auDA REGISTRY TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION
PUBLIC MEETING

Tuesday 2 October 2001
2pm – 4pm
Maddock Lonie & Chisholm
Level 7, 140 William Street
MELBOURNE

RECORD OF MEETING

Attendance:
Jo Lim, auDA
Craig Ng, Maddock Lonie & Chisholm
David Thompson, Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu
Jim Breen, Monash University
Greg Watson, Monash University
Len Whitehouse, Monash University
Fred Accary, Domain Intellect
Gregg Rowley, eSign
Iain Waters, eSign
Tony Lentino, Instra Pty Ltd
David Taylor, Melbourne IT
Bruce Tonkin, Melbourne IT
Yann Courtel, Momentous Canada
Wayne McLaughlin, Momentous Canada
Larry Bloch, NetRegistry
Simon Delzoppo, RegistrarsAsia
Chris Wright, RegistrarsAsia
Robert Sandalis, VeriSign

Background:
auDA's Competition Model Advisory Panel reported in June 2001, recommending that auDA should tender out the provision of registry services for the .au second level domains (2LDs). The auDA Board approved the Panel's report in July 2001.

The Registry Technical Specification (RTS) is a major component of the registry tender documentation. The RTS was prepared for auDA by Jim Breen, Greg Watson and Len Whitehouse of Monash University, based on the recommendations contained in the Panel's report.

auDA released the RTS for public comment on 24 September 2001. The closing date for comments is 5 October.

Discussion:
Comments were invited on each section of the RTS.

1. Introduction

No comments.

2. Functional Specifications

2.1.3 (c) – change to "maximum length in 8-bit bytes".

2.1.6 (a) – 99.5% service availability (equating to approximately 3 hours downtime per month) was considered low for a mission critical system. However, increasing the requirement to 99.9% has cost implications. 99.5% is a minimum requirement, and tenderers will be able to offer higher, taking cost implications into account.

2.2 Registry Access Protocol
The following comments were made in relation to adopting the existing EPP versus creating a new IRRP:

- auDA's intention is to foster the local domain name industry by encouraging new entrants into the registrar market. The proposed IRRP is simple enough for firms with no previous experience to become registrars, thereby lowering the barrier to entry.
- The IRRP would make .au unique, and thus make it more difficult and costly for Australian industry participants (registry and registrar) to operate globally. It would also deter international industry participants from entering .au.
- Designing and implementing an entirely new protocol may delay the introduction of competition. There is no existing documentation or support services to assist industry participants to implement the IRRP.
- Although it is not yet an IETF standard, EPP core features are well-defined and are currently being implemented by the .biz and .info registries (.name will follow in 2002).
- EPP is well-documented and there is a large amount of information and support available over the Internet. The .biz and .info registries have developed EPP toolkits that are freely available to registrars.
- EPP can be readily adapted to support the .au domain name policy environment, through use of additional extensions.
- EPP generally uses TCP, but could also support SMTP for a simple email interface to registry for those registrars who do not wish to implement a more high-level technical operation. It would be a better use of auDA's resources to focus on providing different levels of access for registrars using EPP, rather than developing a new protocol.
- Although the protocol should not be too complex for new entrants, it is important that the barrier is not set too low, as this may compromise the integrity of the industry and the DNS.

2.3.1 2nd para – could leave to tenderers to ensure compliance with RFC2182 and performance specifications, without prescribing location of secondary nameservers.

2.3.4 (c) – 15 minute updates are possibly too high (eg. AUNIC updates are estimated to be 2-3 hours), although new technology is making more frequent updates more feasible.

2.4 Public WHOIS Service
The intention is to specify a complete WHOIS data set, however it is likely that auDA will restrict some fields from being disclosed on a WHOIS enquiry. For example, personal

contact details for individual registrants in the id.au 2LD may be restricted for privacy reasons; the domain expiry date may be restricted to discourage poaching.

2.4.3 – should the WHOIS data set include NIC handles?

2.4.3 (i) – does "term of registration" include the expiry date of the domain?

2.4.4 – WHOIS enquires carry significant load/cost implications for the registry. It may be desirable to restrict the free-of-charge WHOIS enquires to a minimal data set, and charge a fee for more detailed enquiries. This is something that tenderers may propose in their response to this section.

2.4.6 (f) – a maximum of 100 queries in any 24-hour period is acceptable for end users, but too low for registrars. Registrars should be able to negotiate a higher limit with the registry.

2.5 Legacy Data
What is the status of the 7,500 reserved domain names in the net.au registry?

3. Security Architecture

No comments.

4. Business Continuity Plan

Page 36, 6th para – change to "end of the next day" (not business day).

5. Data Escrow

5.1 Data Escrow Operation
The tasks listed in (a)-(k) may lead to downtime in registry operations (ie. registry will not be able to receive new registrations). A snapshot of the database should be sufficient for data escrow, provided it is sufficiently complete and up-to-date.

5.2 (a) – executable code is required as well as source code.

5.3 Data Escrow Formats
It would be desirable to use the same (or similar) format as ICANN.

6. Domain Name Expiry and Deletion

Page 46 2nd para – auDA will define the standard grace period. This may include a 2 tier process, where the domain is disabled for a period, before being deleted.

Page 46 3rd para – remove second sentence.

7. Reporting Requirements

(b) – change "reservations" to "registrations". Include number of expired/deleted domain names.

(f) – change to "number of daily database transactions".

8. Registrar Support Services

(e) – change to "to registrars" (not end users).

Suggestions were invited for any other registrar services that should be listed in this section.

Appendix A: Database Record Format

A.1 – are scode and ccode fields redundant?

A.3 – registrar identity and date of expiry should be included. It may not be necessary to include IP addresses, depending on the availability of a suitable mechanism for solving the glue records issue.

All records – address fields should be internationalised. Some fields that have been listed as "mandatory" should perhaps be "optional" for registrars (but note that "mandatory" also refers to data that is automatically generated by the registry, and not provided by registrars).

Next steps:
Attendees were encouraged to provide any further comments on the RTS in writing. All comments will be posted on the auDA website.

The Monash University team will revise the RTS, taking into account comments put forward at the meeting and other written comments received before the 5 October deadline.

The final version of the RTS will be included in the Registry RFT, to be issued by auDA in the week beginning 8 October.