

**GNSO/SSAC  
International Registration Data Working Group  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Monday 04 January 2010 at 14:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO/SSAC International Registration Data Working Group on 04 January 2010 at 14:00 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/gnso/gnso-ird-20100104.mp3>

On page:

<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#jan>

**Present for the teleconference:**

Edmon Chung -- GNSO Registry Stakeholder Group, .ASIA  
Steve Crocker, Chair, SSAC, Shinkuro  
Rafik Damak -- GNSO Non-Commercial Users Stakeholder Group  
Bob Hutchinson, GNSO Commercial Stakeholder Group  
Yao Jiankang, GNSO Registry Stakeholder Group, CNNIC  
Steven Metalitz -- GNSO Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial Stakeholder Group  
June Seo, GNSO Registry Stakeholder Group, VeriSign  
Jeremy Hitchcock - DYN-DNS  
Avri Doria - NCSG

**ICANN Staff**

Francisco Arias  
Julie Hedlund  
Dave Piscitello  
Steve Sheng

**Absent apologies:**

Erick Iriarte Ahon - LACTLD  
Ray Plzak

Coordinator: We are now recording.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Operator. This is Julie Hedlund, happy New Year to everyone and welcome to the International Registration Data Working Group call.

I will now give a brief roll call, from the working group members we have Rafik Dammak, Jiankang Yao, Avri Doria, Robert Hutchinson, Steve Crocker, Steve Metalitz, June Seo and as our co-chairs we have Edmon Chung and Jeremy Hitchcock and from staff we have Gisella Gruber-White, Steve Sheng, Dave Piscitello and myself.

And we have apologies from Ray Plzak and Eric Iriate. Did I miss anyone? Thank you. What I'd like to do is just briefly review the agenda for today's call which is scheduled for 60 minutes.

First on the discussion is the draft topics provided by Dave Piscitello and I'll ask Dave to maybe briefly highlight those. Have sent them to the list and also they are linked from the Wiki.

Following that discussion perhaps we could discuss next steps and action items and also on the schedule, on the agenda is a discussion point on possibly rotating meeting times.

We've had a request from Jay Daly who is a working group member located in New Zealand that perhaps we could rotate the meeting times so that he will be able to join us.

It is unfortunately for him at this time three o'clock in the morning which is very inconvenient.

And then any other business that we wish to discuss would be on the agenda. Are there any additions to the agenda or changes?

Thank you. So with respect to the topics, discussion topics it was discussed at the last meeting that it might be helpful to have some possible draft topics to - for the working group to consider as possible areas of study.

And Edmon had asked staff, in particular Dave Piscitello to suggest some draft topics which Dave sent around to the list on December 22 and which I've sent again to the list in a reminder for the meeting last week.

Dave did you want to maybe summarize these topics a little? I know that people have the links but perhaps did you want to set them out a little bit in general?

Dave Piscitello: Sure. So the goal as I understood was to try to bring us you know into a little bit better focus by enumerating some discussion points and the original request from Edmon was to try to find three main topic areas.

I sat down and went through some of the - went through the fact documents, went through the meeting minutes and the like and bearing in mind some of the discussion that we had had prior to Edmon's missive I said there are actually - I thought that there were actually three kind of meta-topics.

And the first of those meta-topics was you know essentially what do we require from internationalized registration data?

I chose to create some sub items under that to bring some clarity into that question and the sub items you know are basically pulled from statements that were made during the course of conversations and also from the subject document from SSAC.

I think it's a - and we can discuss all these but I think it is a goal that a user could submit or have a domain name displayed in both the IDNA label and U label formats.

That the registration data be extensible to accommodate users who would benefit from the ability to submit and have registration information displayed in what I euphemistically call familiar characters from local languages and script.

I don't want to get into the details of glyphs and things like that in this working group primarily because I'm not qualified to do that.

But my general sense is that if I am a Chinese resident in the People's Republic of China and I want to access you know a website I'd like to use a domain name in a set of characters that I'm familiar with.

And the same would be true if I were in a country that used Arabic or Cyrillic or some other character sets. When I - when you think of B however you start to realize that there are some implications about you know about what you accomplish if you do that.

And so item C under this first meta topic is does this notion of extensibility imply that there are several representations of the same registration data but in different languages or scripts.

