

**GNSO/SSAC
International Registration Data Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION**

Monday 1 August at 15:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO/SSAC International Registration Data Working Group on 1 August 2011 at 15:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnsso/gnsso-ird-20110801-en.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnsso.icann.org/calendar/#aug>

All recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO calendar page:

<http://gnsso.icann.org/calendar/>

Present for the teleconference:

Steven Metalitz -- GNSO Intellectual Property Interests Constituency,

Jim Galvin – SSAC -Afilias

Scott Austin - IPC

Robert Hutchinson - CSG

Avri Doria - NCSG

ICANN Staff

Julie Hedlund

Steve Sheng

Glen de Saint Géry

Dave Piscitello

Absent apologies:

Rafik Dammak -- GNSO Non-Commercial Users Stakeholder Group

Edmon Chung – Group Leader

Ram Mohan - Afilias – SSAC Board liaison

Sarmad Hussain, CLE-KICS, UET

Yao Jiankang, GNSO Registry SG

Glen de Saint Géry: I've seen that too and I'll get back to the operator, Julie, just a minute.

Scott Austin: This is Scott. I'm still on.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, we're here.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Good. Well we have something called the Meeting View which shows people who are connected. So on our view of the meeting we now see none of us but I think that...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...if those of you who are on the call you're still on - it sounds like you're still on the call so that's good.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Hello, am I in the meeting?

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, hi Avri. I thought I heard your voice. You are. It's a little confusing because I'm - Glen and I are having a little difficulty with the operator...

Glen de Saint Géry: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: ...getting started.

Avri Doria: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Okay I just...

Glen de Saint Géry: Excuse me, the recording has started.

Julie Hedlund: Oh the recording has started. Great.

Glen de Saint Géry: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: And even though nobody is showing up on Meetings...

Glen de Saint Géry: And he's going to get us back onto Meeting View so if we could just perhaps start and then do the roll call a bit later.

Coordinator: Hello, Glen?

Glen de Saint Géry: Hello, (Don)?

Coordinator: Yes. There's a different Meeting View number you need to join with that's why you're probably not seeing your participants on Meeting View.

Glen de Saint Géry: Okay what's it?

Coordinator: It's 37-48...

Glen de Saint Géry: Four eight...

Coordinator: ...905.

Glen de Saint Géry: ...nine zero five. Thank you very much, I'll do that.

Coordinator: You're welcome.

Glen de Saint G ry: And yes.

Julie Hedlund: And why don't - and so the recording has started so, Jim, you wanted to kind of set up the discussion for the call? So why don't we have you go ahead and then once we get the meeting view back in we can do a roll call?

Jim Galvin: Okay thank you, Julie. I know that Steve sent out the document this morning. And I had the opportunity last week since he and I were both at the IETF to sit down with him and have some discussion about the document. You'll see that he incorporated quite a number of changes. And he said in his distribution he had incorporated that based on a discussion with me.

Just to be clear I wanted to make sure that folks understood that I had given those comments to Steve as an individual not speaking as chair or attempting to direct anything that was coming out of the working group. And so, you know, all of those comments and suggestions are still subject to review and acceptance by the working group.

So I'll be very happy to answer any other - any questions or whatever about those comments but I otherwise will just keep my role as chair here on the call unless I need to speak to something specific. So I just wanted to get that out there right in front so there was no confusion from people. And other than that we can continue the discussion that we had from last week.

Our goal here is to establish that this outline represents at least in bullet form with the bit of discussion that's there the points that we want

to make. And then we need to continue to expand the text and fill this out. This is essentially intended to become our final deliverable and document for this working group.

So with that let me turn it back to you, Julie, or perhaps to Steve and we can open the floor for questions or I don't know, Steve, if you prefer to step through the document where we left off last week.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, first - this is Julie. First perhaps we'll do a roll call for the record.

Glen de Saint Gery: Yes, certainly, Julie. Good morning, good evening, good afternoon everyone. This is the IRD call on the 5th of August. And on the call we have Steve Metalitz, Jim Galvin, Rob Hutchinson, Avri Doria. And for staff we have Julie Hedlund, Dave Piscitello, Steve Sheng and myself, Glen de Saint G ry. Thank you very much, Julie. And apologies for the inconvenience.

Scott Austin: Glen...

Glen de Saint Gery: Yes.

Scott Austin: ...this is Scott Austin. I wasn't sure if I was on the list.

Glen de Saint Gery: Hi, Scott. No, you're not on the list. Thank you - yes you are on the top. Thank you very much for telling me. Scott Austin is on the call as well. And we're going to try and get a hold of Rafik Dammak. Thank you.

