GNSO/SSAC
International Registration Data Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 21 November at 16:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO/SSAC International Registration Data Working Group on 21 November 2011 at 16:00 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-20111121-en.mp3
On page:http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#nov
All recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO calendar page: http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/

Present for the teleconference:
Steven Metalitz -- GNSO Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial
Owen Smigelski - Sunrider International, Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial Stakeholder Group
Avri Doria – NCSG
Bob Hutchinson -- GNSO Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG)
Sarmad Hussain - CLE-KICS, UET

ICANN Staff
Steve Sheng
Dave Piscitello
Julie Hedlund
Nathalie Peregrine

Absent apologies:
Rafik Dammak -- GNSO Non-Commercial Users Stakeholder Group
Yao Jiankang, GNSO Registry SG
Edmon Chung - ALAC
Jim Galvin – SSAC –Afilias

Coordinator: Remind all participants this conference is being recorded. If you have any

objections you may disconnect at this time.

You may begin.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much. And welcome everyone to the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group call.

I'll go ahead and do a roll call and then I know we don't have Jim Galvin yet. But we do have quite a number of Work Group members.

So I would like to suggest that perhaps we can go ahead and try to, you know, start some work and see if Jim can join us and of course I'll take notes as usual.

So good morning, good afternoon and good evening; on the call we have from the IRD Working Group Bob Hutchinson, Avri Doria, Steve Metalitz, Owen Smigelski; and from staff we have Steve Sheng, Dave Piscitello, and my self Julie Hedlund and also sorry not to mention sooner, Nathalie Peregrine.

And thank you Nathalie for setting up the call.

And with that I guess my thought for today was that we had sent around the comments that were received in a public forum. There were four comments. I hope you received the email message with the comments.

Did anyone not receive the email?

Then perhaps what we can do is begin to go through the comments one by one and see, you know, how the Work Group might like to address them.

Just a little note about the public comments process, it's changed a little bit recently. And what's happened is that normally in the past the staff would prepare a summary and analysis of the comments received. Now the emphasis is on the community to provide the analysis of the comments

received. And staff can of course take that analysis and put it into the proper report format that needs to be published in the forum.

But for, you know, community working groups it's important of course for us to get the community working group comments on response to the comments received if any that there isn't a requirement necessarily to respond to each comment.

But, you know, the working group members really should (unintelligible) comments and, you know, get a sense of, you know, how they may or may not want to address them.

So that's the process we're in now. And the idea is to try to complete this process pretty quickly if we can because the sooner we can publish the report the better, you know, as part of the public forum process.

Are there any questions with respect to the process?

Steve Metalitz: Yes, this is Steve Metalitz.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Please go ahead Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Are you - did I hear correctly that the staff, I mean here we only have four comments so it's not a big issues but in some public comment forums there are dozens or hundreds of comments.

Are you saying the staff will no longer prepare summaries?

Julie Hedlund: No, that's not what I was saying. And thank you for that.

What I was saying was that the analysis. There's basically two parts to the template now that we use to prepare the summary and analysis. There's the summary portion which staff will do and in this case I'll take a first draft at the

summary, you know, which is really just summarizing the comments and, you know, run that by Dave and Steve to make sure I haven't missed anything.

But the analysis is really the piece that's important to get the Working Group participation in. It doesn't mean that staff won't, you know, write up whatever the final version of that is that gets slotted into the report.

But in particular we need to know, you know, does the Work Group think, you know, it needs to address a particular comment.

You know is the comment germane?

You know, how might we address it?

Might it result in changes to the draft report or not, you know, that's where we need a staff, your guidance.

So that will then be funneled into the template that we use to produce this summary analysis report.

Steve Metalitz: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: That staff will produce.

Steve Metalitz: Thanks for clarifying that.

Julie Hedlund: Sure. So, thanks for your question. Any other questions?

