11-15-01 WHOIS CONSULTATION
MARINA DEL REY, CA

<u>MINUTES</u>

<u>*Moderator*</u>: Miriam Sapiro (VeriSign)

Panel

Mark Kosters (VeriSign)
Peter Dengate Thrush (.nz)
Bruce Tonkin (Melbourne IT)
Hakon Haugnes (GNR)

<u>*Attendees*</u>

Sarah Andrews, Electronic Privacy Information Center
Gertrude Bakel, GNR
Doug Barton,Yahoo!
Marilyn Cade, BC/AT&T
Christopher Chiu, Internet Democracy Project/ACLU
Leslie Daigle, VeriSign
Sabine Dolderer, Denic
Keith Drazek, NeuLevel
Howard Eland, Afilias
Karen Elizaga, GNR
Fernando Espana, NeuLevel
Chuck Gomes, VeriSign
Dan Halloran, ICANN
Hakon Haugnes, GNR
Raymond King, Snapnames
Elmar Knipp, Knipp GmbH
Eric Leinberg, Name Engine
Richard Lindsey, Afilias
Slobodan Markovic, Internodomm
Steve Metalitz, DNSO - IPC
Patrick Mevzek, Gandi
Laurent Millet, Foreign Affairs Ministry of France
Milton Mueller, Syracuse University
Andy Mueller-Maguhn, ICANN
Jeff Neuman, NeuLevel
Andrew Newton, VeriSign
Iliza Nickett, VOV
Tushiman Ogura, ICANET
Elisabeth Porteneuve, Afnic (.fr)
Geir Rasmussen, GNR
Christine Russo, VeriSign
Rachel Samolis, Classics/Business
Larry Vagnoni, NeuLevel
Stephan Welzel, Denic

Opening Remarks (Miriam Sapiro):

- Welcome
- This is the second of three consultations that VeriSign will be hosting to discuss whois database research and development efforts. The first focused on input from IP, business and law enforcement communities, this one on international input and the third will seek input from civil liberties groups and NGOs.
- Gave URL for website for public comment
- We understand that service is intended to include all TLDs, including ccTLDs.
- We will strive to achieve progress in development by 12/31/02
- Possibly two ways to proceed: develop intelligent searching capability; or encourage development of standard whois technology implemented by all gTLDs and ccTLDs.
- Clarify three points:
    o VeriSign mandated to launch this R&D effort
    o This is a technical effort, not intended to get into policy issues
    o Agreement with ICANN states if we can design protocols, we will make APIs available to applications developers in a non-proprietary and royalty-free basis.

Presentation (Mark Kosters):

- VeriSign is committed to this undertaking. In addition to the three ongoing public consultations, we have had informal meetings at RIPE, NANOG, etc.
- Universal whois: What do we see this as being?
    o Non-centralized approach
    o Not specific to any TLD Registry
    o Non-proprietary
    o International character support
    o Access control support
    o Only invent what is necessary, and re-use other technology when possible
- VeriSign's role:
    o Coordinating
    o Commitment
    o Listening
    o Welcome input from international community

Presentation (Peter Dengate Thrush):

- Clarified that he is not representing the ccTLD constituency
- Wasn't aware of Appendix W until now and sees it negatively
- This may be a mistake. Thinks that something other than ccTLDs was intended when Appendix W was drafted
- Wants to take this back to the ccTLD constituency and ask for participation
- May be discussed in connection with the ccSO discussion
- Hopes to come back next time with more positive comments

Presentation (Bruce Tonkin):

- Each whois database doesn't respond to queries the same way
- Offered some suggestions for design and appropriate forums for discussion

- Would like to see development of a requirements draft - make it a more formal process – so that he can take it back to the registrars constituency

Presentation (Hakon Haugnes):

- Defines whois and its purposes (used for availability, for checks, data mining, marketing, etc.)
- Open listing of individual's private details, open for illegitimate use
- Questions: what is legitimate use of whois? Is there a difference among various types of queries? Should there be access policies?
- What it should not be: high volume queries, data mining, general availability checks
- What it should do: respect local privacy policies, one-stop-shop for cross TLD queries, serve legitimate use, give data only on a need to know basis, circular reference checks
- Should be easy one-stop-shop, always up to date, centralized access, not data.

Discussion:

Jeff Neuman (NeuLevel): read portions of Appendix W regarding question of charging a fee; states that other Registries have agreed to provide their data to universal whois; believes that provider should not be a registry.

