GNSO/SSAC
International Registration Data Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 15 March 2010 at 14:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO/SSAC International Registration Data Workign Group on 15 March 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://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#mar
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ird-wg-20100315.mp3

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

Present for the teleconference:
Jeremy Hitchcock - DYN-DNS
James Galvin - SSAC, Afilias
Yao Jiankang, GNSO Registry Stakeholder Group, CNNIC
Steve Metalitz - GNSO Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial Stakeholder Group
Avri Doria - NCSG
Ram Mohan - Afilias – SSAC Board liaison (disconnected shortly after start)

ICANN Staff
Steve Sheng
Gisella Gruber-White
Dave Piscitello
Francisco Arias

Absent apologies:
Rafik Dammak -- GNSO Non-Commercial Users Stakeholder Group
Ray Plzak
Julie Hedlund
Mark Kosters – SSAC, ARIN

Coordinator: The call has started.

Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning, good afternoon to everyone. On today's IRD call on

                    Monday the 15th of March we have Jeremy Hitchcock, Ram Mohan who

                    seems to have temporarily disconnected, (Yao Jiankang James Galvin, Avri

                    Doria, from Staff we have Dave Piscitello, Steve Sheng, Francisco Arias, I,

myself, Gisella Gruber-White. We also have apologies from Rafik Dammak and Ray Plzak.

And if I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking. Thank you, over to you Steve.

Steve Sheng: Thank you and welcome to today's IRD call on March 15. And thank you for your participation especially for those of you calling in at late night from Asia.

So I will - this is the first time I organized the call so my apologies. In the last call since we're rotating our times for call and not all the participants were able to join the call last week - two weeks ago - so I think our first kind of give a summary of our discussion two weeks ago.

And then Jeremy I'm going to give the mic to you to organize the meeting is that okay?

Jeremy Hitchcock:That's great.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Jeremy Hitchcock:Take it away.

Steve Sheng: I'm sorry what?

Jeremy Hitchcock:Take it away.

Steve Sheng: Oh okay. So two weeks ago we had a phone call and a couple - there are a couple of things we discussed; I'm just going to highlight the key issues. So one of the questions that the members - participant on the call discussed is to whether require a must be present representation of the WHOIS data.

And so in the past we have different opinions. On one side basically is requiring a must be present representation may present the barrier of entry to those who does not the must be present language whether that language be English or French or whatever.

So that's one opinion. The other opinion is saying basically requiring a must be present language representation may be necessary to contact registrants from different countries. So those are the two opinions in the room and we don't have agreements.

So Edmon noted that the discussion is maybe a useful way forward would be to consider some kind of a backward compatibility with ASCII. So today most of the - if not all the WHOIS information is in ASCII. So going into internationalized registration data was wondering maybe a more useful way to consider some kind of a backward compatibility.

Some other members suggested other ways so for example one option is not requiring registrants to input English or Roman characters but maybe requiring registrars to publish point of contacts to deal with translation issues so that's one option.

Another option would be just to, you know, to ask the registrars themselves to perform translation. And I think at the meeting some suggestion maybe a good next step forward it just to list all the available options on the table and maybe deliberate on the pros and cons of each of them.

So a third area that we discussed is the UPU standards for international addressing. And I provided - and Edmon asked us to provide some background documents more on these UPU standards. So I send the earlier document late this morning, my apologies.

So, those where we are in terms of the session. So Jeremy.

Jeremy Hitchcock:Sorry, I keep switching - this is Jeremy - sorry I keep switching back and forth on mute. Could you, Steve, maybe go over quickly the UPU standard just in case people aren't too familiar with it and didn't get a chance to review it and we can discuss its merits of the backwards compatibility as well afterwards?

Steve Sheng: Sure. So the UPU standard is a standard by the Universal Postal Union on formatting of international address. So what it says is when sending letters, sending mail internationally, they govern that their standard define the character set to be used.

So essentially it's saying the addressee's address be worded - should be written legibly in Roman letters and Arabic numerals. If other letters or figures are used in the country of destination it shall be recommended that the address be given also in these letters and numerals.

So essentially it's saying international mail is - the address should be written in Roman letters and Arabic numerals. And in addition if there's an additional language for example if a mail was sent to China or sent to Japan or sent to India where they have a local language the addressee can also put the address - the sender can also put the addressee's address in the local language as well. So that's roughly the UPU standard for formatting international address. This is Article 123.3.3.