So here what we have discussed was the possibility that there would not simply be one registration record so to speak that contains the contact information for the registrant, the sponsoring registrar, the registrant's administrative and technical contacts.

But perhaps multiple, so there's contacts as an example. One of the comments that was made that was brought in was you know I think it was from the W3C consortium was considering the adoption of a format for (citic) address information, that is "reasonably functional around the globe".

So this is something I think Thomas Ruffler made in correspondence with Steve Crocker.

This is kind of synergistic with that comment that - and the work that ICANN staff had done relating to the universal postal union formatting for letters.

And so I brought that up. I think again relating to the implications from B, is it possible to adopt an ICANN policy that meets the expectations and needs of internet users around the globe.

And correspondingly has a high probability of adoption by ccTLD operators as well, so I'm - not necessarily that ICANN is or we would suggest that ICANN would overreach and suggest policy for ccTLD operators.

But clearly if we could come up with a policy that was very - that accommodated many concerns and that was appealing to a broad you know set of the ccTLD operators then one wonderful goal would be to have some uniformity across the way that registration information where collected irrespective of whether the TLD operator were an ICANN gTLD or a ccTLD.

I guess there are two other sub items under this first meta topic and one is that the registration data be collected and displayed uniformly in manners that would allow applications to process data efficiently.

This addresses the concern about automation and the difficulty of providing legitimate automating applications with the ability to easily parse data and easily understand and recognize and discriminate between the different elements of a registration record.

The last item in this one was that it would be useful to understand where there is an opportunity to do some filtering or processing to reduce opportunities for deception or misuse when characters from multiple scripts are used in composition of registration data.

So when the same way that the IDN guidelines attempt to prevent the intermingling of characters from different languages and scripts that would create some sort of deception.

You know like a Cyrillic A in the word PayPal, the same would be - the question would be whether it's worth investigating whether the same kind of filtering would be appropriate for composition of contact information as an example.

The other place that might be relevant would be in name servers. The next meta topic would be what should the registration data look like.

You know today registration data are largely in US ASCII 7 although there are some areas where unit code UCF8 is used and in largely most WHOIS data are collected and essentially delimited by white space or delimited by carriage returns or some other ASCII character.

One of the questions that we have been discussing involve the use of something like a standard meta language like XML to tag either individual elements or blocks of data in a form where specific XML tags would identify what the data contained within the tags represented.

So as an example you might have something like an open bracket admin dash contact closed bracket with an individual entire set of information that relates to a contact.

Or you could just simply have something like a contact address or a contact name. So those were a couple of different ways to perhaps represent the data and we can discuss those.

The last point to try to summarize quickly, I don't want to take up too much time, this is hard (unintelligible) here is whether you know what methods of delivery are needed to support internationalized registration data.

And how does internationalizing registration data affect existing protocols. There were a couple of suggestions from the SSAC recommendations in terms of using Iris and Chris.

Perhaps there is a - you know because there has been some significant concern about the availability of Iris and Chris implementations and in some people's minds there is a perception of some heavy handedness in implementation it might be important to consider or worthwhile considering what our and the regional internet registries have done with the RWS service in terms of using XML over HTTP.

Then in addition to looking at those protocols it would probably be appropriate to think of whether there is an impact to the EPT, the provisioning protocol for registries and whether there is some complexity to operating both the - either a WHOIS port 43 interface or web based interface as a result of this.

And then lastly there was a comment about whether the work that the IETF has been doing in what's called B card area might be relevant to this.

So this was my - I sort of initial and best shot at trying to consolidate into three meta topics a fair number of important subjects. Thank you Julie.

Julie Hedlund: No problem Dave, this is Julie, thank you very much. I'd like to open up the discussion. Perhaps we could take each of these meta topics at a time beginning with comments on some of these suggestions for what we would require for internationalized registration data.

And I do urge you when you do have a comment if you could provide your name so that the scribes will be able to include it in the notes for this meeting.

Would either of our co-chairs like to start with a comment, Edmon or Jeremy?

Edmon Chung: Sure, this is Edmon. Hello?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, hello Edmon, go ahead.