Scott Austin: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Glen. Steve, do you want to go ahead?

Steve Sheng: Sure, Julie. So what does the working felt that if we just go through the document section by section from where we left off last time? Is that okay?

Julie Hedlund: Hey, this is Julie. That sounds like a good plan; it worked well last week.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, this is Steve Metalitz. Just looking through this last version that was sent out a few hours ago I - am I right that most of the changes that Jim just referenced are in the recommendation section? I didn't see very many changes prior to that compared to what we were looking at and discussing last week.

Steve Sheng: I think that's correct, yeah.

Steve Metalitz: All right, just wanted to make sure I didn't miss something.

Steve Sheng: Yeah so there isn't much change...

Steve Metalitz: Okay.

Steve Sheng: ...at all. I did incorporate the comments from the working group too, for example, you know, in Section 2.2 from Bob's suggestion to remove the managed and also, you know, align the bullet points as to (collective) (store) and display it so that's one change I make.

Another change would be to just to clarify things a little bit. But not much change at all. So I didn't hear any objections. Then perhaps well we can continue - we can start with Section 2.3.

Current practices by registrars and registries and ccTLDs to support the display of internationalized data. What do the - what does the working group feel about this section? Is there something I missed? Is there something we need to add? Something that needs to be taken out?

Bob Hutchinson: Steve, this is Bob Hutchinson. And when I read this section the second line where it says support of ASCII 7, character return line feed is the only (obligation) I believe that many of the ccTLDs and some of the gTLDs are currently using UTF-8 and I'm guessing that that's how they're doing their internationalized support today.

But this doesn't reflect that it sort of only - it only reiterates what's in the - what's in the current Whois standard not what - the reality of what is actually being used today. And I guess since we're addressing current practices I thought that other part should be...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Sheng: I think that's a excellent suggestion. So you're suggesting the second bullet point that only refers to the Whois protocol, right? And then maybe add other practices by other, you know, registries. Is that correct? That's somewhat covered in the third bullet point or fourth bullet point. Certain registries have developed various ad hoc TLD-specific conventions for signaling. Is that - does that cover that point?

Bob Hutchinson: I guess I would, you know, I would say basically that - I would then reword that it's I would say to support internationalized data...

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Bob Hutchinson: ...many registries have developed or many - I don't know how you would word this or leave it up to the group. Many registries currently support UTF-8 or something like that.

Dave Piscitello: This is Dave. A while ago we actually surveyed ccTLD registries on what they use and not all of them use UTF-8 some use UTF-16 and some use ISO 88 or 9, you know, I think the ISO standard - and some support multiple, you know, character sets.

So I don't want to, you know, be too picky about this but I think that what we can say is that people use character sets other than ASCII 7 with their own signaling mechanisms but I don't know whether we could say many or whether we can say a handful, you know, or what's many today may be very small, you know, two years from now if we have many more TLDs so.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Galvin: This is Jim. We should be able to list some examples though, right? I mean, we don't have to say - we don't have to try to give any kind of quantitative indication of use but I think it would be helpful for context in the filled out text to list what we do know is being used just for, you know, exemplary purposes.

Steve Sheng: Okay so what I'm hearing that there's a need to list a few of these other practices.

Bob Hutchinson: And then - Steve, can you explain what this third bullet means? Is that...

Steve Sheng: The registration data directory service (unintelligible) only supports the mission and display using US ASCII. That bullet?

Bob Hutchinson: Yeah, using ASCII 7.

Steve Sheng: I think this is a current practice. So most of the current - most of the data, you know, it is in US ASCII. And many of the services only support that at the moment. I mean, there are - there's a couple with the fourth bullet point that some registries, you know, have, you know, do support others.

Bob Hutchinson: Well I guess the, you know, what is the commonly term referring to here? Are you talking about more than half of the gTLDs or ccTLDs?

Steve Sheng: Oh okay I see so you want the terminology to be more precise?

Bob Hutchinson: I'm not understanding what the point of this bullet is, okay?

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. Let me ask the following: To the extent that the previous bullet talks about the support of, you know, US ASCII is the only obligation it might be better if we're going to try to make a quantifiable reference to fold it into the second bullet rather than trying to call it out separately and just observe that, you know, typically that is how it's done or maybe just drop the bullet all together.

I guess is that the point you're making, Steve, it seems redundant in the presence of the second bullet?

Steve Sheng: Okay. All right we can - I guess we can remove it if this is not clear and it's redundant.

