

**GNSO/SSAC
International Registration Data Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 08 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 08 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/gnso/gnso-ird-20110808-en.mp3>

On page:
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#aug>

All recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO calendar page:
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/>

Present for the teleconference:

Rafik Dammak -- GNSO Non-Commercial Users Stakeholder Group
Steven Metalitz -- GNSO Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial
Bob Hutchinson, GNSO Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG)
Jim Galvin -- SSAC -Affiliates
Sarmad Hussain, CLE-KICS, UET
Yao Jiankang, GNSO Registry SG
Scott Austin

ICANN Staff

Julie Hedlund
Steve Sheng
Gisella Gruber-White
Dave Piscitello

Absent apologies:

Avri Doria - NCSG

Coordinator: Today's conference is now being recorded.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone.
On today's IRD call on Monday the 8th of August we have Sarmad Hussein, Rafik Dammak, Scott Austin, Steve Metalitz, Jim Galvin. From staff we have Steve Sheng, Dave Piscitello, Julie Hedlund and myself, Gisella Gruber.

And apologies today noted from Avri Doria. If I could please also just remind you to state your names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Gisella. And so on this call we are going to continue with the discussion of the extended draft outline. I sent around earlier today the latest version. Note that we did actually get through the discussion - through the findings I think of last week. And we're now starting on the recommendations.

And so we'll start from that section which is labeled Section 4 in the document that I sent around although I think since the findings section is labeled 4 also that probably will have to be changed to Section 5. But in any case...

Man: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: ...we're starting with the recommendations I believe and the recommendations start - if you're looking at the document on Page 8. So I think I'll go ahead and turn it over to you, Steve, if you want to start there.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Julie. And good morning and good evening everyone. I noticed that Dr. Sarmad Hussein is on the call. And we have been going through these draft outlines.

And Dr. Hussein, since you weren't on earlier calls I would appreciate if you have any comments of the previous sections up to Section 4 you could comment on the document either send it to me or send it to the list. Actually I prefer you send it to the list so that way we have captured some comments.

((Crosstalk))

Sarmad Hussein: Thank you.

Steve Sheng: Okay thank you. For those of you who have been on the call we've been going through findings. And I think we are almost done with findings but not quite. We are at Section 4.2, the second bullet.

At the last meeting we had some discussions - Steve Metalitz raised some points about the first sub bullet, Section 4.1, regarding there may be some solutions exist today to accommodate multilingual users - monolingual users. And his comment is to list these solutions and - which we'll do in the final report.

For the interest of time let's move onto second bullet. I would like to ask if participants on the call have any comments on this bullet. It begins - it reads begin, "At a minimum the current Whois data needs to be tagged with language script."

There's a RFC 4646 which I believe was Mark Davies from Google was one of the authors that have a tag that both indicate the language and the script. So with that I would like to open up the floor for discussion on this bullet point. Thanks.

Sarmad Hussein: I have a question. This is Sarmad.

Steve Sheng: Go ahead.

Sarmad Hussein: So are we requesting a language or script or language and scripts?

Steve Sheng: So the RFC has - there are different ways of tagging. And one way in the RFC it tags both the language and the script. So for example in the - I know in the - for example in the Chinese case you can identify the language as being Chinese and you can tag whether it's simplified Chinese or traditional Chinese so there are unique combinations there. Thanks.

Sarmad Hussein: I was actually thinking where actually...

Steve Sheng: Go ahead.

Sarmad Hussein: ...the same data may be valid in more than one languages which are used in the same script.

Steve Sheng: Same data might be - could you give me an example?

Sarmad Hussein: So if I write a string that may actually be valid in Persian and Arabic - both written in Arabic script.

Steve Sheng: Yes.

Sarmad Hussein: So in that case would it be just arbitrarily based on the user's choice on which language he or she would select?

Steve Sheng: In that case it wouldn't be - wouldn't it be necessary to tag the language so that - so let me ask this question I think. So what you are saying is you have a string that could be - that is in the Arabic script. Since the Persian language as well as the Arabic language - or even (Urdu) use Arabic script. You know, that string could be valid in all of these three contexts, right?

Sarmad Hussein: Correct.

Steve Sheng: And in that case - so my question is in these three contexts do they have the same meaning? I mean, would it - so for example a string that meant in the Arabic language like an address or something would it mean - does it have a different meaning in the Persian context or in the (unintelligible) context?

Sarmad Hussein: Well so there may be cases where they all mean the same thing as well.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Sarmad Hussein: And so the question is that is this labeling at the discretion of the user?

Steve Sheng: Oh you mean whether user provide the label?

Sarmad Hussein: Yeah.

