TMDB Webinars
Collected
Questions and Answers

Version 0.4

Table of contents

1. Introduction and administrative information

1.1. Introduction

This document contains a repository of Questions and Answers (Q&A) gathered during TradeMark DataBase (TMDB) webinar sessions. Future questions may be answered by reusing this repository of resolved questions.
This document is intended for anyone seeking answers to TMDB related questions.

1.2. Document information

Subject	TMDB webinar collected Questions and Answers
Client	IBM GTS/ICANN
Auteur	Various
Datum	23-09-2013
Status	Added questions #13 and #14
Version	0.4

1.3. Changes

Version	Date	Author	Summary changes
0.1	June-20-2013	Wouter Schenk	Initial version
0.2	August-29-2013	Marta Bawor	Added questions from webinar on 28/08/2013
0.3	September-11-2013	Marta Bawor	Added questions from webinar on 04/09/2013
0.4	September-23-2013	Marta Bawor	Added questions #13 and #14

1.4. Approval

Name	Signature	Function	Date

2. Collected Questions and answers

This chapter contains the collected Questions and answers

2.1. Q&As TMDB Webinar session 21-08-2013

1.Why is there a different user name defined for each of the services (SMD Revocation List, LORDN, and DNL List). Can there be a single login and password for all services?
Currently, user names are system generated and different per TLD and per service. Passwords can be set by the Registry administrator and can be identical across services. It is possible to move to a model where a registry (TLD) has 1 login and password for all services and will review this request with ICANN.

2.Is there an password reset policies associated with the automated TMDB services (SMD Revocation List, LORDN, and DNL List)?
No, there is no password expiration. The password remains valid until the Registry administrator changes it.

3.Does the test environment provide a method to create SMD's (UI and API)?
No, the Sunrise & Claims OT&E environment does not allow to do that. (SMD generation is not part of the Sunrise & Claims platform but part of the Trademark Validation platform.)

4. Are the user id's specified by us (the user), so therefore we can decide to use a single user id?
User names are system generated and different per TLD and per service. Passwords can be set by the Registry administrator and can be identical across services.

5. Do you need to specify the active phase to support both sunrise and claims LORDN's uploads for testing?
No, in the OT&E environment both phases are active all the time. You have to complete the related Profile Pages in the TMDB application (https://marksdb.org). As a minimum you need to specify a password (this makes the Registry user name "active") and one IP address for the Test LORDN Service. For the LORDN service there is a single password and set of IP addresses for both the Sunrise and Claims LORDN file uploads and downloads of related LORDN Log Files.

6. Do you need to have the token to access the "register as registry" screen in the first place?
The homepage (https://marksdb.org) and the "register as registry" screen can be accessed without the registration token. To proceed with the registration and access the application, the token is required. The token will be provided by ICANN as part of the on-boarding package once a RA agreement has been signed. A process to provide Registries access to the OT&E environment prior to signing the RA is available with ICANN.

7. Why is certification required?
This is an ICANN requirement. ICANN wants to ensure readiness to start using Claims and Sunrise services.

8. If you see "Registry username: <Not activated>", how do you activate the user name?
You activate the user name by entering a password in the 'Registry password' and 'Password Verify' fields and pressing submit.

9. The LORDN file format includes the registrar's IANA ID. What values for this field will be accepted in OT&E?
All registrar IDs present in the token file we get from ICANN. We are working with ICANN to get all known accredited registrars included in that file, as well as the test ID 9999 or to provide an alternative solution.

10. When will the testing be available?
Sunrise functions can be tested as of Aug 9th, 2013. Claims functions can be tested starting September 9th, 2013.

11. Can we download the presentation?
The presentation will be available on ICANN's webinar pages at http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/announcements-and-media/webinars

12. Must a registry operator wait until the 9th of September for the claims functionality to complete Integration Testing?

Yes.

2.2.   Q&As TMDB Webinar session 28-08-2013

1. Will the steps required from a registry to complete Integration Testing documented in the User Manual change when the claims service is live?
The steps will remain the same, but further details on the test certification process will be published.

2. Can the email address listed in the ICANN Welcome package be altered?
The email address that is used to send the Registry administrator user ID and temporary password to is to be agreed between ICANN and the Registry during on-boarding. That mail address is communicated to the TMDB via a token file that is managed by ICANN. It can be updated by requesting ICANN CSC to update the Registry entry in the token file, which is synched with the TMDB on a frequent basis (every 30 minutes).

2.3.   Q&As TMDB Webinar session 04-09-2013 and 11-09-2013

1. Use of the whitespace in the signed marks of the SMD's - There was much discussion on the tmch-tech list about this, and there were many supporting the removal of the extra whitespace from the signed marks of the SMD's to reduce the likelihood of validation errors. Is the whitespace going to be removed from the signed marks of the SMD's and is a new set of sample SMD's going to be made available?
We have provided 2 test SMD's to ICANN with whitespace removed and we are going to generate the same SMDs without white spaces and without CA cert. This is on the request of ICANN in order to start the discussion with the community.

2. Use of separate user name for each TMCH service (SMD Revocation List, LORDN, and DNL List) - Can a single user name and password be used for all of the TMCH services?
 In order to satisfy this request we need to do a code change, we will discuss this with ICANN, and inform you accordingly.