Jim Galvin: Well, I mean, I'm glad, Steve, that you're agreeing to remove it. That was Steve Metalitz who was making that question was it right, I mean, does removing it respond to the question that you're raising or...

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I did not raise that question.

Bob Hutchinson: This is Bob Hutchinson.

Jim Galvin: Oh it's Bob, I'm sorry, so, Bob...

Bob Hutchinson: Yes, I'm sorry. I should have identified myself. Yes I raised the question. I was just asking for clarification as to why it's in here and do we need it and so on.

Steve Sheng: Okay. I think how about we remove it for the moment and, yeah, let's just remove it I think it's - oh the second and third can be combined together or in some fashion. But I did get your point, Bob. Let me strike that.

Besides that are there any other comments for this section? Okay hearing none let me note to myself to remove this. Okay so Section 2.4 Whois protocol. Any comments?

Bob Hutchinson: Yes, Steve, this is Bob Hutchinson again. I had one more comment.
Where it says certain registries have developed ad hoc or TLD-specific conventions...

Steve Sheng: Right.

Bob Hutchinson: ...for signaling.

Steve Sheng: Right.

Bob Hutchinson: I guess what I'm not seeing in this current practices is that, you know, a clear statement that ccTLDs that cater to internationalized clients or have heavily internationalized client bases...

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Bob Hutchinson: ...have already worked around the current standards, okay. And it says certain registries have developed various ad hoc or TLD-specific conventions for signaling but that's, I mean, that's for signaling I'm - it's not for the containment of the data and so on and so forth. I mean, I would say that, you know, registries which - whose business target countries with internationalized - I don't know how we want to say this - languages or - with languages that require greater than ASCII 7 support have already figured out a way to do this. And I, you know, that's what I'm not seeing in here.

Steve Sheng: Okay. So I got your point. I can add some more to that point. Yeah. So I think what you want - what you're saying is to complement the third bullet point, you know, the signaling is the enabling part but you want

to add that, you know, actually some of this data is ready in other encodings other than US ASCII. Is that...

Bob Hutchinson: Right.

Steve Sheng: Is that what you're saying? Okay.

Bob Hutchinson: Yeah and I don't know whether that comes in the first bullet that basically says no standards convention or policy exists...

Steve Sheng: Right.

Bob Hutchinson: ...but absent that...

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Bob Hutchinson: So we haven't figured out how do we, you know, haven't figured their own way how to work around those situations.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Bob Hutchinson: I mean, that's - if we're trying to present what the world is today.

Steve Sheng: Okay, all right, I got your point. So I will either add that to the first bullet point or the - add to the fourth bullet point. What I will do is when I actually wrote the report if you could comment specifically on this section so that I make we get it right and reflects...

Bob Hutchinson: Yeah.

Steve Sheng: ...the opinion.

Bob Hutchinson: Not a problem.

Steve Sheng: Is that okay? Okay, thank you.

Bob Hutchinson: Thank you.

Steve Sheng: So I'll take a note to myself for that. Section 2.4 any comments? Okay going once, going twice, okay I haven't seen any comments. So let's move on - so shall we move onto Section 3, international standards.

Okay hearing no objections so in this section in Jim's earlier outline was to - we're trying to decide whether to put this in the background or, you know, put it in at a separate section. And the thinking is since some of the (extenders) that the working group did reference later on it would be good to put in the section here and - as a separate section.

And there also when the interim report put out for public comment we got some feedback for example from, you know, IETF experts, you know, there are some standards for transliteration so, I mean, I'll also put them there.

So this is standard - I separate it into three sections, IETF-based standards, UPU, that's the ITU standards and also the - there are some standards for transliteration. Do people have comments on this section?

Bob Hutchinson: Steve, this is Bob Hutchinson again.

Steve Sheng: Go ahead, Bob.

Bob Hutchinson: I guess a list of standards is appropriate. I agreed with the overall sentiment of this. But I also believe that the list of standards doesn't help much anybody who's reading this unless we actually make a comment about how that standard is relevant or not relevant to this work. And...

Steve Sheng: Yeah so fair point. What do others think?

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. My expectation in having included this section is that we would in fact speak in filling out the text to exactly the point that you're making. You know, we would indicate that there are some recognized and accepted standards for some of the data elements. And that as policies are developed in the future it would be good to take advantage of these rather than trying to do something new.

You do call out something interesting and now that I'm thinking about it we don't actually have a finding or a recommendation that speaks to that issue. I had expected to put some text like that in this section but we probably should think about adding a specific finding or recommendation that speaks to this too. So let's make a note about that too, Steve...