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: (Unintelligible) wait, so we're going to start discussing this and then you're going to do a summary later?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, I mean we just got the comments. The summary is just - basically the summary is just there were four comments. This is basically what each one said, you know, summarizing very high level, you know, this was favorable, this was not. It's not an analysis at all. There's absolutely no analysis in that piece. It's just four comments, you know, this one said that, you know, this, this one said that, this one said that.

I mean if you prefer we can produce that summary but the fact of the matter is that summary isn't going to necessarily address every single detail that's in the comments which is something really the Work Group has to do is take a look at the comments and read them and say well, you know, we agree with this or we don't agree with that or we want to deal with this or deal with that.

I'm afraid if you take the summary, you know, if staff produces a summary, you know, and we lose some of the detail there might be details that we need to address that aren't in the summary, you know, but are in the actually comments.

And the summary is meant to be very brief.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, okay. I mean again I don't think it's an issue in this one because there's only four comments so but I supposed in a - in one in which there are many, many public comments then the summary takes on this issue.

Julie Hedlund: Well and, you know, and I think that was the case. You know Avri you probably could mention too, you know, on something like the PDP process, I think there was a great deal of comment, a great deal of detail and, you know, a need for more summarization of all of that.

In the interest of being expedient, you know, we were thinking then why don't we just go ahead since there are only four comments and deal with them this way. I think it really does depend Steve on, you know, how many comments you have and, you know, what is the, you know, what the issues are there.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Any other questions?

Okay so I'm going to turn things over to Steve. Okay and I see we have a note from Jim. Okay and Steve why don't you go ahead and get started. I'm going to respond to Jim here. It looks like now he does have a conflict.

Steve Sheng: Sure Julie. So perhaps we could go through the comments one by one since there are only four comments so it shouldn't take us too long.

There are several substantive comments from INTA and also the Message Anti-Abuse Working Group that does deserve careful consideration.

So if people are okay, then we'll start with the ALAC comment since it's the first on the email.

I'm hearing no objections. You can pull up the ALAC comment from either the public forum or the email that Julie sent out.

So I went through - first of all let me give us a minute or two to read through these comments. I did read through this a couple times.

Woman: We don't have an Adobe Room, do we?

Julie Hedlund: No, we have not used an Adobe Room for this call so we've never had one established.

Woman: Okay, fine.

Man: Well this...

Steve Sheng: Perhaps...

Steve Metalitz: ...comment, this ALAC comment seems to be supporting the three recommendations. I guess we should note that. I mean obviously that doesn't call for any change in the report or any response, does it?

Steve Sheng: Yes, I agree with you Steve. Yes, it's a report - a - yes, it's supporting the recommendations in the IRD Report.

Any other thoughts on the ALAC comment? So Steve suggested that we note this of their support in the summary analysis. Any other thoughts on how to address ALAC's comments?

Tim Ruiz: Hi. This is Tim Ruiz. I just wanted to point out that...

Steve Sheng: Hi Tim. Go ahead.

Tim Ruiz: Okay. I just wanted to point out that there's - reference RAA is something which we are not sure this address explicitly in our report.

Steve Sheng: So in the report in one of the sections where we talk about what is our registration data we pull up the relevant requirements from the RAA. I believe its Section 3.3.

Is that enough for this purpose or do we need to go further in the summary analysis?

(Simon):   (It's really on this call) try to understand what ALAC's perspective as far as their reference to RAA is concerned, what are they trying to say in this particular comment?

So if they're saying that we have (consistently) focus the implementation of (Whois service) within this (unintelligible) of the existing RAA Group. I'm actually not sure what that really means.

Steve Sheng: I'm not sure either. Any others have thoughts on that? It's the second paragraph of ALAC's comments.

Steve Metalitz: Well this is Steve Metalitz. I can - the only insight I have on this is that I chaired a Drafting Team in the GNSO that worked on identifying topics for revisions to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and ALAC was quite active in that group and stressed the importance of steps to increase the accuracy of who is data and to make it - to regulate proxy services and so forth.