Another UPU international addressing standard is called ACT42 called the International Post Address Component and Templates. It essentially defines a common list of international name and address elements and provide template languages both a natural language and XML language schemer for computer processing.

And so it essentially kind of standardized, you know, when sending mail internationally what are the fields needs to be there and how to be - what are the definition for each field. And it's up to the - each member country to

approve the standard and implement the templates for that standard become part of the ACT42.

So those are the two UPU standards that might be of interest for the working group. Thanks.

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. So a couple things that seem to jump out at me at least is that UP Standard makes the ASCII character representation a requirement and the local script is optional? Is that correct Steve?

Steve Sheng: That's my understanding.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Okay. And the second - the second thing that kind of jumps out based on discussions that we've had before is the mixing of scripts in a particular single address. And it sounds like that a single script is permitted for a particular address representation and that's also correct?

Steve Sheng: I'm not sure, I'm not certain about the mixing of scripts. I don't think the UPU standards specify.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Okay.

Steve Sheng: Yes. Generally the postal - the address is very flexible, the postmen are really good finding the addresses but...

Jeremy Hitchcock: It's the human component of the equation though I think that makes it so flexible. So this is Jeremy again. What do, you know, what's kind of people's initial feedback of the UPU standard as a potential to be applied for addressing information? People have - is this something that we should look at, not look, what are some pros and cons of potentially adopting this as kind of a standard that we point to?

Dave Piscitello: This is Dave Piscitello. The original idea of looking at the UPU standard was not so much to see if there's an alternative schema so to speak of collecting information that would be contact information but trying to understand how they dealt with local languages, you know, in their transport.

So the - in the original Webinar I gave I mentioned that this was an example of a, you know, a communications provider that essentially said, you know, you must have, you know, must have Roman letters and Arabic numerals but you may have, you know, may have contact information in an alternative if that is also beneficial.

And it was simply to point out that, you know, that some people do in fact say well there's something that's mandatory. And that was the only real purpose in calling attention to the UPU. Now if we think that there's something else that we need to consider that's fine but I just wanted to make certain that the original intent was clear.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Okay.

James Galvin: Yes, this is Jim Galvin. So to use that as a basis for my comment I don't think that the UPU standard should be used as a reason to suggest that there's any kind of base requirement for a single international language for WHOIS information.

The problem that I have - I mean, the issue - the reason why I think that is because UPU standard really applies more in a peer to peer relationship if you will. The problem is the WHOIS model is different, it's a one-to-many relationship.

And so I thin it's harder to say that the entire world needs to have a single language. I mean, here with the UPU standard, you know, you're dealing with, you know, just the country of origin and country of destination and you

don't have that information readily available to you when you're using a WHOIS type service or protocol.

Avri Doria: This is Avri can I comment?

Dave Piscitello: Well in one sense...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yes, to Jim's I think I respectfully disagree. I think you are in this as well as in anything in a one-to-many -- in others it is one sender and yes each instance may just be one-to-one but that I actually would very much support using something like this standard.

I think one thing when you get into the discussion of you're trying to force Latin down everybody's throats you basically have an internationally accepted agreement where we'd just say, yes, this is just the right way of doing it.

I think the base requirement of having something that anyone in the world can understand is valid and I think the idea of having something that also those who only have the local could also understand if they wish is a really good idea.

So while I'm not saying that we necessarily need to adopt it, you know, in total because I haven't, you know, read the whole standard and there may be different pieces that don't fit I think basing what we do on this is a seriously good idea that we should consider.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Yes.

Dave Piscitello: This is Dave again. I wanted to point out that there are also some nuances that don't necessarily translate from postal mail to WHOIS. One is that in

some respects we, you know, we have some unique information that doesn't appear in a letter. For example sponsoring registrar, I mean, there is no other than the postal stamp, you know, there is no real indication of who the sponsoring registrar is.

And so when we say it would be nice to have some information mandatorily in certain character sets that's I think, you know, one part of the topic we have to look at but then the question is are we talking about all the information, are we talking about information that the registrar provides, information that the registrant provides.

And then even in the context of information the registrant provides what of that information would the registrant be required to provide in the sort of mandatory language and what would the registrar be able to provide.