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Jim Galvin: ...to add that too.

Steve Sheng: So add a - so, Jim, what you're suggesting adding a finding based on these standards?

Jim Galvin: Yeah, okay. So you want me to think out loud about what to do here. What I'm thinking is that we somehow have to speak to exactly the issue that he raised. We want to say that the reason why we're including these references is because they're appropriate to use for data elements, you know, for internationalization purposes.

I think as a factual matter we can state that in a finding that these things do exist. It's an open question as to whether we also want to add a recommendation that says that this group would recommend that, you know, wherever data elements that could take advantage of these standards are, you know, used or created they should use those standards for internationalizing them.

You know, I don't want to word smith this here, I mean, if people at least understand the concept and are acceptable with that we'll have to work through word smithing exactly what we want that to say.

Steve Sheng: Okay. So are people on the call in general okay with that finding?

Bob Hutchinson: This is Bob Hutchinson again. I'm perfectly happy with that as an approach.

Scott Austin: Yeah, this is Scott Austin. That sounds good to me.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Any others? Steve? Steve? Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Steve Sheng: Is that okay? So you're okay with that finding too? All right then we can try to - I can try to word smith into it. Okay so any other comments before we go into findings? Going once. Going twice. Okay so let's go onto Section 4, Findings.

So in this findings I changed it slightly different from the interim report in that I organized it. So the Board asked us essentially kind of two questions. First, was the - is it desirable to have, you know, to represent domain name registration in non-US ASCII? And second, you know, is it feasible to introduce displayed specifications?

So when I'm working on this outline I thought, you know, it would be good if we can direct response to the Board request and separate our findings into, you know, is it desirable, you know, and is it feasible. Are people okay with that approach? Okay, no objections.

So Section 4.1 what do people think?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. In the...

Steve Sheng: Go ahead, Steve.

Steve Metalitz: ...next to the last bullet there I think...

Steve Sheng: Go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: ...the last sentence is not complete. In some cases such as law enforcement and electronic crime investigators...

Steve Sheng: Oh sure.

Steve Metalitz: So I think that needs to be fleshed out. I think that's Rod Rasmussen's comment that was...

Steve Sheng: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: ...referenced there so...

Steve Sheng: Yeah, yeah.

Steve Metalitz: And I wasn't clear on what the last bullet meant.

Steve Sheng: So the last bullet - other interests do exist. The working group can't speak to those interests because their purpose with the data was not clearly defined. Jim, you want to speak to this?

Jim Galvin: Yes. We do call out, you know, law enforcement specifically. But for example I was trying not to get - trying not to let this group get bogged down in too many other options so the particular thing that I had in mind with this sentence was that intellectual property interests also care about domain name registrations and the data that goes there.

And there probably are other things, I mean, the two obvious things obviously are law enforcement and intellectual property interest. But the main point to be drawn from this finding is the fact that registration data serves purposes other than just the lifecycle of a domain name.

And I think that this group should, you know, speaking as chair, its focus should be just about, you know, feasibility and suitability of

displaying data and getting the data in that form and not try to speak to the issue of use cases of the data.

Although as we get into the next section, Steve, one question that came to my mind is I realize that even with the recommendations that are there we don't explicitly state the fact that there's no specific policy for the purpose of data. Is it just to serve a domain name lifecycle or is it to serve other needs and purposes which I think is an interesting point.

So anyway, you know, answer the specific question the point here is there are use cases for this data and I wanted to specifically scope in this document that we're only dealing with the suitability and feasibility of doing this and not addressing concerns that might be put forth based on use cases of the data.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. Thank you for that explanation. It's hard to make a finding about desirability of doing something if you don't take into account, you know, how the data is used, isn't it? I mean, I thought the proceeding paragraph says this.

There are other uses and we give an example there citing to a comment that was actually made. I mean, I don't, you know, I'm fine to say we're not trying to comprehensively, you know, address all the uses but just to point out that for some uses there are issues with internationalized registration data.

I'm comfortable leaving it there but I just wasn't - I wouldn't want to say we're not taking uses into account. We're not trying to comprehensively

survey all the uses that a long list of them in the Whois principals that the Governmental Advisory Committee adopted.

There was a debate over a two-year period within ICANN over what is the purpose of Whois data. So we don't really need to reopen any of that stuff I don't think. But I think the preceding paragraph kind of makes the point that for some uses of Whois data there are issues with internationalized registration data.

