

TRANSCRIPT

ccNSO Contact Repository Implementation Working Group Meeting in Prague

28 June 2012

Attendees:

Luis Diego Espinoza, .cr
Isak Jakobsen, .fo
Antoinette Johnson, .vi (phone)
Hitoshi Saito, .jp (phone)

ICANN Staff:

Bart Boswinkel
Kristina Nordström
Gabriella Schitteck

Luis Diego Espinoza: Okay, great. Great you join.

Antoinette Johnson: We're all here.

Speaker: (Inaudible)

Luis Diego Espinoza: Yes, okay. Let's start. I was thinking and rethinking and rethinking about this contract repository and my proposal in this meeting is to build a proposal of the specification of the service we want to ask for. And that we can review it and approve it and send it to the consent for consultation about the requests from some providers and according to the specification.

When we have the offers or leads we can review the different offers and make a recommendation with the offers and we can finish at the moment.

Then thinking about the scope of the repository, with all the work from Hitoshi and the diagram and all the other meetings we have many, many questions about how this committee should work. I found the weekend split in two process. The first process is

the directory service, (inaudible) directory service. There is a software system that stores, organizes and provides access to information in a directory or map between names and budgets. It is something like (inaudible) book and this service is really well known. An example of this service is an LDAP directory, L-D-A-P directory. It's a well-known system about this (inaudible) no new (inaudible).

Okay, the second part is a process where the information in the contract repository should be kept updated for accuracy. Then this kind of service, I found that is the same service provided a contact center. Looking for a little bit of information about how the contract center works, and one of the main services it provides is proof manage all the contact information through different channels of communications, such as telephone, fax, letter, email. Then in this way if this fits correctly in our mandate about the contact repository.

Then I have two parts. The directory service is a system that will provide like (inaudible) book storage information. And we can expect something like LDAP or something like that. And the other part is the contact center function.

Do you agree with that or do you have any comments about this focus? Hitoshi or Antoinette?

Antoinette Johnson: I think it's -- this is Antoinette. I think it's a very good direct approach. It would definitely streamline and simplify what is really needed. It sounds good to me actually and it makes a lot of sense.

Luis Diego Espinoza: Okay, thank you.

Antoinette Johnson: I question again where we would have to perhaps in my thinking develop a budget as far as how much we think something like this would cost. Because with an RFQ you're going out with a corrected proposal for it. We probably would have to think about that internally within the group. It's just my thought.

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart. If we understood you correctly, is that you wanted something to be included on the costs as well?

Antoinette Johnson: Not included, but I think we will probably, in order to narrow the scope or define the scope, we would have to kind of think about this, the directory service itself. It's two parts, if I'm understanding this correctly. Directory service and a contact center, which would actually be quote the repository.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Antoinette Johnson: So I was just thinking in my mind, just hearing -- and I'm just speaking out loud based on what Luis just shared with us. Just -- I don't know. This is -- something's missing, but I can't quite put my finger on it yet. But overall it sounds good because it's very concise. It's framed tightly.

Bart Boswinkel: Or maybe -- would it address your concern if we wouldn't call this a request for a proposal, but a request for information?

Antoinette Johnson: Oh, okay. That would change it. Thank you. Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: I've been looking at the charter. If you call it a request for information, then at least, because this makes it very difficult until now if we talk about costs, we have no idea how much it costs if you can't (inaudible) the providers. And based on these requirements, et cetera, and if you just call it another request for a proposal, because that would be the

next step in the process. But if you just go out and ask providers for the information, including how much the provisional sector service would cost, then you have an idea, which you can present to the council and the community and based on that you may refine or minimize the -- say, the requirements. And because before sending out the request for a proposal, in fact the council needs to request this to the working group. But with a request for information, you don't have that issue because it's nothing.

Antoinette Johnson: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: And then the working (inaudible) has a good idea of what it's really talking about. So it's until now we've been more or less guessing (inaudible).

Antoinette Johnson: Yes, thank you so much because as you were speaking, I have actually made that our notes of request for proposal and I was just -- there was a lot of things that weren't clicking with me, even though the specificity of the scope is excellent. But a request for information would definitely handle my concerns entirely. Thank you, Bart.

Luis Diego Espinoza: Yes, I'm agreeing with that and at least we need one or two (inaudible) price to have here (inaudible). We need to adjust some of the requirements to feeling the real offer in the market (inaudible). Yes, okay. Then okay. The request for information will be the name of this proposal.

Then okay. Hitoshi, do you have any comment about what we are talking about?

Hitoshi Saito: No.

Luis Diego Espinoza: I will send you the writings based on the information I found out about these two kinds of products, directory service and contact center. Mainly I use what is defined in a standard way for this kind of service and adapt it a little bit for emergency contact. But I will send you these today in a draft mode. Then here is to review it and complement it as soon as we can do it to have a request of information. (Inaudible)

Isak Jakobsen: This Isak. No, I think this is the way to go. Yes.

