

GOVERNANCE IN NAMESPACES

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE
STANFORD PROGRAM IN INTERNATIONAL LEGAL STUDIES
AT THE STANFORD LAW SCHOOL,
STANFORD UNIVERSITY,
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF THE SCIENCE OF LAW

By
Stefan Bechtold
May 2002

The assignment of numbers is also handled by Jon. If you are developing a protocol or application that will require the use of a link, socket, port, protocol, or network number please contact Jon to receive a number assignment.

RFC 776 (1981)

*Anyone can assign names.
We each do that all the time.
Ellison & Schneier, 16 (1) Computer Security
Journal 1, 2 (2000)*

eBay reserves the right to modify, alter or suspend any User ID at any time (at our sole discretion and without notice) for any reason whatsoever.

eBay FAQ at <http://pages.ebay.com/help/basics/f-faq-UserId.html#9>

Abstract

Since the creation of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), the regulation of the Domain Name System (DNS) has become a central topic in Internet law and policy discussions. ICANN's critics argue that ICANN uses its technical control over the DNS as leverage for policy and legal control over the DNS itself and over activities that depend on the DNS.

The ability to use technical control for policy and legal purposes is not a unique feature of the DNS. Rather, it can be observed in other namespaces as well. Namespaces are especially important in distributed computer systems such as networks. In a distributed system, namespaces can be used to identify four different kinds of resources: computers (or more generally: devices), users, files, and applications (or more generally: services). Examples of device namespaces include DNS, ENUM, IP and Ethernet addresses. Microsoft Passport is an example of a user namespace, while certain Peer-to-Peer systems provide file namespaces. Finally, TCP/UDP port numbers and UDDI are examples of service namespaces.

This paper analyzes namespaces in each of these categories and derives some common dimensions of the governance of namespaces. In particular, the paper shows how design choices at the technical level of a namespace directly or indirectly influence its policy and legal implications. It matters, for example, whether a namespace is merely controlled by technological means or also supported by contractual protection. It also matters whether namespaces are controlled by private or public entities, what their topology is, and what the intensity and scope of namespace governance is. All these dimensions influence how namespaces protect values, how they allocate knowledge, control, and responsibility, and how they interact among each other. Designing namespaces therefore should not only take technical considerations, but also legal and policy considerations into account.

Table of Contents

I. Introduction.....	1
II. What's In a Name?	8
III. Examples of Namespaces	15
A. Device Namespaces	15
1. Domain Name System	16
2. ENUM	17
3. IP and Ethernet addresses	19
B. User Namespaces: Microsoft Passport.....	21
C. File Namespaces: Peer-to-Peer Systems	26
D. Service Namespaces	32
1. Port Numbers.....	32
2. UDDI	36
IV. Dimensions of Namespace Governance	40
A. Mechanisms of Namespace Governance	40
1. Governance by Contract	40
2. Governance by Technology	46
B. Governance by Whom?.....	48
C. Namespace Topology.....	50
1. Flat versus Hierarchical Namespaces	50
2. Centralized versus Decentralized Namespaces	52
3. Proprietary versus Federated Namespaces.....	56
D. Intensity of Namespace Governance.....	60
1. Control versus Coordination.....	61
2. Coordination versus Uncoordination.....	62
E. Scope of Namespace Governance	69
1. Information-rich versus Information-poor Namespaces.....	69
2. Single-purpose versus Multi-purpose Namespaces	71
F. Implications of Governance Dimensions	74
1. Namespace Architectures Protect Values.....	74
2. Allocation of Knowledge, Control, and Responsibility.....	76
3. Interactions Between Namespaces.....	78
4. Fixed Structures in Changing Environments.....	81
V. Conclusion	82

List of Figures

Figure 1: Name Resolution in the TCP/IP Protocol Stack	20
Figure 2: Centralized Identity Namespace.....	24
Figure 3: Federated Identity Namespace	26
Figure 4: Centralized P2P Namespace	28
Figure 5: Decentralized P2P Namespace.....	30
Figure 6: Hybrid P2P Namespace.....	31
Figure 7: TCP/IP Packet (simplified)	34
Figure 8: Namespace Governance by Contractual Webs	41
Figure 9: Flat versus Hierarchical Namespaces.....	51
Figure 10: From Centralized to Decentralized Namespaces	53
Figure 11: Proprietary versus Federated Namespaces	58
Figure 12: Vertically Innovation-friendly Namespaces.....	73
Figure 13: Allocation of Knowledge, Control, and Responsibility.....	78
Figure 14: Interaction Between Namespaces.....	80