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim again. So thank you for that - for your question and your comment. I mean, yeah there's room for some clarity here. And as we begin - as we develop this text further in the next iteration you're right that last bullet is probably an overstatement of what we're trying to accomplish. And so, you know, maybe just a simple comment that there may be other things that we're not taking into account is sufficient. Just referencing the fact that what we are saying is not intended to be comprehensive.

But then as you say we could also reference some of the other work that we know has existed just for completeness and reference in this document so that people know that we, you know, we're at least paying attention in choosing to do what we did. So thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Scott Austin: Steve, this is...

Avri Doria: ...I can add?

Scott Austin: Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I think - I'm not sure, Jim, what you meant about listing the other work because I actually think we want to stay away from any of the policy discussions at all.

And so I think finding a neutral expression of what the uses may or may not be as a point as opposed to pointing to anything because if we start pointing to things then we may get into subjective evaluations of what was the validity of the outcome of that. If we're including the outcome of that why aren't we including the outcome of this?

And I think for this group it's probably better if we just say something abstract about, you know, there being policy work that talks about uses and we're going to stay away from it.

Jim Galvin: So, thank you, Avri. I actually like that. But I am interested in what other people think. Can we get a sense of the group on whether people support that?

Scott Austin: Well this is Scott Austin. I guess my question then - my interest is as a trademark lawyer in terms of the intellectual property aspects of this. But one of the things that I wanted to get involved in this group in fact was pretty much this issue.

And I guess the question we're supposed to be answering is it desirable to represent domain name registration data in non-US ASCII? I mean, I think that we've answered that question at least there is a statement thus it is desirable based on the first three paragraphs.

I guess the question it begs is are we representing it only in non-US ASCII or should it be convertible into ASCII? And again I'm a latecomer to this group so I don't want to slow you down but I guess the question is has there been discussion that while it's okay to put it in non-US ASCII is it supposed to be convertible into US ASCII or some means so that a language that's extremely unique could not be a means to essentially be a form of encryption so that it's kept from law enforcement or a safe harbor for infringers?

Jim Galvin: So we have actually had - this is Jim speaking - some discussion about that. And you'll note that there is a recommendation in there - the second one as I recall - and I apologize I don't have the document open in front of me anymore - which speaks to the issue of translation and transliteration and makes the observation that this issue needs to be addressed in a larger context. But that's a policy question and that this group is not going to answer that question specifically.

There is obviously the issue of burden on what it means to put things in a single language or - and who bears that burden and at what point in the process it needs to be there. So I think my answer to your question is that it's a - it is a recommendation that that particular issue needs to be addressed.

Scott Austin: So - because I guess my point is if our question is as open-ended as what 4.1 says is it desirable? Well it sounds like it's desirable to be inclusive but it's also not desirable to allow it to be abused as a subterfuge. If someone's language or character set is so unique or so difficult to translate that there's only a few human beings on the planet that can do that then, you know, there's a potential for abuse.

And I just want to make sure that that's been characterized someplace or maybe in that discussion - I don't see that as policy I think it's part of the analysis of answering the question.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. If I can comment?

Steve Sheng: Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: I actually think that that is bringing in a policy. As soon as you start talking about doing something because somebody may or may not abuse it you've left talking about the technical capabilities to talk about.

So while we want to talk about it needing to be possible or it not needing to be possible technically to do something I think to include the notion of people abusing and subterfuge and why someone might use a little known language because they're trying to subterfuge would be a really unfortunate thing to see added to this particular bit of work.

Scott Austin: Well maybe not with those terms. I'm using that in this forum just as a - the reason I suggested. But maybe the notion that there should be capable - it should be capable of translating into the other language - sorry the ASCII.

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. And speaking as chair and the discussions that we've had before about this issue really does - separating out the notion of abuse and, you know, subterfuge and those kinds of things the way that we have characterized this issue thus far in this document is that registrants are monolingual and there should be the opportunity for them to be that.

So where that leaves us is with the question of translation and transliteration. And we realized in our discussions in particular that there's - it's not possible for us to solve that question because that issue of who has to do that and where that should occur is a much larger issue that involves more parties than we have in this discussion.

Because one can talk about should a registrant do it, should the registrar do it, should a registry do it, should law enforcement have to do it for itself, should intellectual property interests have to provide their own service to do this? There are reasons for and against each one of those positions and this group is not the place for that decision to be made. So that becomes a policy discussion and that's why it's a recommendation and we put it forward to that place.

Would anyone like to add anything to that?

Avri Doria: Yeah, this is Avri. Just as a suggestion, I mean, not a suggestion but a further for example given that most registrants in the world we expect as the IDNs go forward will be monolingual; that's the whole point of IDNs, you know, other than the few people that may be waiting out there to abuse it because wow what a cool way to encode something.