Steve Sheng: I think so, right? So but that's probably an implementation issue. What I'm envisioning when users submitting this information there is like a drop down, you know, for a user to indicate, you know, which language and script that is in. And maybe (unintelligible) do some secondary checks but I'm not sure.

Jim Galvin: This is Jim. I have a comment.

Steve Sheng: Go ahead, Jim.

Jim Galvin: So, Steve, it occurs to me that the issue that Sarmad is raising goes back to the discussion that you and I were having with, you know, (Cien), (Nick) and Andrew Sullivan during the ITF. And I hadn't thought about this until just now when Sarmad brought this question up.

We have that technical issue of there are times - given the fact that when you have a script there is a one to many mapping from scripts to languages and there's also one to many mapping from languages to scripts. Now that's true in all cases, there are clearly cases for which a script is sufficient information to know everything and there are cases where knowing the language is sufficient.

But there are examples especially in the Devanagari languages - and Arabic is another good example where because of this one to many mapping opportunity you need both a language and a script in order to accurately identify the data.

Let me just pause for a moment and say, I mean, obviously you do remember that discussion, right?

Steve Sheng: Yes.

Jim Galvin: And so - and I'm wondering now as a result of all of that since we're obviously going to be doing some other things in the ITF to fix that issue in EPP we probably should say something here about all of that too since we now have this technical issue that we know about.

I mean, I have some Devanagari examples that I can give you and Sarmad probably has some Arabic examples that he can provide that would justify the observation and simply, you know, knowing that you need both a language and a script.

Steve Sheng: Sure, Jim. I think if you can - you and Dr. Sarmad can provide some examples and - to drive this point home, yeah, that would be great. I think that would be a wonderful addition to the...

Jim Galvin: So, Sarmad, does that speak to the issue that you're raising?

Sarmad Hussein: Sure, I think what I'm also suggesting is that if we are asking the users to provide this information we should make that probably more specific or clear. It doesn't really say where this information is coming from.

Steve Sheng: Okay. So what I can do - let me see the...

Jim Galvin: I think what's interesting here - so this is Jim again speaking - is that I don't know that we want to be specific about the fact that a user has to provide that information. I think it's sufficient for us to observe that the registration data needs to be tagged in this way. I mean, in point of fact the data could actually come formally from multiple places.

I mean, a user might provide it but a user would only provide it if a particular registrar - in the presence of a registrar offered multiple choices. If they offered multiple languages or multiple scripts to their particular user community then a user would obviously have to have some input into that either directly or indirectly.

But it's also possible that a registrar that only serves a singular community with a singular script or language they would know the answer and they could simply fill that in to pass it up to the registry. It's also possible that a registry might be only in a particular community for a particular country or something else like the gTLD .cat which, you know, serves Catalonians.

You know, they would implicitly know and only expect things in a certain way. So I don't think we want to specify where the data come from; we should stick to saying that the registration data - Whois data as it's stated here needs to be tagged with both.

Scott Austin: This is Scott Austin, could I just ask a question? In looking at some of the information on the various - on the RFC 4646 I just wondered has there been any reference or do we need to make any reference to case sensitivity; whether these scripts should be upper case, title case or lower case?

Jim Galvin: In general case sensitivity only applies to Latin-based script. So in general we don't speak about case sensitivity when talking about IDNs; we leave that as a special case to be dealt with in those scripts for which it matters.

Scott Austin: No but for registration data where they're entering addresses and things like street names and things like that.

Jim Galvin: Again only applies in Latin-based scripts. You're presuming that the registration data is going to be in a Latin-based script.

Scott Austin: Okay. I just saw something in the language sub tag registries being in upper case versus other sub tags being in lower case. And again I just didn't know if that made any difference in these scripts.

Steve Sheng: Hello this is - yeah, hello, this is Steve. So the RFC 4646 can tag both at a language and a script level. You can also further tag even the region, the variant extension and other uses. So I think it's - I think it's good to call out that both language and script needs to be tagged.

But I think for our purposes RFC 4646 is probably sufficient tagging both the language and the script. So - but I'm willing to be corrected if - so. Okay so am I correct in observing that there is an action item that Jim and Dr. Sarmad will provide some Devanagari and Arabic samples to drive this point clear and home. Is that a correct characterization?

Jim Galvin: This is Jim. Works for me.

Sarmad Hussein: Okay sure, thank you.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Are there any other comments on this section? So I think this - there's also a - there is also a second point here. It says, "In addition the community will benefit from the standard registration data schema." Like more of a formal data schema and it lists the three benefits for this schema.

Is this a correct characterization? Is this correct?