So that may be a reference to that and I'm not sure - don't think there's anything there that we necessarily need to take onboard in this group because ultimately whatever is finally decided down the road here presumably would be reflected in the Registrar Accreditation Agreement or some other document that sets forth what registrars are required to do, if they're required to do something different in the (current) environment.

So I'm not - I don't know if that's exactly what they were referring to but I could just - I was just offering that degree of insight to what they might be talking about there.

Avri Doria: This is Avri.

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes. Just to build on that, I think what they're basically saying is, you know, this is something that would make Whois better and in many ways ALAC has always been, you know, whether it's what got euphemistically called the aspirational registrant's rights and other issues like that. ALAC has always

been supportive of this kind of effort and their support for this fits into their history of support so basically looking at historically to ALAC principles of, you know, Whois being fully useful and their other goals.

So yes, I would agree with what - and I don't see that it calls for any particular response from this group. I think, you know, just thanking and acknowledging, you know, their support is sufficient. There's nothing in what they wrote that requires a change and so it's really just a thank you situation. I think agree.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Owen Smigelski: This is Owen. I fully agree with that as well.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Thank you (Simon) for raising this and for Steve and Avri and Owen for expressing the opinion.

So what I'm hearing is there's no specific actions on the RAA but merely thanking (note) ALAC on this. Is that the correct summary of the opinion here?

Steve Metalitz: Yes. This is Steve. That sounds right to me.

Steve Sheng: Okay. So we'll go with that. Any other comment and thoughts on ALAC?

Hearing none, we will go to the second comment and that is (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: And I'm sorry Steve.

Steve Sheng: Okay, sorry.

Julie Hedlund: I just want to let you all know that I've been going back and forth with Jim and I have to say I apologize. I misunderstood when I talked to him Friday. He does have a conflict today. But he's going to go ahead and read the notes and, you know, and see if there's any comments.

I did indicate to him that we're going to try to address sort of the easiest or most straightforward comments first on this call and then we'll schedule a subsequent call, you know, for comments we don't get to today.

Steve Sheng: Okay, sure. So can we go to the INTA comment, that's the second comment from Julie's email? Let's pull up that.

And let's also spend a few minutes.

Julie Hedlund: Steve you might want to summarize your sense of, you know, what...

Steve Sheng: Sure.

Julie Hedlund: How you thought (unintelligible) was?

((Crosstalk))

Steve Sheng: Yes. I read through the INTA comment and the key comment is the INT (urgence), the work, the recommendations be conducted expeditiously to basically as soon as possible given the pending, you know, new detail and new program. That's my key sense of it.

And then you go through each of the recommendations.

But let's give it a minute for the Working Group members to comment on it.

Avri Doria: This is Avri, I (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead Avri.

Steve Sheng: Go ahead Avri, yes.

Avri Doria: I'm not quite sure how we answer something that says yes we agree with the steps that you've proposed. Now work on it quickly. Other than to say, you know, again thanks and yes, we hope it can be done. I mean I'm not sure what this group gets to say about doing it expeditiously.

I don't know.

Dave Piscitello: This is Dave. I absolutely think we can sort of call attention to some of the other activity in the IETF WEIRD Group and the work that SSAC has indicated it will be doing in its SAC Number 51 Report.

And, you know, illustrate that, you know, that we are in fact doing everything within the realm of what is quick and it's standard and, you know, and multi-stakeholder community environment to find a resolution.

I mean, you know, so I agree with you. There are some things we can say that indicate we haven't just written a report and are going to set it aside.

Avri Doria: Right. Yes, that's true. You guys are doing a lot. And the issues reports are probably going to be, you know, worked on by staff expeditiously. It's getting the policy questions in question one that it's still tough to predict. But yes, it sounds good.

Steve Sheng: Okay. So...

Owen Smigelski: So this is Owen.

Steve Sheng: ...what I'm hearing - I'm sorry, go ahead.