So maybe Staff could sit down and kind of pull out all these questions and try to draw the, you know, draw the questions that are innate from the parent question here.

You know, I have some sympathies with, you know, with the notion that people who don't, you know, who don't know English or don't know, you know, don't know Roman, you know, Roman characters, you know, being in some respect hamstrung.

But, you know, there's a strong observation that, you know, many of those people probably aren't in the domain world yet. And maybe there's a transition where we learn a little bit by having ASCII remain mandatory for some time but also start to consider ways to expand into other languages.

I think there's a lot of permutations here and what's promising is that we're getting an awful lot of good perspectives in this working group which is what we had originally hoped for.

James Galvin: So this is Jim Galvin, let me respond to Avri and Dave here in the following way. I guess - I want to focus on the particular contact information about a registrant or about the domain, I mean, as Dave says there may very well be - and in fact I think that there is some information that can be standardized in, you know, very significant ways like the registrar identifier for example could certainly be required to be in one format, one script, one kind of identifier.

When I think about the postal service and I think about what happens when people send letters, you know, if a letter is going to stay within a certain country and within in that locale then you get to use just your own local language and I think that that applies to the vast majority of messages.

And so the idea that we're going to require the entire world to put things in one script just seems - it doesn't seem quite international to me. Now, I mean, is there a way for us to provide a means for information that a registrant might enter in their local script that is then stored out there as a way for us to provide for that to become some international format. That might be interesting just to talk about and Steve had put a couple of ideas out there.

So I think Avri, I guess maybe if I were to try and identify the one point - I guess I want to clarify one point from you and figure out if this is really a point where we disagree. I mean, are you suggesting that you think there should be a single script which all registration information has to appear in? Or are you allowing for the possibility that these things might be in two forms and we just haven't talked about how we get it into both forms yet?

Avri Doria: Yes, I am arguing that there has to be one mandatory form and just like the UN says all business with the UN has to be done in English or French and other languages can follow. I think that all WHOIS information needs to be in one and should optionally include another.

So basically following the sort of principal of this standard obviously the details like I said would be different but the principal saying that Latin characters or in our case ASCII characters need to be the base standard that everything has a listing in and that for the purposes of local usage that when there are registrants who don't have Latin - not registrants but users who don't have Latin I expect that the registrants we're saying need to have some way of doing Latin or the registrar needs to provide them sort of translation ability.

I don't really care at the moment how it gets into ASCII characters or an equivalent gets into ASCII but the user should have the ability both if they're a local user to get that information in WHOIS locally without needing to know ASCII and that the international user or whoever needs that information should be able to get that information without needing to know the local language.

So yes I'm saying at least one is required and one is optional. I think making them both required might be difficult although I have probably no problem going there.

James Galvin: So one final comment for me then, the only observation I make, I mean, I have some sympathy for the UN sort of principal, I really do. My observation about it is compared to the Internet community is I think the Internet community is much larger than the UN community.

And so I just have concerns about how well that principal scales. And I'll just put that point out there and just sort of wait and - oh...

((Crosstalk))

James Galvin: ...wait and see where the discussion takes us.

Avri Doria: If I could just counter that for a second? I actually disagree with that completely unless we're including the interplanetary network in the Internet (unintelligible). I think there are plenty of nations within the UN that barely have an Internet presence yet. So I think that the Internet has not quite reached as far as UN reaches but this is a philosophical difference, I just wanted to counter that.

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. Jim would you have a way of articulating what the requirement base is? I guess you would mostly say that contact information could be represented in any particular language and there be multiple encodings or a single encoding or what sort of rule set would you use to define kind of the - if not the UPU something else?

James Galvin: Well let's see. If I understand your question, I mean, obviously the first requirement would be that the WHOIS information would need to be tagged with whatever script it's in which is certainly something that doesn't exist today.

                  But I think what I'm suggesting is that, you know, local registrants should be able to use whatever their local accepted language is. The act of translation so that it's generally readable I think the parties that need that translation should be obligated to find a way to cause that to come into existence.

Jeremy Hitchcock: So registry - yes, I'm trying to wrap my head around this of whether a registrant decides a language script and if a registrant let's say in a country with a standard language or an official language let's say in France if I decide to use a different language set even though it's not the official language am I permitted to do that? Is it based on the registrant?