Edmon Chung: Okay. I guess I'll start with a few comments, especially the format I really want to thank Dave for the really tough answers - set of items. I think it's a really good start for us and that's exactly what I was sort of suggesting.

So I think it's very useful for us. First question is sort of looking at the three meta topics it seems to me that I think number one definitely makes sense which is sort of like what data should be collected and displayed.

Two and three seems to be - seems to me that they might be very much (intrincably) related in terms of the granularity of the display and formatting and the how it's transmitted or transported.

So I'm sort of thinking if we are grouping our folks standard session maybe two and three might actually have to go together because they have some inter-relationships.

And then I guess the second question is a little bit more I guess I'd like to get a sense from people from the group how much we think that it's within our scope to either recommend or even make recommend suggestions or adjustments to protocols or what protocols to be used.

Whether that's sort of within the scope of this - whether people feel it's within the scope of this group on that particular topic, how much of the protocols side we should venture in to.

And then the third question is slightly more open which is sort of how do we want to go about this? I think it might be the next step so that - maybe next steps.

But how will we go about this? Do we split up, do we you know - but the main point is to really try to focus the discussion and last few times I you know we felt - at least I think we tried to cover a lot of ground.



But instead to position to actually produce something for - according to the timeline, so those are my initial thoughts.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Edmon, this is Julie. Jeremy do you have some comments you'd like to add or some questions?

Jeremy Hitchcock: Sure, this is Jeremy, I have a number of comments that I'll probably just limit them to a few higher level ones at least for now, just be interested in hearing what other people are thinking about this topic.

For WHOIS and any sort of contact data the expectation is that the - or there is no expectation right now that character sets are identified as far as what language tag that they're associated with so there's some requirement that has to be put in or some application level awareness of guessing or something along those lines.

And I think that that really is something that this group needs to figure out what's the right responsibility, correct responsibility between application design and the WHOIS system?

You know certainly aware of the sensitivity of WHOIS and it being in somewhat of an okay balance right now.

Also just some general thoughts as far as registrars and registries and one of the critical requirements, in fact one of the only requirements that ICANN has had to terminate registrars over the past has been unavailability of WHOIS.

I'm not exactly sure what the percentage is but of the 40 or so registrars that have been terminated, lack of providing valid WHOIS has been a leading factor or has been a factor in - because I think it's only - it was in the old RAA, the 2001 RAA was - RRA - RAA, my apologies, I corrected myself incorrectly, that particular agreement only had maybe two or three different reasons for termination.

One of them was WHOIS, so kind of sensitive to the number of what registrars have to do in order to make sure that this works correctly. And probably the last comment I have is that this is an area that RARs probably have been - as Dave said have been leading the way in terms of registration databases for contact information for IP allocation ownership.

Not exactly the cleanest data source but in terms of looking at WHOIS or looking at some of those data sets now anecdotally and I'd probably say that those data sets are a little bit cleaner.

And I don't - I'm not 100% familiar with the different systems that they use. I don't think that there's a - I think (Ripen R) use the same one, I think the others use their own, I'm not - somebody can correct me if that's wrong.

But they have - you know they obviously have to deal with character sets, so there's some good work that's already been done in that particular area. So those are kind of my three general comments.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie, thank you very much Jeremy, that's quite helpful. I'd like to invite others from the working group to comment as well or questions or anything you want to add, we could look at all three of the meta topics or we can begin with the first one, what do we require from internationalized registration data.

Anyone? Okay, maybe one thing I could suggest is to go back to perhaps some of these questions that Edmon has asked and what do people think about say the first item of you know if we look at how to tackle these issues, do we feel that items two and three appear to be related and could be combined (unintelligible).

Any thoughts on that?

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon again. That sort of goes back to Dave as well what he thought, he sort of laid out three, seems to me that it might be very difficult to discuss about two without also you know some discussion about three.

I just - my general thought, for you know whether Dave can give some thoughts to that.

Avri Doria: This is Avri I'd like to add something.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. Avri, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay, I didn't know if Dave wanted to respond to Edmon before I jumped in.

Julie Hedlund: That's a good question, Dave did you want to add anything before Avri jumps in?

Dave Piscitello: No.

Avri Doria: Okay. In looking at what protocol and what the protocol carries, yes, I mean there is always some relationship between can protocol X carry XML or does it need to carry something specific that's hardwired within that protocol?