Jim Galvin: So - this is Jim. I'm sorry, did we just change bullets that we're looking at?

Steve Sheng: No it's the same bullet. It's still at a minimum - the bullet begins with, "At a minimum."

Jim Galvin: Right so...

Steve Sheng: ...in addition...

Jim Galvin: Yeah but it doesn't - oh I'm sorry, okay; I was confused. All right.

Steve Sheng: It's still the same bullet.

Jim Galvin: Yeah, yeah, okay never mind. I missed the upper phrase. Sorry.

Steve Sheng: Maybe perhaps with the addition of the information from Dr. Sarmad and Jim we ought to separate this into two so that, you know, we explain one concept clearly instead of, you know, having two together. I can take that as an action item. But, yeah, currently it's still one bullet. Thanks.

Jim Galvin: Yeah, I like that plan so other than that, yes, I think we've got yes I think what we've got what we need here for right now.

Steve Sheng: Any other comments on this point? Steve, Scott?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. No comment from me.

Scott Austin: No, looks good to me. This is Scott.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Okay let's move onto Bullet Number 3. There are recognized - oh, sorry, was that me? No. There are recognized standards for internationalizing the third bullet. Do we have comments on that?

Basically this recommendation says, you know, to the extent that the standards we discussed before those should be, you know, followed to the extent possible.

Jim Galvin: No, Steve, you called this a recommendation. This is - again we're just in the findings here; this is just...

Steve Sheng: Yeah, yeah...

Jim Galvin: ...a statement of factual information?

Steve Sheng: Yes. Yes. Yes.

Bob Hutchinson: This is Bob Hutchinson. I don't know whether it's nit-picky to change the word many to all but I think it's all. Many of the elements to all of the elements.

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. The only reason I said many is because in my mind the reason why I would say many versus all because I think I tend to agree with you but I've never actually sat down and made that direct comparison to be sure.

But I'm just being sensitive to the fact that it's not clear to me we have consensus and what is domain registration data. Well, in fact, I think an assertion is that we don't have consensus on what that is.

Steve Sheng: There is also another technical issue. It's some of these elements does not have standards yet. So for example the email address, there's a (EAI) working group within IETF and a standard hasn't been produced. So we can't (unintelligible) cite that as a standard. So that's one of the technical reason for using many instead of using all of them. Thanks.

Bob Hutchinson: Thank you, Steve. This is Bob again. That clarifies your concerns. I'll leave it that way.

Steve Sheng: Okay do we have any comments on this point? Okay I think the next few points are very important. So this drives - the next couple points deals with the issue of, you know, the contact information meaning the name and the addresses.

And what this does is basically list a couple of the models that we described in the past. You know, I think the goal here is, you know, since we spent a lot

of time coming up with these models and examining them we should, you know, just throw them away in the final report but at least list them.

So that's where it begins is one key issue is internationalizing contact information. So there are two sub bullets under here. And I'd like to hear any comments on this point. Thanks.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I guess my question is - I just want to be clear on kind of how we got to this point.

Steve Sheng: Go ahead .

Steve Metalitz: We prepared our interim report we put out...

Steve Sheng: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: ...these - there are four models and we asked people to comment on those and provide any other models and...

Steve Sheng: Right.

Steve Metalitz: ...there was another model brought forward.

Steve Sheng: Right.

Steve Metalitz: And now I see this bolded statement that it's not within the remit of this working group to choose what is the best model. I mean, literally that's true because we couldn't choose it anyway. But are we now saying that what we did on that was kind of out of scope and, as you said we're just putting it in here because we've already done the work?

Or are we saying that we're not competent to make a recommendation? Or are we saying there's no community consensus that would allow us to make

a recommendation? I'm just not clear on what we're trying to say here about what we've done in the past in this working group.

Steve Sheng: That's an excellent question. To some certain extent I share - I completely agree with your point as well. So let me think here. So we discussed a couple models and we couldn't - so the reason I put it here is thinking from a policy development perspective, right, so even if the IRD - this is a joint SSAC and GNSO working group. It is not a policy-making group, right?

So for example even if we decide on one model still a policy development process needs to follow to make those into contracts, right. So that's the steps. So we're missing one step here. And that's the - that's my intention for framing it here.

And I think also some of those are really policy questions like, you know, who is bearing the burden, which party has the - is most capable to address this issue in a cost efficient manner? I am not sure this group is the right group.

But so that's all I have now. I'm really open to your suggestions on how to make this section and have this general discussion here and what is within the scope of this group and where do we carry. So that's all, thanks.

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim, if I can comment here. I'm going to have to drop off here after this. But speaking as chair the way that I approached this I think there's some tweaking that we can do on the words here, Steve.