                  Because you'd presumably get into cases where the local registrant could choose a language script that the presiding mail system would not accept or understand or be able to process.

And looking at the spirit of the contact information which is to presumably identify that - the geographic location of that person or send them documentation by courier or something like that. I'm wondering if there's a conflict in the flexibility given to a particular registrant in different scenarios.

James Galvin: Well obviously a registrant would be limited by what their registrar offers so they would need to seek out a registrar that supports them in the way in which they want to be supported.

So are you asking me what are the requirements on a registrar or what are the permissions on a registrar?

Jeremy Hitchcock: It would be the permissions on a registrar. If a registrar is an international entity and is serving customers in different countries do I - does that entity need to have a, essentially a look up of what scripts are permitted in what countries? And I think that that's - it's kind of a prevailing question of knowing - of understanding whether a registrant can provide a particular language script.

James Galvin: Well, you know, I mean, I guess I don't want to be hard about what would be the absolute requirements on a registrar. I mean, think there are several models that are possible and we need to continue to explore them. Registrars are going to have rules imposed on them from many places not just ICANN.

So in this particular context if a given country has a requirement that all of its domains or contact information have to be in a certain script then a registrar that wants to sell to registrants in that particular country would need to, you know, to follow those rules whatever they are.

You know, if a TLD has requirements about, you know, names being in a particular language and contact information being a certain way then yes they're going to have to implement those rules too.

You know, I don't know, do we want to have a one universal set of rules or do we want to allow those options on registrars or countries to impose rules? I guess I have to think about that some more and would be interested in hearing what others have to say about that. Does that answer your question?

Jeremy Hitchcock: Yes it does. And again it's just trying to frame the question of a - if we're presuming to say that we're creating a standard that is different than what exists out there it's useful to articulate it in the sense of what are the rules.

And if - I'm in the United States so if I use a language set that is essentially not English - not Latin characters and I drop it in the local post system it's not going to get delivered and that's kind of the same thing that's true in either in Arabic script countries or in Cyrillic script countries that if the UPU standard is what it seems to be Latin representation seems to work and it's somewhat of a universal set of identifiable geographic or identifying information.

So it's just, you know, understanding the subtleties of why that is a particular standard I think is important before going off and saying that, you know, maybe there's - that's flawed for the Internet context. But something worth discussing and looking at tearing apart with other members as well to hear different opinions.

Dave Piscitello: Jeremy this is Dave again. You know, as I listen to the conversation here one of the things I realized is it's very easy to conflate the impact when we talk about these in - the issues generally because we aren't really focusing on who is impacted by each decision.

And I'm wondering if what we need is a matrix that identifies the choices down the column or the row. And across on the column it says impact to user, impact to registrant, impact to registrar or implication to registrar, impact to registry.

And we take for example requiring, you know, requiring Roman, you know, Roman characters and Arabic numerals for all fields. So if you look at that the impact on affiliates today as a registry provider is relatively zero; the impact to the registrar is relatively zero. The impact to the user and to the registrant probably has to do with locality.

And so we can maybe tease out what happens in each of these cases and then we can say okay that's in the case now what if we say that it's, you know, it's essentially a local user choice, you know, whatever language, you know, is established by the registrar as, you know, as one of a set of languages it supports.

What are the implications on all the parties? And I think we get to see perhaps some of the more subtler issues that are hard to quite tease out when we just look at it in just one way. And I'll close with sort of a - I know it's going to sound like a frivolous example but I think it calls attention to internationalization and IDN in particular.

I mean, imagine a new TLD that is - applicant that wants to use Klingon and the purpose is to, you know, to embrace the language or it's not Klingon, some language that is disappearing in the world but is recognized in Unicode. And the purpose is to embrace a, you know, a language that is not widely used.

Chances are that the majority of that, you know, of the community that will use that do not know Roman characters and Arabic letters. And if they don't perhaps, you know, what would be the implication on the users, on the registrar, you know, if we chose to impose certain rules? And I think it would be worth walking through that.

Avri Doria: Okay this is Avri. Comment?

Jeremy Hitchcock:Go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay I'm sorry. I think that's probably a good exercise but I think we have to add just one complication to it; I think for example where you said that requiring ASCII would have no impact on the registrars.