Owen Smigelski: Oh I just wanted to jump in since I was involved with the drafting of this comment on behalf of INTA.

I think the concern was that they looked and saw that the Working Group had been, because I think almost two years in the working to get this report and identifying the issues. And they certainly appreciated the work. Their concern was that, you know, there would be a report and then just kind of things would languish and not really move forward.

And I think they just wanted to highlight and draw attention to make sure that there was some sort of focus moving forward. And that this wasn't just going to be something that, you know, the report came out and that was it. So I think that was really the only concern. They just wanted to make sure that things would continue to move forward with the, you know, some sort of internationalization of this.

Julie Hedlund: Right. And that was Owen, right?

Owen Smigelski: Yes, that was.

Julie Hedlund: Okay, great.

Steve Sheng: Thank you Owen for that clarification. In that case in light of that clarification perhaps and what they suggest is sufficient (group that you work with)?

Owen Smigelski: Yes. No, I think what Dave raised, I certainly think that would be good to show what else is going on, you know, and what could be expected to happen in the future after this report, would certainly I think be a good idea to point out just so the people know that there is other things going on and this report isn't, you know, even though it's a final report, it's - there's already other things that have come out of this report and things are moving forward.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I'd agree with that and but I'd also say, you know, if you look at our three recommendations there's two that are directed to the staff and two that are directed - one that's directed to GNSO and this SSAC.

And I think we would agree. I think we should say we agree with what INTA saying that it's important to expedite this work.

So we would underscore to the recipients of our recommendations that we think they need to move as expeditiously as possible.

Steve Sheng: Okay, so Steve you're suggesting in the analysis, say we agree with the comment and ask staff to move expeditiously on this.

Steve Metalitz: Yes. And also the GNSO and the SSAC as one of our recommendations directed to them.

Steve Sheng: Okay, sure. I'm perfectly fine with that.

Okay, any other comments? I'm sorry, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes. This is Avri. I've got one other comment on that and I think that comes out from that.

And I think, you know, to the extent that the IRD Group is still in existence I think the IRD Group saying, you know, continue to filing these things insofar as making sure that they've gotten to the GNSO and the SSAC and so on.

So I think perhaps if it's reasonable and valid to add that, you know, or so long as the IRD Group is still doing its work it'll periodically check and see what's happening. If that makes sense to people.

Steve Sheng: What do people think of Avri's suggestion?

                 Avri if I understand correctly, you're saying the IRD can be dormant but can
                 check periodically on the progress, correct?

Avri Doria: It certainly can. Yes.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: And this is Julie. Avri that's an interesting and I think helpful suggestion
                 because one of the things that this group will need to think about I think is,
                 you know, this report, the final version will go before the SSAC and before the
                 GNSO. And the GNSO Council in approving the report if it does so, you
                 know, there'll be a motion.

                 And conceivably the motion could specifically say that, you know, the IRD
                 Working Group, you know, shall continue, you know, to monitor these efforts
                 because sometimes, you know, when a work is completed, you know, and
                 the GNSO Council says thanks and we accept this report or whatever then,
                 you know, then the GNSO Council has the option to disband a group.

                 But we could conceivably in the motion specifically say that the group should
                 remain, you know, constituted and have, you know, an additional (monitor)
                 (unintelligible).

Steve Sheng: Hello?

Avri Doria: Yes. Who did we lose specifically?

Steve Sheng: I'm still here.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I think that's - I'd want to think about that suggestion a little bit more. I - you know we - there's a lot of groups now within ICANN working on something related to this issue. And I don't know whether the problem is that we don't have enough groups that are active on it. I think the problem may be the opposite that we have too many groups and not enough focus.

So I'm not sure that keeping another group in existence for the purpose of monitoring action on its recommendations is a good one. But I guess I'd like to think about that.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks. This is Julie.

Avri Doria: This is Avri.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Go ahead Avri, sorry.