But more and more I think of the protocol that that issue is ending up secondary so I think - and of course when you get to what can Port 43 do, you know you are going to get into certain capabilities and what can carry what?

But I think that the topics are yes, related, I think all the topics are related at a certain level of abstraction.

But I think at a certain point about how you're going to express the data and the - what mechanisms are going to either carry it are things that really do need to be explored in separate - with the awareness that of course at some

point you're going to have to bring them together and make sure that they work together.

But I think it gets confusing, at least what I've seen in the past in terms of protocol development, it gets confusing to both deal with how something is carried over the wire and how you want to you know express it, how you want to store it in the databases.

How you want to do whatever, so I think that they are separate but of course Edmon is right, at some point they are related.

Dave Piscitello: This is Dave Piscitello, one of the reasons why I ordered these in the manner that I did and one of the reasons why I initially separated two and three was exactly Avri's point, I think we actually need to understand what our goals are which is why that was first.

I agree that it's very important to look at the data largely because the kind of data that you carry often influences the protocol that you're going to use. Now when you get into things like meta languages, that often doesn't have quite the impact that it had in the past because we used to have six container sizes and there will be protocols that couldn't expand and things like that.

And we're far away from that in the application layer now, but I didn't intend - I (unintelligible) to mean that we were considering recommending or selecting a protocol, only that we understand that whatever we do to modify or expand the model for data that we use for WHOIS information, we will have some effect on more than one protocol.

And so the list under item three was really the sort of initial off the top of my head list of you know if we are going to change this, what areas might there be fallout?

I think it is possible to support you know the kind of registration data that we're talking about using multiple protocols and it may well be the case that different registries would choose to do so with registrars and that that would be a matter for registries and registrars to you know decide just as you know we - everyone wasn't on ABC at the same time, everyone doesn't necessarily have to be on XML over HTTP or IRIS (scripts) at the same time.

The important thing is understanding that you know there are going to be some changes you know that will be by necessity introduced if we change the data in certain manners. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Dave.

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon.

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead Edmon.

Edmon Chung: I think it makes a lot of sense, in fact I - after listening to Avri and Dave I think three different topics makes a lot of sense except perhaps I'm seeing much more clearly now that number three, the third point is not really what methods of delivery are needed to support IRD, but should be what is needed from the protocols to support IRD.

So you know because when I read number three it seems like you know what protocol are we choosing to support IRD? That - you know after Dave's clarification I think that's - it's like you know what we're - it seems like what number three is talking about is what we need to do to actually implement number one and two.

Is that...

Dave Piscitello: Yeah, I think that if we were actually - Edmon if we were actually to distract the first sentence of that, of item three and look at the second, we probably are closer to the mark.

And that was the additional clarification. So I think we're (unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: Yeah, there's the first one and then that dominant - over, so yeah, I remember - I guess that down, I wrote that the three areas make a lot of sense.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Edmon and thank you Dave and Avri. So I'm hearing that we'll keep those three discreet items as we go forward but change the description of number three in saying what is needed from the protocol to support the IRD.

With respect to second question from Edmon, perhaps we want to discuss a little bit about what - relating to protocols what is within the scope of this working group with respect to suggestions concerning protocol?

Does anyone want to comment on that?

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. I'd probably want to focus on the - what we would require rather than the protocol. I think that the data is certainly important and if we have a better understanding or can nail down what the specific data set that we're encoding and what it looks like we can probably have a better understanding of what the transport mechanism is.

I think that both are really good topics, but having an understanding of what I think it will help us in determining how. I mean I'm probably the discussion that David sent out about you know the different types of transport, I mean WHOIS Port 43 still has to continue to work and be backwards compatible.

I'm guessing that that's an assumption that this group is probably okay with, thinking about XML over HTTP, I mean that might be something that we think about as far as just thinking about a way to have some kind of structured format.

But I think a lot of those type of things will be driven based on the data that we decide is most relevant or that we think is most relevant.

Dave Piscitello: Yeah, this is Dave, I think that there are a couple of different issues relating to protocol and it's probably worthwhile capturing them as agreements in the working group.