I think we have to consider that, even though I very much support doing it, that if we require it on a registrant then it might have some feedback impact on a registrar in that if it's something that's difficult for them to do but must be done then the registrar incurs the need to find a way to help them do it whether it's translation service of some sort of whatever - automatic translation or what have you.

So I think in doing that it's not a simple exercise of saying, you know, no real impact on registrars for ASCII but yes impact on registrants but none on users and so on so that we understand the implications of requiring it once that's down the food chain has an impact on one step up the food chain.

Dave Piscitello: Sure.

Jeremy Hitchcock:This is Jeremy. I do think a matrix is going to be useful because I think that this in the end is going to come down to a gut feeling and some people are going to feel one way or another and having the lines defined will be useful in trying to determine what level of consensus there is for which particular flavor.

Steve Sheng: Okay so the Staff can take a first pass at compiling that matrix. And then the working group can discuss and add content to that matrix. That sound like a peaceful step forward?

Avri Doria: Yes, one comment to go with the one I made. This is Avri again. Is it may be good in talking and looking at each of the matrices and I know it complicates things - at looking at primary effect and secondary effect. That sort of covers and makes you look at not only what are the primary effects to each of these

entities but are there any secondary effects that happen because of effects to someone else.

Steve Sheng: This is Steve again. Avri so what difference between - can you give an example of a primary and secondary effect just to clarify.

Avri Doria: Sure. A primary effect for example when we answered the question of what is the impact on ASCII for a registrar. The impact in a primary sense is there's none; they're already doing it. In a secondary thing if there is a requirement that registrants produce ASCII then there's a requirement on registrars to help them do so so that would be a secondary effect.

Steve Sheng: Sure, thank you.

Dave Piscitello: That's a good point.

Steve Sheng: I guess maybe if you agree maybe we can before compiling the matrix maybe we can determine the rows and columns of that matrix before we fill in more information.

                  So what I'm hearing is Dave, Jeremy and Avri's suggestion is so for each row of the column basically one option that, you know, maybe one option is we leave this to local matter registrar deal with locally but maybe they provide translation service so that's one option. So those are the options.

                  On each column basically the criterias we're evaluating them. And so far what I'm hearing is the criterias are potential impacts to registrars and to registries, to registrants. So for registrars...

Avri Doria: And users.

Steve Sheng: ...do we also want to separate out the existing registrars and the potential entrants for IDN registrants - registrars I'm sorry. And for each of those we

consider primary and secondary impact. Am I summarizing the discussion correctly?

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. So you would potentially draw a distinction between truly generic top-level domains and language-centric top-level domains?

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Is that - am I hearing that question correctly/

Steve Sheng: Yes, language-centric. You mean ccTLDs?

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. No things like .cat which are in a particular language set.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Okay.

Jeremy Hitchcock: That's an interesting way to slice it apart. What do people think about that?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I just wanted to mention that we also would need a column for the users of the WHOIS data.

Avri Doria: This is Avri...

Steve Sheng: Right.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Yes, Avri also had said that and I...

((Crosstalk))

Jeremy Hitchcock: ...note to make sure that that got added because that is an important distinction of law enforcement intellectual property concerns.

Avri Doria: Right.

Dave Piscitello: So if you're going to look at users it might be worth just -I'm not certain there's actually going to be a distinction but automation as a different kind of users, so interactive user and automated user.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, I think that makes sense as a subset.

Avri Doria: And Avri - this is Avri again. Commenting on dividing the two types of registrars or, you know, the IDN versus not I don't know that anything different will come out between them but I think it's an interesting exercise to see if the answers come out different between. So, yes, I could support putting in the column which at first seems sort of redundant but it's worth checking if it really is redundant.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

James Galvin: Yes, this is Jim. I mean, I think as a principal I'm generally in favor of splitting out columns more because it would be interesting to see if they come out different. I mean maybe as you're filling out the matrix something will occur to you as a difference and you'll want to create additional columns just to call that out.

But - and I think that would be useful. It would be helpful just to sort of see how that falls out.

Avri Doria: Right which recommends a final column which is other notes and comments for other stuff that we find filling it out that doesn't get into the matrix.

Steve Sheng: Okay then...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Sheng: ...Jeremy's previous question about separating gTLDs into the generic and also the language-centric gTLDs.

Avri Doria: Well they're all generic but if we're talking about - oh no we're talking about generic (NTC)s...