I think that the last thing that you said which is that we were not able to come to consensus I think is the most important point that we somehow need to fold into the fuller text that we develop that goes around these points.

Steve is right, it would not be our place ultimately to say, you know, what should or shouldn't happen although we could make a strong

recommendation about what we think is the right answer if we were able to come to consensus.

And we had developed these models. We thought about this problem. We asked the community for input. And from my point of view as chair I just did not feel comfortable that there was any way to identify a consensus; I don't think that we had one not even within this group let alone anything that we got from the community.

So I think that we definitely - we did all of this work and we clearly understand what the two important issues are in answering the question about these models. And I think it's appropriate for us to document the fact that we had this discussion, we came to these two questions.

We can probably find a way in the fuller words when we fill this out just to observe that at least no consensus was forthcoming in our group or in our request for community input. And so, you know, and part of the reason for that I think is we don't have a full participation of all of the parties that matter in answering these questions.

So I think it's appropriate ultimately as a recommendation to push back and say, well, no obvious answer stood out; these are the issues which we clearly identified. You know, we think that the GNSO in particular and the ccNSO also, you know, should create a fuller policy development process with all of the relevant parties to examine these questions in detail and come to a conclusion.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Jim. What do others think? Please comment? This is a really important issue.

Scott Austin: Well this is Scott Austin. Could I just ask a question about when we saw best model is model referring back to the information that's provided up to that point? In other words the bullets - and I'm going to use the circles or the

squares in the immediate preceding paragraph that says several options have been discussed. Is option another word for model?

Steve Sheng: Yes.

Scott Austin: Could we change option to model then just so that the - reflects, you know...

((Crosstalk))

Scott Austin: Because it's just very hard to read what we're talking about. And I concur with what Jim just said in terms of, you know, making the lead-in to this a bit more robust so that it's explained that there was no consensus reached but consensus on what.

And in terms of is it selection of the model that there was no consensus reached so essentially we're just saying here's some models and here's some good things and bad things about them but it's not for us to choose. At least I think that's what I'm hearing but I just want to make sure.

Steve Sheng: Thank you. I can change the option to model right now. And, yeah, what do others think? Steve, Dr. Sarmad, Bob and any others on the line please chime in.

Steve Metalitz: Well this is Steve Metalitz. I think Jim has summarized it pretty well. And I'm comfortable saying we couldn't - we didn't reach a consensus but that we did try to identify some of these options and some of the main questions and attempt to see if there was a consensus. But I'm more comfortable with that than with saying this really wasn't our job because I think it was our job to try to do this anyway.

Steve Sheng: Thank you. Dr. Sarmad, were you going to say something?

Sarmad Hussein: Yeah. So I actually had a question. This is something we talked about before. And I'm not sure whether it should be reflected here or not in these list of questions which come after the models.

And the question was about who actually would be the owner of this data. And I've heard two or three different variations on this whether it's the registrant who owns the data, the registrar who owns the data or is it the registry?

And I'm not sure whether it's really clearly specified somewhere; it's probably a more fundamental issue maybe not directly related to internationalized data so it may actually not be relevant in this discussion but I still wanted to raise it at this point for any comments you guys have.

Steve Sheng: Thank you. Any other comments on this? Go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, Steve Metalitz. Just to respond. I think we've had - I recall our having this discussion before and I'm not exactly sure when. But I agree with you it's a cross cutting issue and probably not something that should be in our report.

One of the problems is there's an ambiguity I think in how people use the word own. I think lawyers tend to use that in a legal sense, who has property rights in certain data. And others are using it more in a sense of who is responsible for it, whose job is it to do - to take some steps with regard to the data.

So it's - I think it's quite ambiguous and unless we thought it was essential to confront that in order to do our job I would suggest that we not raise that issue in this report.

Steve Sheng: What do others think?

Scott Austin: Yeah, this is Scott Austin. I totally agree with Steve's comment about ownership being something that is in the eye of the beholder and it's very different from a legal standpoint versus a management standpoint.

Sarmad Hussein: I have a follow up question. So would that have any implication on the five models - considering the five models so when we are translating or transliterating data for the IP of the data (intervene) or somehow become involved?

Bob Hutchinson: This is Bob Hutchinson. Could you clarify what you mean by the IP involved?

Sarmad Hussein: So meaning that depending on where the ownership of the data is there may be some implications on who can or can not transliterate or translate that data.

Bob Hutchinson: Thank you.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. Again I think I would consider that kind of a separate issue because even if there were, you know, whatever the incidents of ownership are they can be managed for any of these models.