Avri Doria: I hadn't actually thought I was suggesting that. And I think what I had mistakenly thought was this group still other work to do. And that while it was doing its other work it would periodically check back. I hadn't actually thought through to the fact that this group had no other work to do and once it finished the final report it was blinking out of existence.

And if that's the case I think I'd have to say what Steve said. And I'd have to think about whether there was enough work for this group to do. For example would this group get involved in reviewing the data model that the staff was coming out with. Is that something that this group would even be competent of doing, you know, and so on.

So I think I would have to agree with Steve. My thought was that we still had some work to do but I wasn't paying attention to our (track of) work items and that while we were doing that other work we could take side trips to make sure that this was still going on.

But I agree with Steve that in terms of taking another group and turning it into a tracking group unless there's some work for it to do, I'm not sure how that would work.

Julie Hedlund: Right. And this is Julie just to confirm that this group was envisioned to be disbanded at - once the report is approved. I mean if the report is approved by the SSAC and the GNSO Council there is not any other work for this group to do unless it is tasked with other work by the GNSO or the SSAC.

Avri Doria: Okay, that was my mistake.

Julie Hedlund: No, not at all. And I should have made that more clear.

Steve Sheng: Okay, so what I'm hearing is we may now want this Work Group to keep track of the progress. But we do want to in the summary analysis stress that we agree with this comment and think that it's important work for the community that should be moved expeditiously. Is that a correct summary?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. Steve I just want to make sure because I'm not sure if I understood you. I think the, you know, the suggestion from Avri and Steve is that, you know, they would want to think about whether or not the IRDWG should, you know, continue in existence, you know, to be tasked to monitor work or otherwise.

And I don't think we need to address that issue in the comment. So I think you're right in what you said that, you know, we would, you know, thank the INTA and indicate that, you know, we do agree with them, you know, the Work Group agrees with them that this work should be, you know, should be expedited and to call attention to the other activity that is continuing in relation to the recommendations that is, the IETF WEIRD Group and the SAC 51 recommendations.

Steve Sheng: Yes, that's exactly what I meant so. Yes, I fully agree with you.

So maybe we can move onto the three recommendations in the discussion section that is on Page 2.

Steve Metalitz: No. I thought dealt - I thought we had dealt with this. They're supporting recommendation two and three. And there...

Steve Sheng: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: ...seems to be importance (unintelligible) quickly to make progress on all these so...

Steve Sheng: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: ...the only thing that's specific here is the paragraph about language tags. And I think they're agreeing with us there.

But I would defer to others about whether that requires any specific response.

Steve Sheng: I agree with you. I don't think - I think the current report already covers the language tag issue. And unless others felt it hasn't.

Okay, so any other thoughts on this, the INTA recommendations?

Sarmad Hussein: Hi, this is Sarmad. Just one question and that is concerning the language there is that something with the WEIRDs Group (unintelligible) or is that something which is going to be done for the initiative somewhere within ICANN's structure?

Steve Shang: Sarmad, my understanding was as part of the data model work that is Recommendation 1, you know, they need to select, you know, what (RFC) to

use for the language tag. And there are (RFC)s for tagging language and scripts so that's my understanding.

It - at this point it's unclear what the WEIRD's Group will pick up but that's a good question that we need to keep in contact - close contact with the IETF on that.

Julie Hedlund: And, Steve, you might emphasize - and I think this leads - this relates to what Dave said too, we can emphasize in our analysis that the SSAC does have a work party that is working with the IETF on the data model piece of the recommendation.

Steve Shang: Okay sounds good.

Julie Hedlund: And...

Steve Shang: Sarmad does that...

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead.

Steve Shang: Does that address your question, Sarmad?

Sarmad Hussein: So I'm actually not still clear so is this language tag requirement something which is officially put up by ICANN or is this something which needs to be put up officially by ICANN through some policy process or where are we on this? So if something which is in the report in IRDWG but does that really mean that it's an official request to WEIRD's Group from ICANN?