We're not protocol developers, meaning the ICANN community, so my assumption is that if we have - what we would do is we would identify the data requirements, perhaps identify or recommend the data schema.

And then work with or contact the IETF and say this is what we would like to do with WHOIS data. We understand that this might affect the following IETF protocols. Can you help us understand exactly how they are affected?

And so it would not be ICANN going and saying you know we're going to change ETP so please modify the RFP in the following manner.

It would be the communities getting together and understanding that the protocol - the data that we now need to deliver requires some changes to the protocol. Could you please study this and make recommendations for how those changes would be incorporated into the RFC?

Does that make sense?

Julie Hedlund: Dave, this is Julie, thank you for that, that's helpful. Jeremy, do you have - or Edmon and others, do you have any comments on that with respect to

coming to some agreement along the lines that Dave has suggested as far as the protocol issues?

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. I think yeah, that sounds good.

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon. I think it makes sense as well, the only part - I don't think we need to get into details of it today though, but the only part is I'm curious how we sort of pass it over to EITF if there are different groups for different protocols.

And might relate to different things, but that might be a tricky part - it might come to a part where it's tricky to identify exactly how we pass it over to the EITF to do further work.

But I actually you know think what you summarized makes sense in terms of what this group should do and deliver.

Dave Piscitello: This is Dave. Edmon, one of the benefits of this being a joint GNSO and SSAC effort is that SSAC has members several internet - architectural board members and a fair representation of people who regularly participate in the IETF process.

So I think that we could go to Patrick Faltstrom as an example and you know Olaf Kolkman who also works with SSAC on a regular basis and ask you know - and say what is the best way for us to bring these questions into the IETF community?

And I'm sure that they would be treated expeditiously.

Avri Doria: This is Avri, if I can add something?

Julie Hedlund: Please Avri, this is Julie.



Avri Doria: Yeah, I think that that question is actually relatively easy to see any number of them. I have a question on what Dave said earlier in terms of I think it was totally correct that you know ICANN would not be designing any protocols.

I think we may not even go so far as to say we have issues with protocol X or Y and just be presenting requirements because that's going even one step into IETF work.

I have a question though also on whether ICANN would be develop schema or schemes. And I think Dave said that we might and I'm wondering whether ICANN would actually go that far?

Certainly there are you know people in ICANN that have that ability to do that, but would that be taking one step further into the doing and away from the meta as opposed to discussing the requirements for something that's in a schema?

Once we start defining a - and maybe when he said scheme he didn't mean schema and I'm being confusing.

But I just wonder whether that's also one step further than would be within the scope of this group to actually define you know the scheme for the data?

Dave Piscitello: So Avri this is Dave. One of the things I've been trying to understand as I've been looking at this and other GNSO WHOIS studies is exactly the boundary where you know defining the data requirements and you know and actually proposing a strawman schema would be appropriate.

Now if you look at ICANN's data escrow agreements with the registry operators as an example, there are data schema attached as appendices to the registries that say you know here's what you have to submit you know for escrow.

So there is a precedent for ICANN creating or working in conjunction with others to agree upon a schema. I'm not suggesting that anyone - that ICANN would run someplace and say this is exactly the schema that we insist the world uses.

But I do believe that there is merit in offering up a strawman if you have the competency to put people in the same context as the committee or as the working group you know and say you know here's what we were thinking, here's the conjecture that we have, here's where it's based.

You know we looked at some existing you know XML structures that appear to be practical and functional and are being used and instead of coming up with a brand new one maybe we could reuse this one with some extension.

So I'm not - I wouldn't be looking to wield the hammer, more - rather I'd be looking to sort of bring an offering.

Avri Doria:

Can I comment? This is Avri again. I think that's probably okay. When you say a strawman schema, that actually makes sense. And I certainly wasn't concerned that ICANN was going to go so far as to have a hammer and say this is what you must use.

Because the standards are always at best recommendations of what - the space that I was concerned with and you seem to be avoiding is getting down to the - I don't know how many XML schema discussions you've actually gotten involved in in IETF where you spend forever discussing and arguing over nitty gritty aspects of what will be represented in XML and how.

And that the thing between - here's the strawman, here's what we've thought through and now all you gods of XML you know look at it, beat up on it and be the ones that are responsible for creating something that you know gets registered somewhere as something that can be used in a standards manner.