I mean, if the registrant owns the data then the registrant - but the registrant is not the person responsible for doing transliteration or translation just to give that example then, you know, you have to have a provision that makes it clear in the registration agreement that that - that the registrant is giving whoever is responsible for doing translation or transliteration the authority to do that.

But that, you know, that's how - in other words I think it's implementation question rather than a policy question as to whichever way it turns out in terms of intellectual property rights it can be managed in - mapped to one of these models. I think that's the case.

So again I think - I don't think it's necessary to raise - to really identify that as an issue in the internationalized registration data context.

Scott Austin: Steve, this is Scott Austin. And I just want to raise one other question on this because...

((Crosstalk))

Scott Austin: ...I think that what the Dr. has mentioned about or maybe it was you mentioned about responsibility. I just don't know if anywhere in here we have said whether the registrar or the registry has any kind of a duty to allow this information or, you know, provide for one or more of these models in terms of the number of languages they will accept data in terms IRD - internationalized registration data.

Steve Sheng: That's a good question. I don't know enough to answer that. Jim, what do you think since you may have a registry perspective on this? I presume that a registry would accept whatever a (registrar) is willing to accept right? Unless - I don't know otherwise. Jim? I think we may have lost Jim.

Scott Austin: Yeah, I just didn't know if it had been discussed in this group before and is it sort of a funneling? And by that I mean that registrants may come from 150 different languages and - I don't know how that translates into scripts - maybe it's 50 different scripts and then registrars would provide an outline of the data that's required for a registrant to sign up in all 50 of those scripts or 20 of those scripts?

And then would the registries then have to accept and make provision for all of the scripts that its registrar provides? Or would it require further transliteration, translation down to maybe 10? And some of that...

((Crosstalk))

Scott Austin: ...on cost too. But I just don't know that I've seen that ever dealt with in any of this.

Steve Sheng: Right. So I think the - you brought up an important question here is - so let's suppose there are, you know, there is a - there is a need for, you know, 150 languages inputted in their native script; let's say 50 of them. The question is maybe a registrar may be only willing to open up maybe, you know, 5 or 10 of these script and does not allow the rest.

Is there something that we should be concerned about or no? It's almost - is that - does that make sense? I'm...

Dave Piscitello: This is Dave.

Steve Sheng: Go ahead, Dave.

Dave Piscitello: I think you phrased that in sort of a negative. But my perception is that what we're evolving to is a scenario where the user gets, you know, the user gets to use the local language that he is most comfortable with. Registrars get to determine which market they want to serve where a market is, you know, uses a certain language.

And registries need to be able to disambiguate among any of the languages that the registrars, you know, will support so that the registration data can always be at least, you know, identified with and associated with the language that, you know, that was used to originally submit it.

And that's the minimum constraint that we've applied and what I - I understand we've done over the past months.

Steve Sheng: Right. I think you phrase it in a much more positive manner than I do so I'm going to use your words. Are there any other comments on this point?

Bob Hutchinson: Yes, this is Bob Hutchinson. I agree with Jim's previous summary. I would change the beginning of this where it says while not within the remit of this working group to choose what is the best model. Definitely change the sentiment to that is to refer to the models and that there was no consensus rather than the words that are used here.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Bob. All right, yes, I will strike this sentence completely and I'll rephrase it using the language I think that Jim and Steve and yourself referred to. Yes, we tried but we couldn't come to consensus. Is that - do people agree with that?

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, Steve Metalitz, I agree with that approach.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Thank you, Steve.

Bob Hutchinson: I guess the other - this is...

Steve Sheng: Go ahead.

Bob Hutchinson: Steve, this is Bob again. I wonder whether there isn't a round what Dave just outlined. I wonder if there isn't a consensus that is emerging about how this data has to flow in terms of its sourcing. And, you know, I believe the way Dave outlined the constraints of the system we as a group I think acknowledge that that's what we have to operate within.

And I'm wondering whether we couldn't use that as a basis for how this is written in terms of the recommendation here - the recommendation of subsequent policy. But maybe Steve Metalitz could speak to that as to whether that's acceptable.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. I'm not clear on what you're suggesting. What would you suggest that we say is the consensus?

Bob Hutchinson: That the data is sourced by the registrant and that the - the - I guess if I had to characterize what Dave said is that the data is sourced by the registrant, the ability to enter scripts and languages is constrained by the registrar and the registry. And that those policies which exist ad hoc today probably will exist in a future system. And those are basically what we have to go forward with with, you know, to shape the policy for the future.

Dave Piscitello: Yeah, this is Dave. The only thing I would change from Bob's summary of what I said is that the registrars actually aren't constraining they are choosing markets. So there may be some registrars who deal with, you know, (unintelligible) 250 different top level domains.

