Registry Data Escrow/ Internet Registration Escrow BOF

IETF 77

March 24, 2010

Anaheim, California

Agenda

1. Problem Statement and Goal - 20 mins
2. Chartering discussion and potshots - 20 mins
3. Escrow Draft discussion - 20 mins

BoF

- The goal of this meeting is to determine whether we will form a Working Group
  - The decision rests with the Area Directors
- What is the work? Is there interest? Is there wide enough interest? Is the work focused?
- Can the goal be accomplished?
- Key ingredient - a proposed charter

Problem Statement

30,000 "units of length" view

- We want to define a way for all registration entities to backup the critical data in a standard way
  - In case of emergency
  - In case of other extenuating circumstances
- Items to discuss including:
  - Format, scope of registration data, whither transport

Escrow

- Definition from various dictionaries:
  - a contract, deed, bond, or other written agreement deposited with a third person, by whom it is to be delivered to the grantee or promisee on the fulfillment of some condition.

The "contract, deed..."

- The "contract, deed, bond, or other written agreement" referred can be
  - A domain name
  - An IP address (v4 or v6)
  - An Autonomous System number (2- or 4-byte)
  - ?

"deposited with a third person"

- The "third person" is a contracted entity who specializes in retaining data
  - No restriction on how the data is delivered or retrieved
  - This is not to maintain a history
  - This is not to be routinely accessed

"some condition"

- The condition for retrieving the data is usually a catastrophic failure of the owner of the data, for reasons including service related or financial
  - Service related - the facility burns
  - Financial - go out of business

The problem

- Internet registries maintain relationships between objects (domain names, IP address ranges) and entities (people, enterprises)
- These relationships are reported in DNS, WHOIS, used in routing
- The relationships are important in many ways and must survive any catastrophic event

The R*'s

- Registry - the main relationship recorder
- Registrant - the entity in the relationship
- Registrar - sometimes used "broker”
- Extended R's that can be involved
  - National Internet Registry
  - Local Internet Registry
  - Service operators (such as DNS)
  - Resellers

The relationship

- Entity
  - Person, legal body, company
  - Contact information, tech, admin, billing
- Object
  - Domain name, network range, AS
  - DNS servers where information is available
- Other possibly related information
  - Operational parameters, expiration, financial information

Issues for WG to Consider

- Thick vs thin registry environment
- History of data
- Data format – XML vs CSV vs ??
- Dataset to escrow
- What is not in scope?
  - Policies of the organization
  - Configuration of servers
  - Statistics collected

Why IETF?

- This issue is prominent in ICANN now and the effort originates there
  - But ICANN does not represent the majority of TLDs, just a few albeit big ones
  - This is an issue that transcends the type and mission of the registry environment
  - Registration coordination is fragmented - RIR meetings, RIPE, NANOG, APRICOT, CENTR, LACTLD, APTLD: all are regional

Is this IETF work?

- Interoperability of registry operations
- Want to be able to transfer data usefully from one organization to another
- Is this ICANN's work?
  - ICANN only works with some registries and registrars
  - Issue cuts across many operational and business models

Charter Discussion

Proposed Charter I (of 5)

- The objective of the IRDE WG is to produce a specification of the contents and format of data escrow deposits, allowing extensions to support new services and objects.

Proposed Charter II (of 5)

- The specification will allow a registration organization (different to the one making the deposits) to rebuild the registration services of the former in a timely manner, with minimum harm (downtime) to the users of those services (e.g., registrants, registrars, Internet users, etc.).

Proposed Charter III (of 5)

- Contents in the deposits will comprise the minimum set of data required to resume operation of the registration services of the original registration organization, assuming the organization will not be there to provide any input or help.

Proposed Charter IV (of 5)

- Given the importance and sensibility of the information involved, authentication, confidentiality and integrity mechanisms will be considered in the specification when transferring the deposits to and from the Escrow Agent.

Proposed Charter V (of 5)

- (Assuming becoming a WG soon.)
- Goals and Milestones:
  - May 2010 Submit first draft of IRDE specification.
  - Nov 2010 Submit draft IRDE specification to IESG.