But most of the people that will be doing IDN registrations will be monolingual in a script that is not ASCII. And so then it immediately becomes well since it's incumbent on anybody maybe it's incumbent on registrars to be doing something and at which point, you know, we've made a policy decision that imposes upon then work and expense.

And so, you know, then as I said then it goes to what, you know, Jim is talking about, well it's not the registrant because they can't and not the registrar because of expense and whatever and that being a policy decision then it moves to what Jim said.

So I agree with what Jim said; the only thing I wanted to add was the fact that, you know, to have the registrar do it has been also objected to simply because of the work and expense.

And when we talked about automatic transliteration capabilities that was shown to be something that wouldn't give a necessarily reliable answer anyway. So it really is a hard question.

Jim Galvin: Scott, any further comments from you?

Scott Austin: Well I just think that, I mean, I mean, then we're essentially walking away from it and saying that somewhere someone that has less technical skill and ability to understand it is just going to - is going to answer the question.

You've raised it there that says other interests do exist. I don't know why we want to leave it - that inarticulate but that's fine if that's - if the consensus of the group is that we are merely technicians and that the aspects of it beyond that in terms of how it would affect it.

I would suggest, Avri, that the cost will now be put upon the thousands of trademark holders across the world that will now have to take it upon themselves to find a re-transliteration, etcetera. And maybe that's - your policy sees that's the best way to do it. I guess, you know, that's just something that we'll disagree on.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I'm not making a policy evaluation on who should do it. You might actually find me arguing that well yes it's unfortunate that there's an expense to the registrars but, you know, we should come up with something and they should do it. I don't know. We haven't talked about it yet.

But I'm just saying that we can't put it on the registrants because they can't do it and there isn't a reliable transliteration. So given that we've gone no automatic transliteration and registrants can't then, you know, it really does become a policy and you've got to bring the registrars into the discussion to decide if this is something that, you know, they're going to take on or not.

And certainly this group can't make that kind of decision because that does become a GNSO policy decision of who is responsible. And, you know, perhaps I will fall on the side you say that, yes, every, you know, trademark lawyer has to be able to do it. I don't know. We haven't talked that through yet but this isn't the group to do it.

Scott Austin: Yeah, well I guess I'm still questioning the assumption that the registrant can't because it seems to me if there's an encouragement for them to do that as a lot of people do when they register a trademark and they want to submit it in another language and they have to include an English translation or a patent then they do that. But maybe at this level, maybe at the registrant level, you're suggesting that they don't have the funds.

((Crosstalk))

Scott Austin: I don't want to argue against myself.

Avri Doria: I mean, these - we're talking...

Jim Galvin: Okay - so folks...

((Crosstalk))

Jim Galvin: Avri.

Avri Doria: ...IDN.

Jim Galvin: Yeah, Avri and Scott so, you know, I do want to try and cut off this discussion about, you know, the policy and where it belongs. We have talked about this a great deal in this group.

I mean, Scott, I think ultimately the right answer is not that we're technicians and ignoring it it's that we have had the discussion, we recognize that there's a cost associated with it and then we further recognize that that cost could be shared in multiple different places and it was out of our scope to decide where to put that.

Okay so I think that's the right answer not - I would characterize it that way not in the way that you did. So we're expressly calling out that we have an issue. We're expressly recommending that that particular issue be dealt with. And in response to your concern that the last bullet is vague and otherwise, you know, sort of leaves out your interest I would welcome suggestions from you as we go forward in expanding this text to offer up, you know, any words that you feel would better represent your interest to make sure that they're not overlooked and...

Scott Austin: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Scott Austin: Yeah, I'll accept that challenge. What's the deadline for rewriting that one sentence?

Jim Galvin: As soon as you can; this is a work in progress.

Scott Austin: Okay.

Jim Galvin: So as soon...

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. Can I get in the queue?

Jim Galvin: Yes Steve, please, go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, I think one way to approach this might be - let me back up a second. On the interim report we actually put out these four different options to really address the very question Scott asked. And we said here's four different ways of doing it. We had a lot of - a number of public comments including people suggesting other ways of doing it.

So I don't know if we're now saying that all of the work we did on that is out of scope or simply that we aren't reaching a conclusion on it. But it certainly - I think it was probably useful to have that discussion and I would disagree with Avri that we've made any decision that it can't be imposed on the registrant. But that's one of the options that was

discussed. So it's kind of - I don't want to say that this is out of scope, it's - it may be something we can't reach a conclusion on.