Steve Shang: Oh I see, I'm trying to understand. So what you're saying is this language tag is suggested in the IRD report but how does it end up...

Sarmad Hussein: As a requirement.

Steve Shang: ...end up - it ends up as a requirement, yes, yes, yes, okay.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Shang: Go ahead Dave

((Crosstalk))

Dave Piscitello: Yes well there's multiple steps here so the one step is actually to, you know, to come up with a data model and, you know, and get at least some community exposure to something like an XML data model and schema that includes language tags and (unintelligible) tags as part of the schema for those fields that the IRD has - or those elements that the IRD has identified as candidates for internationalization.

After that model is put together, and hopefully we'll have that soon, you know, there needs to be some socialization not only from the perspective of are these the right deals and is this the right way to tag and have, you know, is the model complete but also for, you know, for scrutiny among people who are experts in XML to make certain that the data model and schema makes sense.

So then if we get through those two - or when we get through those two stages the next stage would be to get some cooperation in the IETF in parallel with the work that goes in (ITN) to have, you know, have that standard be, you know, or that document which is (unintelligible) draft move towards some sort of standard (unintelligible) activity.

So the same thing is going on for data models that are being discussed for the regional Internet registries in the WEIRD's Group so in some respects what we have to do is try to track these things so that they work together culminate in a single set of - schema appropriate for IP address, registries and for domain name registries.

And then there's got to be a policy process at, you know, at some point that would identify that schema as these, you know, hopefully the single uniform schema that registries, registrars and, you know, in both gTLD and ccTLD will adopt.

Steve Shang: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Sarmad, this is Julie. Does that answer your question?

Sarmad Hussein: So I guess my question is this is a - perhaps a necessary condition but (it's) a sufficient condition to just point this out in IRDWG and just leave it there for this to happen or what would be - what is needed to be done to ensure that it goes through the process it needs to go through?

Julie Hedlund: So this is Julie. The IRD's task is to produce the report which it has done the draft final report. You know, the process now is that the work group members look at the, you know, analyze the comments and decide how, you know, or whether to address them. And that becomes part of the summary and analysis report that gets posted in the public forum.

And then of course the other piece of that is for the work group to decide whether or not it will revise the final report and then submit that final version to the SSAC and to the GNSO Council to approve. At that point unless the IRD working group is tasked with additional work from the SSAC or the GNSO Council there is no other role for the IRD working group.

That is once it's reported approved by the SSAC and the GNSO Council the IRD working group will disband unless it is given other tasks. But as we've noted work is continuing in other areas and in particular the SSAC has picked up a piece - a couple of pieces of these recommendations as follow on work.

One is the data model that Dave mentioned and that is an SSAC work party that is working on that piece. There also is the larger work plan - or I'm sorry, road map that the Board has directed staff to work with the community on and that relates to SAC-51 in the Whois taxonomy and structure. So that's another piece.

So these are moving in other areas but unless the IRD is tasked to follow or monitor this work this group will disband once the report is final and approved.

Sarmad Hussein: So just a follow up question so I guess so we're putting in a requirement that the language tags should be added to the data model? I guess just to sort of dwell on this a little longer should it be just language tag or should it also be a script tag along with the language tag because the language can be (unintelligible) multiple scripts.

So those sort of issues again there needs to be a forum which needs to discuss this out and really stipulate this. And again as I said I'm not really clear whether the requirements should be coming from ICANN or IETF because IETF may actually be working on formalizing those requirements.

But, you know, again a thought is that ICANN actually should be giving those requirements or some constituency within ICANN. But then the question is who's really going to be working on those requirements.

Steve Shang: Sarmad, so in the recommendation - in the recommendation it says the data model - it specifically calls out need to include the language - a tag for language and scripts. So I think the mandate is there.

The - so you raise an interesting question about, you know, is it, you know, a language tag the language by script and what forms are there for those discussions.