Sarah Andrews (Electronic Privacy Information Center): asks about phone-in capability for Monday's CDT meeting; would like consideration of meetings with data protection authorities.

Christopher Chiu (ACLU; and Internet Democracy Project): Would like to know which members of the business community, law enforcement and IP have participated in the consultations.

Miriam Sapiro: Minutes of meetings include a list of participants and are posted on our website.

Milton Mueller: Feels uncomfortable; registrants are being treated as subjects of surveillance; users have no choice but to put their information into a database; Can they opt out? Is this being done because of the agreement or because of a business desire?

Miriam Sapiro: Appendix W in the Agreements requires us to launch this R&D effort.

Peter Dengate Thrush: This isn't the forum for discussion re: the ICANN agreements; agrees with Jeff's comment re: profiting; nothing can happen with ccTLDs except upon consultations with their communities.

Chuck Gomes (VeriSign): Clarifies requirement in ICANN agreements.

Miriam Sapiro: There are people who believe that a universal whois service is important.

Sabine Dolderer (.de): Urges that this be as de-centralized as possible – centralized mechanism for getting the data but data itself should be decentralized. Each registry defines its policy requirements to implement local policy.

Elisabeth Porteneuve (.fr): Recalls Paul Kane's presentation in Geneva re: running Uwhois. Bottom line was there were only 88 ccTLDs running whois service. Agrees with Sabine's comments. All ccTLD managers should be consulted.

Lauren Gellman (RealNames): Wondering about international aspects. Will it be flexible enough to incorporate international domain names?

Mark Kosters: Yes, it should; need appropriate encoding.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks VeriSign for doing this work; would be glad to make further comments once he sees the requirements.

Mark Kosters: Requirements document will take consultations into consideration.

Bruce Tonkin: Echoes Jeff.

Leslie Daigle: Wants to address Jeff's concern that this is run through IETF appropriately – the answer is yes; we're still trying to frame what the problem is.

Hakon Haugnes: Is the proposal to look up non-dns databases, like Hotmail?

Miriam Sapiro: That's an open question.

Jordyn Buchanan (register.com): If IETF is not interested in it, perhaps that's a sign. Questions how and why certain data was picked and what the scope of this should be.

Karen Elizaga (GNR): Full and complete solicitation by VeriSign should include full information distributed to the target audience – would have been helpful before today.

Miriam Sapiro: Refers everyone to Appendix W and other information posted on our website

Fernando Espana (NeuLevel): What is the timeline to post the minutes of the consultations?

Miriam Sapiro: The last one, in a few days; these, hopefully soon.

Sabine Dolderer: Possibility for a switch for IDNs (choice to see national character set or translated)?

Doug (Free BSD Project): Free BSD Project offers applications, including whois. Problems haven't been adequately addressed and that seems to be by design. Free BSD Project offers solutions that don't require where this is going. If it is about returning information about people, this is problematic and lends itself to abuse. More universal format in query protocol would be useful. Encourages open source requirement be more thoroughly defined. As a software developer, he echoes Jordyn to finalize standards before implementing. Possible to query for more than just names and IP addresses – opposed to one-stop-shop for information about individuals. Concerned about privacy violations. Doesn't see this happening, but it shouldn't replace individual Registries obligations to maintain their own whois.

Sarah Andrews: Agrees with privacy concerns. Consider anonymous registrations for individuals? Distinction between information for commercial vs. non-commercial?

Sabine: Point of clarification: Not all Registries have personal information available. Highlighted differences in data collection and storage among different ccTLDs and some gTLDs.

Geir Rasmussen (GNR): Reinforces that database should be de-centralized and should have multi-entry point system. Should define policy making decisions.

Christopher Chiu: Questions the timeline – December 2002 deadline? Is there a tentative date for a draft document?

Miriam Sapiro: Clarifies that is the "goal" in the Agreements; can better answer after consultations are complete.

Doug: Dual systems – Registries and Registrars. Allow owners of domains to self-publish whatever information they want.

Bruce Tonkin: Issue with ICANN. Whois information is already distributed – need 2 searches, one at Registry and one at Registrar.

Chuck Gomes: There are two types of whois databases – centralized and universal – this is about universal.

Miriam Sapiro: Thanked everyone for coming. Adjourned meeting.