And they may choose because they do so to offer, you know, offer languages and scripts, you know, in the numbers of hundreds. Whereas someone else who only deals with a very small population and doesn't see the need may say you're registered through me, you're only going to be able to register using Spanish and English.

And that's the choice of the registrar because he's the one who actually knows his market. So that - I don't see that as a constraint; I see that as a market decision. And the registrant is still served because if he wants to register in Spanish he has a choice of the second registrar mentioned and the first registrar. But if he wants to register in Urdu he's got only the choice of the first.

The registries simply have to have some information that is associated with the registration data that allowed them to identify language and script as we said earlier. So I don't see that there's any real obligation on the part of anyone in the path, you know, to provide transliteration or translation at this point.

All we're doing is saying these are the minimum criteria that have to be satisfied in order to satisfy the first principal which was users have the, you

know, or kind of the right to register a domain in the language that they are, you know, that is native and comfortable.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I think there's a lot of assumptions underlying both of what Bob said and what Dave said that may not always be the case. I mean, a registry could say we'll only accept registrations in certain scripts; they don't have...

Scott Austin: Exactly.

Steve Metalitz: ...to...

((Crosstalk))

Scott Austin: Scott Austin here, sorry but I agree 100% with what Steve is saying.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, so, you know, it's - it's not a requirement.

Dave Piscitello: I'm not making a requirement, Steve. And, I mean, if a registry chooses to add a filter or add a requirement that's fine. But I'm saying at the minimum this is what - this is the board space you have to accommodate.

Now certainly registrars can make the same - make the same market decisions if there were any technical basis...

Steve Metalitz: Right.

Dave Piscitello: ...or business basis. But I was just saying generally speaking, you know, I think that most registries are going to accept registrations in more than one language.

Steve Sheng: But, Dave, a registrar's market is essentially a competitive market. But at the registry, at the top level, registry essentially act as a monopoly, right, so if the

TLD only accept one say, let's say Latin, and then that's it then, you know, all the data has been going up. There's no way for a registrant to choose another registry because, you know, at the top level it's a monopoly.

Dave Piscitello: This is Dave again. And I'm not certain that I view registries as monopolies; I view registries as competitive, you know, as competitors in a market. If registries weren't competitors in a market we wouldn't see ccTLDs abandoning the notion of being a TLD for just their country and going off and becoming the world's greatest URL shortening TLD or the TLD of choice for Los Angeleans or the TLD of choice for television shows.

So, you know, they need to do that because they said all right I'm concerned about my monopoly; they did that because they're concerned about having hundreds of thousand perhaps millions of registrations as opposed to tens of thousands.

Scott Austin: Well let's add to the fact that in the unrestricted domain status you could have one party, one applicant, essentially that is the registry, the registrar and they are the same person. So I'm not sure the monopoly issue is still the same as it was in prior decades before the advent of unrestricted TLDs. This is Scott Austin.

But beyond that I think Steve's point is a good one that there's nothing driving necessarily a registrar or a registry to allow that we're trying to provide. And I think it's a very worthy cause that is that a monolingual registrant should be able to obtain access to the Internet, have his own Website or their own Website and I just I think there's maybe a disconnect in that we don't have anything that says that that necessarily has to provide - be provided for.

We're just essentially allowing what is currently to stand. That is that the market will determine whether or not that registrant has somebody who's asking for registration data in their language.

Steve Sheng: Hello, this is Steve. I think...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Sheng: Dave, let me - sorry to cut you short. I think all of these points are very valid. In the interest of time I was wondering this is kind of an important point. How do we include things like this in the final report? First of all should we include, you know, what we discuss like this in a final report?

And if we do we probably have to go out on the mailing list to articulate the points and make sure that we have some consensus on that. So that's my question for you all.

Dave Piscitello: Well I certainly think that - this is Dave. I certainly think it's appropriate for the report to identify issues that the working group discussed whether or not we have a consensus and whether or not we have recommendations.

I think that these are going to be - no matter what we recommended, quite frankly, there will be people who have opinions like mine, opinions like Steve and Steve and Steve and Jim.

So, yeah, so, you know, I think it's worthwhile capturing the dialogue, you know, because people won't have to start from scratch. I mean, one of the values that this working party, you know, can bring to the community is laying bare a lot of the issues that are not quite obvious to people who immediately think well why can't it all be in Latin or immediately think why, you know, well why don't we just (unintelligible).

So, you know, no matter where you stand on the section of how the models work and what, you know, what should be done next we've covered an enormous amount of ground in a year in terms of coming to understand a lot of the issues that are not very obvious.

