

Then you create a profile that says, okay, I'm going to have several phone numbers, right. I might have a fax phone number, I'm going to have a home phone number, a mobile phone number. We all know what it's going to look like so I can look there to see.

So now I know how to work with it and if I want to do a display of it for a directory service I now know exactly what kind of data is that I'm working with. I'm still left in the display case. I can label it anyway I need to so I can call it a home phone number or a mobile or whatever, depending on the context in which the profile specifies it's used.

And of course, I can deal with it in whatever language, you know, or script that I need to deal with it in because I have a uniformed and standardized representation of that data.

So that's the purpose of uniform data model. It ensures that everyone knows what they're working with and that it allows you to leverage that for all of the other problems that we're trying to solve in this space.

(Matt): (Jim)?

(Jeff): Thanks, can you go back to the slide on lifecycle updated - yes, that one right there. I don't know if the members of the SSAC are aware, you know, some of the talk - or the contract negotiations in the RA include Whois data validation.

Has anybody looked at that and where this would fit into this domain name registration and any effects of it? Is that something that's on your agenda or not something that you would look at? I'm just curious about the role you would play in there and if you have looked at it, any opinions on it.

Jim Galvin: Data validation is a new topic that we have picked up during this meeting so it's currently just a formative work area. We actually had a very good meeting with law enforcement in particular to hear their concerns about data validation and understanding what that is.

From the point of view of this picture, again, this is just intended to be representative, you know, perhaps to (unintelligible). So the fact that it's

missing from here is, you know, just to keep the picture simple and not overly complicated. But, you know, validation would fit wherever it needs to fit.

From the point of view of a data model, you know, validation would be - out of scope would be an entirely separate issue, just a separate step. The data model just describes how you store the data or, you know, what the data looks like once you have it. And I would presume that getting it, validation would be part of getting the data, that's where that step would occur.

(Jeff): So - sorry, let's say forget about this picture and where it would fit in. Is it something that is - I know you spoken to them, is it something you'd listen and you said, okay? Or is it something that you will follow up on and it's on the SSAC agenda to review and decide upon?

Or is it - you know, it's good to know about, you'd want to hear from other people and that's all there is to it? I'm just curious about the next steps. My ignorance about how - you know, what the process would be.

Jim Galvin: We're always interested in comments and input from anyone about any topic at any time. So anything that you would like us to know about data validation we would welcome the opportunity to hear that and listen to it.

The way that SSAC works is, you know, we take suggestions for work items really from any source - from many sources. I mean typical sources are groups like this. We even - you know, create work items for ourselves sometimes.

The validation effort - what we left with law enforcement in particular was we simply took an action to bring it to the committee to evaluate whether there was work for us or not and if there was what we might do. So we just listened to them talk about their needs and they were looking for us to consider whether or not there was a technical comment that we could make about data validation.

Ultimately work items in SSAC have to be approved by the committee. I mean we have an executive committee that tries to manage that but the committee as a whole has to agree to work on something or not work on it. So it's really just in the formative stages at this point. We simply took an action to consider whether or not there was work for us there.

(Jeff): Okay, thanks to that, that's actually helpful. And I wouldn't volunteer myself but I'm going to volunteer this group and state that if there are any substantive discussions to please include us because we're an integral part of the domain name registration process and would like, you know, a say and for you to give our point of view on how validation and the effects it would have.

And so if you could just contact this group if there are further steps to let us know.

Jim Galvin: Actually, consider this a contact. I mean I really was quite serious when I - I said we welcome input from anyone who believes they, you know - that there's something important that we should know and you'd like us to react to.

So if you have comments or concerns or requests, you know, that you'd like us to make sure that we consider in data validation then please do bring that to us and provide it to us. It doesn't necessarily have to be formal either.

I mean individuals - if any individual would like to speak to any SSAC member you should feel free to do that and offer a point of view if you'd like to get that input into the committee and discussion.

I mean - or, you know, (Matt), of course, you can always create a formal comment or a formal question and, you know, send a letter through (Patrick),

you know, to the committee and ask us to answer questions for you if you like.

Man: Thanks, (Jim). So just a follow up question to (Jeff)'s, what kind of timing - just ballpark, I mean how does your process work in terms of taking an issue and going to the committee to see if that's something that the SSAC would officially take on as a project?

Jim Galvin: I suspect we will make a decision relatively soon. With any luck we might get some consensus this afternoon. We have a full committee meeting this afternoon from 3:00 to 6:00 pm we're meeting and we'll discuss this topic then.

But - so if not today relatively soon, within a small number of weeks we'll probably decide whether or not there's a work item there and then it's about staff resources. We all have staff resource constraints and so it will get put on the agenda and prioritized.