The second point I would make about our previous interim report is as we have in the next to last paragraph here we have a reference to one of the comments that came in on that interim report. And maybe one way to get across the point that there are uses of Whois data that could be hampered by internationalized registration data and that, you know, has to be taken into account is simply to cite some of those other comments.

And Julie has prepared a summary and, you know, I think we could draw from some of those other comments. Again I'm not suggesting this is any type of a show stopper; I'm just saying that it's worth acknowledging that there - while it is desirable to move toward an internationalized registration data scenario there are also some issues that have to be resolved. And it's kind of - that's kind of done in the next section, 4.2.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. If I can comment since I was mentioned?

Jim Galvin: Yes please Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay, yeah, I did not say that we had made a decision. I basically said it's obvious that many registrants wouldn't be able to. And I'm not going back on the fact that we did present four possibilities but didn't zero in on any of them as being the solution because of what Jim said in terms of the costs and who bore them and what worked and what didn't work.

And we left that open and leaving that open is, you know, what I'm recommending we continue to do.

Jim Galvin: So - this is Jim. And speaking as chair let me suggest, Steve Sheng, that, you know, Steve Metalitz is right; we should - we certainly don't want to lose that discussion that we did have. We need to find a way to pull forward those issues that we did identify and make sure to include them in some way.

I don't have an immediate suggestion on how to do that so we're going to have to take that back as an action to make that happen. And I think the real statement to make here is that we didn't come to a conclusion because we ultimately recognized it as a pretty significant policy question. And so that's why one of our recommendations is to visit that particular policy issue.

So I guess I'm also responding to the comments as to whether or not this is in scope or out of scope. I think it's in scope to the extent that we sort of explored the issue and we have, you know, drawn it down to a very specific question and a particular issue. And I think that that's a good conclusion on our part to have come to and to recognize exactly what the issue is that needs to be addressed.

So there's some work to be done here in developing some text to pull all this together. And we'll have to look for the next version of the document. And I think Steve Sheng would be very happy to take suggestions from anybody on exactly what text should go where in terms of how to do this.

Steve Sheng: Right.

Jim Galvin: Does that sound fair to people? Anyone disagreeing?

Steve Metalitz: That sounds good to me. Steve Metalitz.

Scott Austin: Sounds good to me. Scott Austin.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Jim. And I'll work with you and if you suggested places. So in the interim - in this outline I did list those models. And I did highlight several key questions. I will work with you. We can either elevate that to a separate section instead of a sub-bullet or we could keep it in this way but we add more content.

So I would like to ask when the next version comes out, you know, people pay particular attention to that section and make sure that, you know, we covered the things that the working group wants to (say).

With that are there any more comments on Section 4.1? If not we're going to Section 4.2. Okay so let's move onto Section 4.2. I guess any comments on this section?

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, this is Steve Metalitz. I had just inserted that question at the end of the first bullet there. If there are - I'm assuming that in the report we wouldn't just say solutions exist today in the Web environment we would kind of spell out what they are. So that was my only point there.

Steve Sheng: Okay. I will make sure to address that. Any other comments? The overall approach to say - is it feasible so the - if it's yes this is feasible but there are barriers that need to be overcome.

The first barrier is the Port 43 protocol has not been internationalized. There's also a no data schema as well. The second bullet point is at a minimum the data needs to be tagged with language or script because without that even there's no way to know, you know, what it is and where it would translate or transliterate to.

And here it also has in addition the community would benefit from a standard registration data schema with the language tags. And then we'll list some of the benefits of having a formal schema. What do people think about this point? I think this - a fairly important point that will actually factor into a recommendation. So we want to get the feedback on this.

Bob Hutchinson: Yeah, Steve, I guess - this is Bob Hutchinson. My observation here where you're - where you go into must be present scripts and other - I believe that that also impinges or goes into the area of policy or - and I'm wondering whether we should...

Steve Sheng: So, Bob, you're talking about the - internationalizing the contact information? Is that - that's that bullet?

Bob Hutchinson: Yes.

Steve Sheng: Oh okay, all right. Before we go there do we have any comments in the bullet points before that?

Scott Austin: Yeah, this is Scott Austin. I guess in these tags and the things that you've got in these bullet points are those things that registries are going to have to deal with or do they include registrars as well?

Steve Sheng: That's a good question.

Jim Galvin: So, this is Jim. I mean...

Steve Sheng: Go ahead, Jim.

Jim Galvin: ...in so far as registrars and resellers are present they obviously have to deal with these things first. They support multiple languages and scripts. The registrant might have to indicate that to the registrar and then for thick registries registrars are going to have to pass that information up to the registry.