Steve Sheng: Okay. So I see Dave proposing for adding - capturing discussion and adding that into perhaps maybe in the findings section. What do others think?

Bob Hutchinson: Yeah, this is Bob Hutchinson again. I guess given the times constraints we have and obviously the various positions that we - have been voiced this morning the best way to deal with this is to have people propose how to rewrite this section on the email list and then discuss - come back to a discussion next time.

But it's, you know, without having an alternate text in front of us I think it's, you know, the discussion is just going to be reiterating all the stuff we've been through before.

Steve Sheng: Okay thank you, Steve. Can I take that as an action item that some of you are willing to produce some text, you know, maybe a paragraph or two of this nature and to incorporate into the report. Is that a fair characterization?

Dave Piscitello: Sure.

Steve Sheng: Okay. So Dave you're going to produce some text and maybe, Steve, and Scott, you can add some text to Dave's text; is that possible?

Steve Metalitz: I'm happy - this is Steve Metalitz - I'm happy to take a look at it.

Scott Austin: This is Scott Austin; likewise.

Steve Metalitz: Okay thank you. All right so in the interest of time let's move on. We have a couple minutes left. Let's look at the - so let's look at the last bullet in the findings section.

We recommend the subsequent policy development effort to examine these issues. The working group offered the following suggestions based on past deliberations. So there's a couple bullet points there.

Are there any additional bullet points to add there? Is there a need to change correct any of these bullets? We're on Page 8.

Julie Hedlund: Steve, this is Julie.

Steve Sheng: Go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: The only suggestion I would make is that I note that you say we recommend. Since this is a findings section...

Steve Sheng: Right.

Julie Hedlund: ...shouldn't this fall in the recommendations section, I mean, or we should not use the term recommend.

Steve Sheng: Yeah. Yeah so maybe - I got you, this is the findings. Maybe we should strike the first sentence and then just say the working group offered the following suggestions based on past deliberations or just maybe making it more factual just the working group - I'm just trying to invent words on the fly.

Something like basically capture what we discussed in the past on these. Is that okay with you?

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, Steve, this is Julie. I think if you keep it as a factual discussion then it can appropriately fall in the findings section and...

Steve Sheng: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...that first sentence and adjusting the terminology accordingly.

Steve Sheng: I think so. I think that's a good one. I think when we have the report written we need a fresh eye to make that findings is actually findings what we discussed and there's no recommendation in that. Thanks, Julie. Go ahead. Did I hear someone trying to speak?

Bob Hutchinson: Yes, this is Bob Hutchinson again. I'm curious as to why each one of these recommendations is precluded by ICANN staff and not the GNSO?

Steve Sheng: No we're not on recommendations yet. When we get there I can explain more. So - or are we ready to go into recommendations? Hearing once, twice. Okay so let's move into recommendations.

Bob's question is why is ICANN staff to develop - yeah, I guess...

Bob Hutchinson: I guess we have discussed these recommendations...

Steve Sheng: Right, right, right.

Bob Hutchinson: ...but we've never discussed who's supposed to do this.

Steve Sheng: Right, right.

((Crosstalk))

Bob Hutchinson: ...you know...

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. I would recommend...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...Steve, that you take a look at the current version of the policy development process, you know, the process is being revised, it's out for public comment. I think it's set to be concluded very shortly because there is a very, very well

developed and defined process for how the community and the GNSO in particular since that is the policy group...

Steve Sheng: Right.

Julie Hedlund: ...looks at developing what could become a policy. And it's actually I think you have it - I think the first step is an issue's report so that would probably be the first recommendation. And, you know, and then what comes from that issues' report might be a data model or something like that.

You know, and it's - at any rate there's a very set process. And thank you, Bob, for raising that; I think we really need to reference that.

Steve Sheng: Okay. So, Bob, let me ask you a substantive question. Which of these should be GNSO's responsibility?

Bob Hutchinson: Well I believe, you know, Julie can probably elaborate this better in light of what the current policy development process is.

Steve Sheng: Right.

Bob Hutchinson: But that that process - we need to hook into that process and clearly define whatever recommendations we're giving as a group...

Steve Sheng: Right.

Bob Hutchinson: ...as to how it connects to that process, okay?

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Bob Hutchinson: And so I guess that's my point, okay...

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, yeah, thank you, Bob. This is Julie. Steve, I don't think that's an answer we can give you just right off the fly. I'll send you the link to the policy development process as it currently stands. That should make it pretty clear to you.

For instance it's not ICANN staff who - well ICANN staff may develop an issue's report but only in coordination with, you know, a GNSO councilor or so on and so forth...