This is important work, all of this Whois related work is important and so it will probably fall out pretty quickly. If there's going to be work it will fall out pretty quickly.

Man: Okay, thanks. And then I'll just reiterate what (Jeff) said, you know, consider this stakeholder group to be at your disposal because I think if it already had been made obvious, not only in this session but throughout the week, it's an issue that's very near and dear to the member's hearts. So we're more than happy to collaborate.

Jim Galvin: Yes.

Man: Jim, just (unintelligible) reiterating what they've said obviously, two things. One, are you aware of the - what's the name of that bloody document, the extra operation requirements for registrars document that appeared as part of

the (unintelligible) negotiations, which is attempting to mandate DNS (unintelligible) as a mandatory requirement for all registrars, which I believe SSAC would have an opinion on? And we obviously have opinions on them. It would be helpful if SSAC were to weigh in on that.

And secondly, which registrars are currently in SSAC? I mean you used to have somebody from Network Solutions but he left the company. So I get the distinct impression, and I'm not trying to beat up on you or anything, but we seem to be kind of out of the loop with regard to SSAC. And 99% of your output would have a direct impact on us.

Jim Galvin: We actually had this discussion earlier in the week and I remember that the number is four. There are four people in SSAC with registrar expertise, Bruce Tonkin is one and now I'm going to not remember who the other three are.

If I could look at a list of members I could probably remember but I remember the number was four. We actually do have four members on the committee who have registrar experience.

Nonetheless, you know, if you want to question that and, you know, seek to be more directly involved in, you know, SSAC discussions I can certainly take that comment. I gather that's a point that you're trying to make. And...

Man: I mean this is not the first time I've raised this because we've had issues in the past where SSAC has issued papers with respect to registrar security and other things which have been put out by - in one case by an ICANN Board member who is involved with SSAC, which hadn't - without much consultation with ourselves and was forcing a particular view point, which while we could understand and appreciate what the endgame was it would have been a little bit more helpful if we had a bit more input into it.

Jim Galvin: Okay, thank you for that. I take your point that we should be more sensitive to getting direct engagement from the registrar community especially when we're publishing things that really are an integral part of your work.

I will certainly make sure in the case of the validation work that we seek input and comment from the registrar community expressly.

An important thing to keep in mind though is SSAC really does just provide advice and it provides commentary. Now I appreciate that advice tends to carry a fair amount of standing and thus it is often, you know, taken on board quite deliberately by many groups during many times.

So I take your point that you're looking for more direct engagement from the registrar community and I'll bring that back to (Patrick) and we'll figure out what we can do there.

Man: Basically - from a lot of the PDPs particularly around domain transfers, most of the background documents that we keep on being referred to, a lot of those PDPs will be SSAC documents.

Jim Galvin: (Unintelligible) 40 and 44.

Man: Possibly but that's the point, to say that you're - I think you may underestimate the importance and weight that is given to SSAC documents and that they are very important and they're viewed as such.

And we are - while you may have registrars listed as members of SSAC - and I mean choosing Bruce Tonkin, I think he's a little bit distracted by the fact that he's a Board member. So while he may be a registrar officially I think he's a little bit more tied up about...

Jim Galvin: (Jeremy Hitchcock) is another one, but anyway, good point taken. (Matt), we should - the action that really should happen, (Matt), is that you and (Patrick) should have a discussion and I'll make sure that message gets to (Patrick).

(Matt): Yes, no, that's good. And I was just looking at my watch remembering you said you had to leave at five of 2:00 and we've kept you at least five minutes longer than we had the right to. So appreciate that.

Man: Thanks for the update.

(Matt): We are going - yes, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: Yes, just let me know leave without reiterating, you know, the desire to really hear from you with respect to future work and progressing this activity. So whatever your processes are for dealing with that, just, you know, appreciate that you move that forward and let us know how you want to proceed from this point.

(Matt): Yes, no, appreciate that, thanks, Jim. Now we are - if you run quickly you can get out and get your Gala tickets perhaps. We've got about - no, gone already?

Man: The queue is huge and they did - they started before 2 o'clock. When I went out for a bio break a few minutes ago the queue was snaking around again and they were going through them. I don't know if there's any tickets left at this juncture.

(Matt): Okay, well, I guess you can't get your gala tickets. So we are going to take a break from this room and travel across country - actually two doors down I think to the Board - is it right next door? I think it might be one of those with two doors.

But anyway, it's our interaction with the Board so I'd encourage you all to make your way down there. And then for those of you in the Adobe room we'll reconnect here in - I think, an hour and 15 minutes if I recall or an hour-and-a-half actually. And we'll see everyone back in this room after the Board.

Man: And please stop the recording.

END