3. Validation of the LORDN <IANA Registrar ID> in OTE - Is the <IANA Registrar ID> field of the LORDN going to be validated in OTE? Our OTE environments create two accounts per Registrar with non-official IANA ID's, since Registrars need a way to test transfers and the OTE system is the same as Production with a unique constraint on the IANA iD. If the registry OTE environments will link to TMCH OTE for LORDN, then they will fail due to invalid IANA ID's. My recommendation is to remove the IANA ID validation in the TMCH OTE environment.
We would prefer that the code is the same for PROD and OT&E, but we have issued a change request to ICANN in order to open up the discussion.

4. Active phase of TLD in TMCH OTE - For the TMCH OTE LORDN service will the launch phase be validated against an "active" phase or will the TMCH OTE environment support both the sunrise and launch LORDN files for each of the TLD's in parallel? If a single phase is validated per TLD in OTE how is the "active" phase set?
Yes, after the go-live of Claims, the Sunrise and Claims will both be active in OT&E.
The OT&E environment works independent of the pre-defined launch schedule.

5. Use of Server Name Identification (SNI) in Sandbox but not in OTE - The Sandbox required the use of SNI and currently OTE does not. Will OTE and Production require the use of SNI? If so when will OTE be updated to use SNI?
SNI will not be used in OT&E and Production.

6. LORDN Transaction Identifier for Duplicate LORDN - In OTE, the transaction identifier returned for a LORDN with the same creation date time as the previous LORDN should be the same based on what is stated in http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-lozano-tmch-func-spec-07. OTE currently is generating a new transaction identifier, which means that it's not idempotent.
This is not yet implemented. This requirement is new in http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-lozano-tmch-func-spec-07 and the planning/priority needs to be discussed with ICANN.

7. The LORDN service only support multipart/form data and not streams - The bulk of the LORDN clients will be software clients, where use of streams is preferred. My understanding from the Webinar today is that support for streams can be added. When can streams support be added?
Stream support is currently not on our release calendar, this can be added on ICANNs request. We will discuss this with them.

8. LORDN successful upload code should be 202 and not 302 - According to http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-lozano-tmch-func-spec-07 the interface provides a HTTP/202 status code if the interface was able to receive the LORDN file and the syntax of the LORDN file is correct. This issue was brought up on the prior Webinar and my understanding is that it has been added as an item to fix. When do you anticipate this will be fixed in OTE?
For this the application has been updated, and it has been released on 05-09-2013.

9. Precision of the <DNL insertion date> in the DNL List and the SMD <insertion-datetime> in the SMD Revocation List - The <DNL insertion datetime> and the SMD <insertion-datetime> in http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-lozano-tmch-func-spec-07 use a precision of a tenth of a second in the examples, but the files from OTE use a precision of a full second.
Issue has been fixed in the release of 13/09.

10. The LORDN <datetime of application create> field is currently required in OTE, but should be optional - According to http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-lozano-tmch-func-spec-07, the LORDN <datetime of application create> field is optional, but if it is not specified in OTE the LORDN upload fails.
From our investigation we believe this is working fine, but after the go live of Claim (09-09-2013) we will investigate it further, and correct if necessary.

11. LORDN Log File returning HTTP/403 instead of HTTP/204 when server has not finalized processing - According to http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-lozano-tmch-func-spec-07#page-38, the LORDN Log File provides a HTTP/204 status code if the LORDN Transaction Identifier is correct, but the server has not finalized processing the LORDN file. In OTE, the LORDN service returns a HTTP/403 when attempting to download the LORDN Log File prior to the server completing the processing of the LORDN file.
For this the application has been updated, and it has been released on 05-09-2013.

12. In OTE the LORDN <SMD-id> field must be less than or equal to 3 digits after the hyphen - http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-lozano-tmch-smd-02 defines the <smd:id> element as "\d+-\d+", which is used as the SMD-id field in the LORDN file. In OTE, attempting to pass an <SMD-id> value with more than 3 digits after the hyphen fails (1-123 works but 1-1234 does not work). The sample SMD's include <smd:id> values with five digits after the hyphen (e.g. 0000001701373633628125-65535 for Trademark-Holder-English-Active.smd). What are the format requirements for the <smd:id> value and subsequently the SMD-id field in the LORDN file that will be validated by the TMDB? Can the sample SMD's <smd:id> values match the validation rules of the LORDN service so that the sample SMD's can be used end-to-end?
For this the application has been updated, and it has been released on 05-09-2013.

13. In OTE the date formats of the DNL List <DNL List creation datetime> and <DNL insertion datetime> are incorrect according to draft-lozano-tmch-func-spec - In downloading the DNL list, the date format of the <DNL List creation datetime> is "YYYY-MM-DD HH:MM:SS.S" (e.g. "2013-09-10 11:17:13.4") while draft-lozano-tmch-func-spec includes an XSD datetime format (e.g. "2013-09-10T11:17:13.4Z") with precision of a tenth of a second. The date format of the <DNL insertion datetime> is similar to the <DNL List creation datetime> although there are 6 digits of precision for the seconds (e.g. "2013-09-05 11:33:26.800000"). The <DNL List creation datetime> should also use the XSD datetime format with a tenth of a second precision (e.g. "2013-09-05T11:33:26.8Z").
Issue has been fixed in the release of 13/09.

14. In OTE the time of the <DNL insertion datetime> does not use one of the two possible values of 00:00:00 AND 12:00:00 UTC defined in draft-lozano-tmch-func-spec - The <DNL List creation date> time element is not one of the two defined values of 00:00:00 AND 12:00:00 UTC, but instead has the value "11:33:26.800000".
For <DNL insertion datetime> fix is planned.
<DNL List creation datetime> contains the actual time the file was created. 'draft-lozano-tmch-func-spec' does not specify that only 00:00:00 and 12:00:00 can be used for this timestamp.