Antoinette Johnson: Absolutely. I concur was well. This is Antoinette.

Luis Diego Espinoza: Okay. (Inaudible) I (inaudible). The information that we will manage in this contact group history is (inaudible) information. Then the security of faxes to this information or the security of -- the level of security according with the different level of access I think is out of the scope of this working group. I'm calling this policy of the repository. It should be the rules on how the confidentiality, integrity and availability of the information and the governance of the repository should be taking place. And this in not related closely about costs or about systems. It's more related about how to handle information, how to provide a different level of access and how to manage the confidentiality of the information and integrity of that.

Then I'm proposing in this what is out of the scope and that could be something like policy of the repository. And but if you think we can construct this policy, you just let me know in the comments when I send the report.

I use this concept policy of the repository in a reference in many different places in the document. In the way we cannot -- we don't need to specify the level of faxes or the level of security of each data or each field in the system because this -- that rules will be provided by the policy of the repository.

As was stated by the chapter of this working group, there's the main use cases. The first and the, I think the most important is the response to that as of contact information, this data request will come from this (inaudible) or any other incident response team that needs that information.

The other case of use is contact management. The contact management is a typical system -- category system that will provide for (inaudible) that will be (inaudible) the search contacts. The second is at new contact. The third is update contact information. And the fourth is the lead contact information.

The other main use case would be (inaudible) proof of the information to keep up to date. And this will be -- will specify the process of the contact center mainly. And the fourth use case will be user (inaudible) and this user information will be (inaudible) to assign growth according to the policy of the overall repository.

Now the general requirements about the system, we already have it in the past, but I specify this. Supporting (inaudible) use cases, high availability of the system, the access to the repository shall be defined by a policy of the repository. Protect, (inaudible) and authorize the access and modification of repository contents. Primary and alternative communication centers provide interface for different services. In this case, I was thinking about to ask or request in request to the provider or to the provider that the system can be accessed not only by Internet, but maybe by email using email forms. Or maybe by another different kind of matching the change.

The order of the requirement. The repository able to store, search, deliver and delete company information. Part of the requirement is a reasonable manner that is kept accurate and complete. I add the reasonable manner because it is impossible to have -- or to require 100% of accuracy and completeness.

The repository is able to manage that data at many levels under (inaudible). Access privilege, (inaudible) research, okay. Okay. You will see the rest of the requirements in the document.

Okay, yes. The first -- use case number is the response to the debtor request. There's a fee here with the relations of the entities in data. The entities or (inaudible) will be -- the entities and response entities could be an incident response team or incident response type course. The other actor in this process will be the contact repository director.

I use a (inaudible), but it's defined. Then I just tried that the process load of these use case. By example, the incident response entity makes a better request to the contract repository operator. Then the contact repository operator makes an entry into track a request, then contact operator analyzes that request and this way so on and so on, until the process is completed with information or with the negative answer about the information requested.

The second use cases. In the contact management this is -- I defined it still the contact information facilitator. This is the (inaudible) that you'll have the information of the -- each contact repository. Each contact to be getting to the contact repository. And I defined four sub processes. These search contacts, create contacts, update contracts, (inaudible). And I have a process flow for each of these sub processes, but mainly keeping the same ideas, driving the (inaudible) step-by-step, like a flow diagram.

And the use case number three is the contact center like row. This is still in process, the easiest case. And the fourth use case will be use of management.

But the idea is -- or my proposal is send it to you, this document. Review what was writing and if you think there's other use cases, we can improve or add. You can add it following the same mechanics that I used to build the other use cases. And I will send you -- when we are sending you a document, I will send you the (inaudible) for what I want to finish this phase of the proposal of information. Request (inaudible).

Okay, then do you agree with this way to proceed? This could be approved in some way.

Antoinette Johnson: Luis, this is Antoinette. The approach sounds -- it sounds very good. I'm looking forward to receiving the document to look it over and comment.

Luis Diego Espinoza: Okay, great. Any other suggestions or (inaudible) on this? If not, we can end here and send you the document, the next step. And coordinate maybe a call to the (inaudible) for next month (inaudible).

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, we will send out a (inaudible) poll to everybody, so and maybe (inaudible) to schedule a couple of calls already up to for say moving forward. Because that makes what you say and we put it on the agenda again to really progress. One conference call is between now and Toronto is probably not enough.

Luis Diego Espinoza: Yes, it's Isak and I agree upon the proposal. It's fine with me.

Antoinette Johnson: It's extremely sequential. It's logical, it's easy to understand. I'm looking forward to seeing the document.

Luis Diego Espinoza: Hitoshi, do you agree with this?

Hitoshi Saito: Yes, okay.

Luis Diego Espinoza: This was (inaudible). That (inaudible) for today and let's see you soon, I hope. Okay? Bye-bye.

Antoinette Johnson: Good-bye, everyone.

Speaker: Bye-bye. Thank you.