So the strawman makes a lot of sense. The ownership of XML schema that is registered is the one that I was worried about.

Dave Piscitello: Yeah, I think we're in agreement. I don't want to go anywhere near that. I'm nowhere near a professed expert in XML to go and stand before the gods and say this is right and you're wrong.

So someone else can choose to tilt that windmill. I'm happy to go and say you know this is some crude XML that seems to at least give you an idea of what we want, if you could pretty it up for us and do what you believe is most appropriate we've be very appreciative.

And you know hopefully it won't take more than a decade.

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. What's the - WHOIS was a - was something that wasn't selected, had its own particular loose data set that was pointed to and that was a standard that we adopted.

And I'm guessing that what we're looking for is a similar set where we're looking for - we're looking essentially to adopt a standard and in the case that no standard exists to kind of suggest a couple of things that we're hoping for that we'd want to adopt.

Is that kind of the general thinking?

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon. Unless specifically - I'm not really sure if we are recommending adapting or adopting any particular standard, but I think the idea is to lay out a set of specifications and requirements, what's option and what's required and stuff.

And then provide some - a sort of strawman proposal of what might happen if it's done to a particular group protocol. But that seems to be the thinking, we just looked at number three and D, you'll see that I don't think we would

contemplate where we would make a - even a recommendation or suggestion of adopting one particular.

But what might happen in the, you know, 44A or what might happen for B01 might happen for D. Is that an accurate characterization?

Dave Piscitello: Yeah, this is Dave. You know trying to go back and understand you know how WHOIS has evolved and what the standards are if you even want to call them standards is probably going to change from you know which group of people you are sitting with around the campfire and who is playing the lute.

I mean there's just - it's all folklore and evolution. I - we've gone about this, my personal opinion is that we've gone about as far along the lines of carrying folklore through the generations and not having some convention as we can and what we're encountering today is especially within a nationalized registration data is one of the show stoppers that says okay, you really need to stop now and consider how are you going to get some uniformity and some - you know some standard criteria that everyone will try to satisfy.

And I actually don't look at this as an obligation as much as an opportunity to try to go back and say you know we can now do a whole lot better job, we've learned a whole lot from what we've seen.

We know you know a certain number of the issues and we've stumbled over a fair number of the rocks. And so if we want to consider all that we've learned, here are some of the things that we might want to do.

One of the things that I had wanted to suggest following the discussion of these three meta topics was you know was a way forward in terms of you know what we - what the group could practically deliver in Nairobi and then subsequent to Nairobi, I don't think we're going to be done by March by any stretch.

But one of the - it might even be ambitious to just do number one, but what I was thinking of when I started going through number one and the reason why it is probably more detailed than the others is because trying to get community visibility and discussion and then you know some agreement on how to proceed on the requirements seem like an appropriate next step.

And so my sense of where we might want to go next is to take number one as sort of the initial task and maybe an initial report that goes out and says here's the working group's recommendations for you know for the requirements for internationalized registration data.

And so I wanted to just offer that up to the chairs to see if perhaps that is the right way to go and maybe the next iteration is for - you know for staff to and for some of the members to sit down and tease out from this bullet item an initial draft of that requirement statement.

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon.

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Okay, I think that's a great idea and I think that that helps a lot in moving the discussion forward and especially having a really good topic to that, to talk about it in Nairobi, I just think that we should spend this time from here at least to Nairobi figure out a - some results for number one.

And that's - I think it's achievable. And, you know, looking at number 2 and 3 and, you know, just from the discussion in the last 30 minutes. That might take a little while more to come to better conclusion.

But number one will help us move along and it really is the meat of the - what we need to do in IRD I think.

Julie Hedlund: Edmon this is Julie, thank you, that's very helpful. Jeremy do you have some thoughts on that as well?

Jeremy Hitchcock: No, I don't think so. I think I'm on board with what Edmon said and think that that's probably a good place for us to work, especially considering a couple months out we're expected to have something back.

Julie Hedlund: Do other working group members have thoughts on that approach to begin with item number one and try to draft an initial statement and some parameters?