Steve Sheng: Right.

Julie Hedlund: ...so that - we can help to pull the language out based on what that process says because it is very specific.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: And I did see that it - I think you'll see that it will map to, you know, to these recommendations.

Steve Sheng: Okay. I think that makes sense.

Bob Hutchinson: Yeah. This is Bob again...

Steve Sheng: So...

Bob Hutchinson: ...Steve. I guess as much as possible I would make the recommendations make sense without ingraining them too much in that policy development process if that's possible. In other words the recommendations like, you know, the first recommendation you could probably rephrase to that the community needs to adopt a model for domain registration data.

That model should include a formal data schema that incorporates - so in other words do you see what I'm saying is the only thing I'm objecting to is

how we're doing the - or how we're directing the process in the beginning here not necessarily what the recommendations and the text that is here is, okay.

Steve Sheng: Thank you. Thank you, Bob. And I agree with you. My reason to put some direction is, you know, not necessarily ICANN staff but to put - to assign responsibility, you know, who should actually do it. So would it be possible to do this that we can - we're going to look into the current policy process and see how's the appropriate process to - that this work would fit in.

But I was wondering if people could comment on whether these recommendations - the content of these recommendations itself makes sense and also any additional recommendations that you - that you would like to put on there for the working group as a whole to discuss. Thanks.

Oh and I see we reached the 9 o'clock mark. Julie, what should we do here?

Julie Hedlund: Well, Steve, I would suggest - and others of course can disagree. This is Julie. But that you've got information you need to start filling out the report itself and getting some text out there.

I'll put out the notes and the action items we've got. I think Steve, you know, Dave, Steve and Scott, you know, putting some language together that can be included in the text of the report. But I think the next step is for you to put out, you know, the actual first draft full text of the report so that the group can start discussing that.

And I don't know what your timeline is for that but I'm guessing you probably need a couple of weeks for that before we schedule the next call in order to have a draft of the report out for people to read before the next call.

Steve Sheng: Yes. I can do that. The only question I have is we haven't gone through the recommendations so I can write all the way up to recommendations. But I don't...

Julie Hedlund: Steve, this is Julie. You know, my only concern is that we really need to get a written report out there for people to look at. If we wait until next Monday and go through the recommendations then that - then there's another couple weeks delay before we can have a written report out for people to review, I assume.

And realizing of course that these recommendations will also be in the draft of the report that you're writing and we will be asking people to specifically read through that report and comment on it including those recommendations.

So - but I'll, you know, defer to others as well but I note that Jim Galvin is on vacation next week and, you know, we might just go ahead and take this time to move ahead and get a written report out there for people to respond to.

Steve Sheng: Okay thank you. So I take it - what do people think that I start writing the report and then I also write the recommendation section and then, you know, noting that in the report and saying, you know, this recommendation section hasn't been thoroughly discussed.

And then once we have the report and all the text in front of the working group that we engage specifically a discussion on that recommendation section. This way we'll avoid the delay. What do people think?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I support that approach.

Julie Hedlund: And, Steve, this is Julie. I just want to point out that there are several people on our list who have not been on these meetings discussing the outline. So in any case I believe we're going to need a couple of meetings to go through the full report and really emphasize that people need to comment specifically on

the report specifically those who have not been on these calls to discuss the outline.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Julie, I note that. Okay. So are there any difference of opinions or are we all in support of Steve's point of view - Steve Metalitz, I guess. I'll start writing it and then once we have the text ready we can discuss the recommendations.

Scott Austin: This is Scott. That makes sense to me.

Bob Hutchinson: Yeah this is Bob Hutchinson...

Julie Hedlund: So Steve...

Bob Hutchinson: ...I support that as well.

Julie Hedlund: Sorry, this is Julie.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: So if I schedule a call for the 22nd would you be able to have a draft ready before then for members to discuss?

Steve Sheng: Okay that's short but I'll try my best, yeah.

Julie Hedlund: Even if you had some of it written, I mean, I think to keep this moving I would suggest...

Steve Sheng: Yeah.

Julie Hedlund: ...that we have a call on the 22nd. And if others - unless others disagree with that.

Steve Sheng: Yeah, I'm okay with that, yeah.

Julie Hedlund: All right so the next call will be scheduled on the 22nd at this same time. We'll get as much of the draft report out as we can prior to that. Is there anything else we need to discuss on this call?

Then thank you, everyone. I'm sorry to carry over but this has been a very helpful discussion. This call is adjourned. We'll meet again on the 22nd. And I'll send out notes and action items shortly.

Steve Metalitz: Thanks, Julie.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Bye everyone.

END