Steve Sheng: Well no, I mean...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Sheng: ...some gTLDs are language-centric too.

Avri Doria: Right.

Jeremy Hitchcock:This is Jeremy. It would be the ones that are charter-based that are specifically - I guess officially sponsored which are not IDNs in the sense where they're not, you know, they've gone through a different track, .Asia would be another example and just they might have adopted language policies that are specific to the purposes that satisfy their charter. So again looking for other ways to identify differences that might be another way just to tear things apart.

Steve Sheng: Okay. So we can definitely do that. So is (Chin Kahn) still on the line?

(Chin Kahn-Yaoul):   Yes.

Steve Sheng: Hi (Chin Kahn), thanks. I was wondering - well thank you. I was wondering if you have any thoughts on these and also just on postal standards and such requiring a must be present language especially in light of your experience in ccTLDs.

Yao Jiankang   So okay my comments maybe different from your conclusion. From my experience since UPU is from (ITU) - (ITU) is a very strong international

standard is common related organization. So their standard have already followed by many countries. So I think maybe the principal of UPU maybe we can follow it for the - for the English and non-ASCII characters. I support both proposals should there be (unintelligible).

So first the local language will be entered or imported by the registrant. So if the (original) can not put English - English characters so the registrar should help them to input it. So final result received from the registrar should be a - be have both some English or ASCII (unintelligible) and ASCII character.

So the from - application form should be have two-part ASCII part and non-ASCII part. If the local user can not input ASCII part the registrar should help them to do it. Thank you.

Steve Sheng: Thanks. Thanks for the opinion, very valid. So let's see - so what I have - let me just briefly summarize the columns that I have. So I have the potential for given proposal - I have the potential of impact to registrars and we want to separate IDN-based registrars versus non-IDN-based registrars.

I have impact to registries, to registrants and to the users of WHOIS data that includes both human users and interactive users. So that's what I have so far. Am I summarizing things correctly? Hello, did I loss...

Jeremy Hitchcock:This is Jeremy. I think that those are good columns. And maybe the first round of viewing the chart will instill some discussion and some commentary on what we're missing.

Steve Sheng: Okay so does the working group want to give the staff some guidance in terms of what options we should explore to take a first pass? I'm hearing several options on the table, just want to, you know, to give us some guidance in terms of which - or what to investigate.

Dave Piscitello: I mean, I think that the options that we've been talking about and even over the past few teleconferences about, you know, the kinds of overall systems or models that might exist are all appropriate.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

James Galvin: I mean, we can - try and recap them here if you want or I'm comfortable with letting you go back and, you know, find the ones you can find and then we'll see during our first discussion if anybody recalls anything that didn't get captured or wants to add something new. This is Jim Galvin by the way, sorry.

Steve Sheng: Thanks Jim. So what I have is I think the - let me just kind of briefly summarize the options that I think are currently on the table. So the first option is requiring a ASCII representation of the WHOIS data and then in addition to that make it optional for local language representation. So that's Option 1 that I see.

The Option 2 I see is do not require ASCII representation so registrants are free to enter their own format but it's up to the registrar to provide translation service and make that - and make that ASCII. So that's the second option.

The third option is very similar to the second option but instead of requiring registrars to translate the registrar just provide the point of contact for responding to translation services. So those are the three options that I think from past discussion that are on the table. So is that a correct summary or are there other options on the table?

Dave Piscitello: I guess one - this is Dave. One thing I want to do is carefully tease out which information we're talking about.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Dave Piscitello: And we had done a pretty good job thus far of identifying blocks of data so we had I think a good discussion about sponsoring registrar and a good discussion about what - that we would treat contact information as a blob I think was Jay Daley's term. And I think that that will be valuable.

And certainly name server information, you know, would fall into that category. So, you know, we probably want to note that. And my assumption is that, you know, all the kind of ancillary information that registrars, you know, apply when they do display is their own business.

Steve Sheng: Thanks Dave. So what do you think - which data elements should we go through these matrix? So what's your suggestion I guess?

Dave Piscitello: So I guess - I think it would be useful to call attention to the sponsoring registrar as one item. You know, there may be actually no need to, you know, I mean, whether or not we have one or many languages for sponsoring registrar is, you know, is one issue.