Steve Crocker: Julie, this is Steve Crocker. I'm fine with all of this. With apologies I need to break off, I've got another meeting that I've got to run off to.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Steve.

Steve Crocker: Thanks very much. Bye folks.

Man: Bye Steve.

Julie Hedlund: Any other thoughts from working group members on this approach? Edmon this is Julie, and Jeremy would it be useful for staff to flesh out a little bit further on item number one as a strawman or starting point for the working group to look at for perhaps the next meeting?

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. Go ahead.

Edmon Chung: Okay. I guess yes, definitely. I'd like to (unintelligible) it's somewhat split into two areas, one of which means the sort of - I shouldn't say areas, but at least a set of questions to be asked and then some sort of a first kick at even answering some of the questions so we know I guess when we next discuss we can talk about whether we asked the right questions.

And also you know whether there are additional questions to be asked and then also whether some of the observations are - people feel comfortable with.

Dave Piscitello: So Edmon this is Dave, the - under item one everything is posited as a question. Are there other questions beyond those that you would want us to consider? Or do you think that perhaps it would be useful to just sort of cut that out, put it on the mailing list and ask people to provide some feedback on each of these questions.

And then staff could sort of take a look at what the discussion - you know what arrives from the - or results from the discussion on line and formulate an initial draft based on that?

Edmon Chung: Well yes, I think that works. I mean in fact I think that's where we would start and I want to keep those questions in the discussion rather than just you know in the next iteration having some draft answers if you will.

But that's really what I wanted to point out, I think that's you know what you have there is pretty - covers quite a bit. And once we get it through the discussion we might have more questions but definitely a good starting point.

But I want to keep them in the next document, that's the only thing.

Dave Piscitello: Oh yeah, this is Dave. I agree that we can't lose the questions because I think the questions are precisely what the community is going to focus on and some people will say that we haven't asked all the questions.

Other people will say we haven't asked the right questions, but certainly among the questions that we've asked there are some that everyone - or that a large number of people would be asking.

Okay, so that's then I think I have an assignment that I should repost. Just item number one and then Julie and I will work on - you know on collecting and encouraging and nurturing comments from the mailing list.

Edmon Chung: Jeremy also had a comment I think earlier.

Jeremy Hitchcock: I did. In addition to this I think what would be useful for probably both staff and the working group to consider is as we're thinking about what we require that we put together a list of assumptions.

Certainly one thing that I can think of is what are the - what are applications that are touching both computer based and human based that are touching registration data?

So computerized systems that are doing this are provisioning systems between registries and registrars. Human systems might be web WHOIS queries, just in the sense of trying to think about what are the - where are the different touch points that are - that might have different - that might force different requirements of different data.

And I think that that might be another - not another thing but just some common ground to go in to this particular question as far as we're thinking - when we're thinking about trying to answer the scope of questions that Dave asked.

And just to comment on that particularly I think that it's a great list to take off of and look at what - you know where the requirements and what things need to be in there.

Dave Piscitello: Jeremy this is Dave. Could I ask you to quickly capture your - what you've described about touch points, in an email or perhaps it might actually be possible to just get the transcription and cut that out and paste it into an email.



Because I think that that's a very, very important aspect of at least you know one or two of the sub questions that we have under that item number one.

And I know that is Steve Metalitz still on?

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, I'm here.

Dave Piscitello: I know that you had had some concerns and I think the item E represented some of the - at least a summary of what I understood your concerns to be regarding deception and if there's something that you could contribute or either embellish or amplify that would be very valuable as well.

Steve Metalitz: I'll try to do that.

Dave Piscitello: Thank you so much.

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. I'll send that out after the call. I'll have a better chance to think about it too and distill it to something more intelligent.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah Jeremy, this is Julie, thanks for that because the transcription does take a little bit of time if you wanted to go ahead and provide something to the list that would be great.

And Steve Metalitz thank you also. I think we do have some good action items here. I do want to mention that we're now at the top of the hour and I wanted to address quickly the question of whether or not we can rotate the meeting times for this call.

I would like to retain it on Mondays if we can because of the complexity of scheduling more than 16 various sort of policy calls on the GNSO.

But Jay Daly has asked whether or not we could alternate the times and the time that he had suggested is 19:00 UTC which is 8 o'clock in the morning for him in New Zealand and I wanted to put that out there as a possibility for discussion very quickly.