So it's an issue that all parties probably have to deal with at some level; the details of that just, you know, depend on who are the parties in that particular domain registration system. Are those gTLDs or ccTLDs?

Scott Austin: Okay so I guess my - that sounds to me like it supposes that both registries and registrars are going to have to be able to figure out how whatever language they're presented by a monolingual registrant is to be tagged. Is that right?

Jim Galvin: Yes well presumably they would know the answer to that question. They would know in some way what they're expecting from a registrant and of course there is a registry of language tags and registry of script tags and, you know, so yes I believe that when registrars are present they would implicitly know what they're dealing with as the registrant or they would have a way for a registrant to say what it is they're entering so that they can tag it appropriately.

Avri Doria: And of course - this is Avri. And of course the difference between cc and g, you know, there may or may not be a registrar even when you're talking about a cc. And they would also be under a different set of constraints and rules that they had to follow or not have to follow since they probably wouldn't have any centralized rulemaking.

Jim Galvin: Right. And, Steve Sheng, just to add to this given our discussions about variants last week we're probably going to have to find a different way to word all of this because of issues where there are some cases where you need both the script and the language tag and other cases where one or the other will work. So let's just make a note here to revisit that issue.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Sure. Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Steve, this is Julie. I'm noting that we're almost at the top of the hour. I think we're going to lose Jim shortly.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: We still have the recommendations to go through. How do people want to proceed? I think this is very helpful but I think we probably need further discussion on this document.

Steve Sheng: Right.

Julie Hedlund: Steve, what do you think?

Steve Sheng: So I want to get a sense of if people are okay with this general outline and flow of the document. If people are okay I can start producing text

based on the, you know, almost work in parallel I can produce text up to the point where the working group discussed. So that's the feedback I need to start working I guess.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I think the general form of the document is fine. Most of the stuff I've read in it, you know, seemed to have, you know, seemed to cover stuff and seemed to have the right, you know, tendency toward neutrality. While there may be things that I may pick on, you know, I think it's going right.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Avri. What do others think?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. Yeah, I think you're clear to start writing at least through 4.1 which is as far as we've gotten I guess. But...

Steve Sheng: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: That sounds fine to me.

Steve Sheng: Okay. What do others - Scott? Bob?

Scott Austin: Well this is Scott. I guess my only comment here is there's a number of - I mean, we seem to be trying to avoid policy but yet - and these pages aren't number that I have anyway but just before recommendations there's a number of items with question marks at the top of that same page before recommendations.

And it says while not within the remit of this working group - is that realm or is remit the chosen term there - to choose what is the best model we observed there are several important policy questions to

consider noted below. So, I mean, I guess we are considering some policy questions.

Steve Sheng: We can flag those policy questions. I think the goal - our goal should be we present as much as we've covered. Whatever questions we thought of we can put on the document and then hand it off to the next group which could be the policy group - a policy process to answer those questions.

Scott Austin: Okay I guess - the only comments I would make is that those seem a bit terse and perhaps...

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Scott Austin: ...we could expand them to say, you know, who should bear the cost of because there could be a number of different costs involved whether it's the idea of transliteration or whether it's the idea of, you know, as Avri has pointed out ccTLDs may not have any overarching rule that - those centralized, I think, rulemaking body that pertains to them.

Steve Sheng: Okay. All right, sounds good.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: So now it's past the hour.

Steve Sheng: Is it okay to...

Julie Hedlund: Do people want to have a call scheduled for next Monday to complete the discussion on the outline?

Scott Austin: Sure.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, I think that makes sense. Basically for 4.2 and then the recommendations, that's what's left, right?

Julie Hedlund: Yeah that's right.

Steve Sheng: Yes.

Jim Galvin: Yeah, so this is Jim. And I'm going to have to sign off here in another minute and we are at the top of the hour. So, yes, let's have a discussion next week to finish the outline. And I think that Steve, yes, you are okay to start (unintelligible) text for everything that we've gone through thus far.

And everyone is asked to provide text for any additional material that you think needs to be in the document and, you know, subject to review from the group we'll progress forward with that.

Steve Sheng: Thank you.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I'll be on vacation next week...

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. I'm going to go ahead then and close off this call. I'll send around notes shortly and there will also be a transcript and a recording.

And we'll plan to meet at this same time next Monday and I'll send a note around that as well.

Steve Metalitz: Thanks, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you everyone.

Jim Galvin: Okay thank you Julie. Thanks everyone.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Sheng: Thank you Julie.

((Crosstalk))

END