And I think it's separate from registrant contact information, you know, technical contact information, administrative contact information. You know, what is the consequence of having one of those be mandatory?

For example when we say must be, you know, must be ASCII to use Avri's term, for contact information is it absolutely essential that that be applied for registrant administrative contact and technical contact or are we going to be more liberal than that in the way that we analyze these?

So I think the best thing to do perhaps is to just walk through the, you know, the mandatory elements and try to come up with some granularity to see how far we want to delve down.

Steve Sheng: Okay thanks. I'm taking a note on that. Any other thoughts?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I thought we had determined that - and for some of these elements I think we know the answer, the telephone numbers I think people were saying on our last call are always in Arabic numerals. And obviously there might be different ways of presenting that I guess but it's always in Arabic numerals.

And I suppose that the email address to the extent that's required is, I mean, it's going to be what it's going to be. Today it's always in ASCII or at least - but obviously in the future it won't always be in the ASCII. So and it's not really useful I suppose to have an email address that was - it's in some other script be transliterated into ASCII. It wouldn't help you contact the person.

So I'm just noting that there are probably some for which we - there isn't going to be as much - as many options about how it's going to be presented. Now when you get into registrant name and street address and so forth then I think there probably are options. Thanks.

Yao Jiankang   This is (Chin Kahn). I think some of the information should not be ASCII-based so some information should - ASCII information should it be mandatory, should it be necessary since we (unintelligible) internationalize the WHOIS why we have internationalize ASCII. For internationalize there are two parts, one part is for those who don't understand the local language understand some information, the other is the localize is for some local user who input their prefer the language.

But for communication I think some information should - the ASCII information should be mandatory and non-ASCII information should be optional. Thank you.

Steve Sheng: Thanks (Chin Kahn) and also thanks Steve. I think we are not disagreeing with you. And I think it's not really a correct word of saying that. But I'm just saying - acknowledging there is a difference opinions on the - in the whole working group that I - tougher to do this matrix.

I think that the goal of the matrix is really one way to help us to understand each and different options better. I think that's - I see the greatest benefit of doing the matrix.

As responding to Steve with respect to I think Dave is also not contradicting you either. What Dave is specifically saying I think talking about for example the - we have mostly spent time talk about like registrant contact information, internationalize that. But what about administrative contact information? What about technical contact information?

Should those be internationalized the same way as the registrant contact information? And I think we haven't really discussed about those yet. So those are my points.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I agree with that, we should look at all those. But I'm just saying within those categories for example administrative contact information has a number of elements and some of those would need to be internationalized and some I think are already all in ASCII such as telephone numbers; that was the only point I was making.

Steve Sheng: Thanks - thanks for that clarification. So I think the staff probably has enough guidance and can take a first pass at producing the matrix. And then Jeremy I think maybe the next step is before the next conference call we will send it out for deliberations.

Now also realizing that - what's the best way to do this? I think we may not be the best representation of the different ideas of this working group. Maybe we produce a preliminary matrix and it's up to working group member to fill it out. That, you know, who has the best interest in that. What do you think?

Avri Doria: Hi, this is Avri. I think that's a good idea. I think getting some sort of polled result or something that shows, you know, some of the variety of viewpoints...

Steve Sheng: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...and what, you know, whether it's standard deviations or what are we really close in our opinions or are we not. It could be an interesting exercise, you know, if we all think the same way that's good; if we have wide deviation then that might be interesting.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Sheng: Yes.

Avri Doria: But yes, we've done that in the past with various things, you know, ask people not only to answer yes or no but the 1-5 scale and then you can play all kinds of fun number games.

Jeremy Hitchcock:Thanks Avri.

Steve Sheng: Noticing it is almost 1 o'clock. We have run out the full hour. Jeremy, are there any agenda items you want to raise and discuss?

Jeremy Hitchcock:Not me specifically, I mean, if you feel armed to start putting that chart together, the matrix together, and send it around I think that we'll be in good shape. Before we close the call are there any other topics that we should bring up for either next time or for just a flag? Okay.

                 Well thanks everyone for participating and looking forward to seeing the work on the matrix.

Steve Metalitz: Thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: So good to have a teleconference so soon after the meeting.

Jeremy Hitchcock:Indeed, take care everyone.

Avri Doria: Okay bye-bye.

((Crosstalk))

END