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon. That would make it pretty tough for me I think.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, I'm thinking that that would be hard for you.

Edmon Chung: Is it going to be 4 am or 5 am for me? I don't have...

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, I don't have - this is Julie, I don't have that up right in front of me but it's early in the morning I know I believe for you. I - given that we...

Edmon Chung: Do we have a lot of people - do we have people from Europe actually?

Julie Hedlund: We have people from the US as well and I was going to ask Jeremy actually since we do have co-chairs, Jeremy that would be - I think it's 2 o'clock EST?

Jeremy Hitchcock: Yeah, that would be okay. I'm pretty flexible on the time. I'm more cognizant of people on different continents. I mean just in the interest of time I don't know if it's something that the working group thinks that we should do a quick poll over, whether or not there's some flexibility.

But I think that this time seems to work for the majority of us, but I don't know if that is actually the case.

Julie Hedlund: Do others on the call wish to comment? I know Avri, you're in Europe. I don't know if that time would work for your schedule.

Avri Doria: I go back and forth between Europe and the US but I am totally time flexible except for when I'm on airplanes which is too much.

Julie Hedlund: Right. Others on the call? Steve Metalitz or June or Jiankang I think that might be a difficult time for you.

Jiankang Yao: Yes, it's a very difficult time. Nine hundred UTC in China is 3 am.

Dave Piscitello: We also want to try to start rotating these meetings at Jay Daly's request, so it would be helpful if just staff sit down and tries to figure out a way to foster participation from different regions even at the expense of doing so you know and having rotating participation.

We do that in the anti-phishing working group and it's actually more empowering than it might seem to be because you do get some broader diversity and perspective and I think that especially in this topic that's much needed.

Julie Hedlund: One possible alternative to consider is which one approach that we used for some of the ICANN calls is moving the meetings to weekly as opposed to bi-weekly calls but alternating the time and keeping the topic areas similar with each call so that the various people in the different time zones get to discuss some of the same things.

That however does add you know to the number of meetings scheduled. I mean I'm interested in particular what the chairs think about this proposal. It is very difficult because we do have a fairly disparate set of working group members.

And we're probably not going to be able to find a single time that works for everyone.

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. How about...

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead, I hear Edmon and Jeremy.

Edmon Chung: Yeah, I'll go first, I think rotating it is fine and I just checked out and thanks Jiankang for bringing up. It's - 3:00 am actually is fine for me, so I'm going to take that back and (unintelligible) is fine for me.

But I know it's not good for Yao, but so I'm flexible with that time actually.

Julie Hedlund: And Jeremy did that time work for you as well for the next call?

Jeremy Hitchcock: Yep, that time works for me and I think doing that alternating time is probably a good way to go forward.

Julie Hedlund: Okay, then I'm going to suggest then that the next call which will be in two weeks time will be at 19:00 UTC and we'll go on a rotating basis until we - you know until we decide to change.

I didn't have any other...

Jeremy Hitchcock: And with keeping with a two-week cycle.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, I would say let's keep with the two week unless we feel time constrained and need to go on a weekly basis, but we'll schedule that two weeks from now at 19:00 UTC.

I didn't have any other business on the agenda. Does anybody have anything they want to add?

Steve Sheng: Dave and Julie, this is Steve. I can also help with the compelling comments for this committee on the item number one, so I'll just offer that.

Julie Hedlund: Wonderful, Steve Sheng, thank you, appreciate that. All right, well thank you everyone and thank you for bearing with us as we go a little bit past the hour. This is a very good discussion. I will follow up later today with a summary of

our discussion for everyone on the call and those who could not be on the call.

Dave Piscitello: Yeah, this is Dave. I'll get my post out probably late tonight. I'm leaving directly for the airport to travel to Los Angeles so I'll be in transit for the next ten hours.

Julie Hedlund: Great. And Dave, this is Julie. You'll have my notes then prior to when you send out and perhaps also comments from Jeremy and perhaps also Steve.

Thank you all and happy New Year and we'll look forward to discussions on the list and to talking to you in two weeks time.

Dave Piscitello: Thanks much Julie.

Man: Bye.

Man: Bye bye.

END