I will suggest probably, you know, SSAC will be displaced and also when the staff or whatever, you know, whoever implements the recommendations from this report that needs to involve in a kind of a consultation process that involves the community members in coming up with that data model. So presumably by then at that stage that's where input like the ones that you raised will come into play.

Dave Hutchison: So I have a question for Sarmad. You use the term script and to be honest when I have been talking to people who are processing XML they're always talking about a language tag and a character tag; no one has actually shown me, you know, a schema that actually has script as one of the tags.

And so my understanding of the way that things like the Google Translate API works is that it processes the combination of character set in a language and then determines whether or not it knows enough to transliterate. And then if it doesn't know enough to transliterate it determines whether or not it's able to do translation and then it returns your results.

And so the way most Web pages are rendered using - when they use the Google API is that you've got language and character set tags and that's, you know, that's the same tag in theory that we would - or tag set in theory that we would use for registration data.

And that's what the user would submit. Then if you're going to render it in a language other than the originally submitted language run through Google API as an example saying here's the original - here's the XML, here's the language tags that are associated that the user associated with XML and then here's the target language that the browser wants (unintelligible) and you either transliterate or your translate.

There's a fair amount of sophistication that already exists in some of the APIs. Google is the only one that I've done any sort of, you know, examination with. But I haven't seen anything yet that talks about scripts.

Steve Shang: Dave, I think this is an excellent question but I wonder if this - we're going to, you know, going to more the implementation of the recommendations here. I think the focus is we're trying to see whether, you know, we'll need to address it in the summary analysis.

Dave Piscitello: Well the reason I mentioned it is because...

((Crosstalk))

Dave Piscitello: ...is because, you know, I'm, you know, I am admittedly clumsy between character sets and scripts and languages but I just wanted to understand whether Sarmad was asking for a third kind of tag that I haven't seen yet.

Steve Shang: Sarmad, do you have a quick response?

Sarmad Hussein: Yes, sure. So character set may actually come from multiple scripts. And so if you're looking at the language table, for example, it may not be possible to determine what exactly the script is. So even - and then I think so it's not easily possible to determine what the script is. One can obviously guess at it but if one can define a script specifically that just makes it easier.

((Crosstalk))

Sarmad Hussein: ...inherently has script information in it in any case...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Shang: Yes, yes. I think this deserve more attention than on this phone call because I personally would like to understand those differences as well. Would it possibly - if I may suggest - that we take this conversation specific offline but we do need to continue this between - with the three of us and anyone who are interested, is that okay?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, this is Julie. Sarmad, I would suggest that it would be very helpful if you wanted to - if you had something that you wanted to send to the IRD working group list that we could all look at because it may be something that we might want to consider including in maybe a revision to the final report.

And I think we're going to have to have another call specifically on, you know, any changes we might want to make to the final report. So I think this is very important to call out.

Sarmad Hussein: Sure.

Steve Shang: Okay thanks. Any other comments on the INTA report that we need to address? Okay hearing none we have about 10 minutes left. If I could suggest - I will suggest we come back to the messaging abuse comments next week because there are several of the substantive issues that does need to address and I'm afraid that we are running out of time.

So if possible if you can come to the last comment that is from the IETF WEIRDs working group.

Steve Metalitz: This comment actually seems to be from someone named (Alessandro Vaselli) is that...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. I think he was commenting - my sense he was commenting on behalf of the WEIRDs.

Steve Shang: Well probably not on behalf of the WEIRDs, he's a participant in the WEIRDs, yes.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Steve, for that clarification.

Steve Shang: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: I think it looks like Dave posted this on the WEIRDs listed and he responded
                    to that but anyway.

Steve Shang: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: Steve, do you want to summarize quickly what you - your sense of this
                    comment?

Steve Shang: Well the comment is talking about the four models it's suggesting must be
                    present to may be present because it's saying the must be present should be
                    the local recommendation and may be present would be the permit and
                    asking to the extent allowed and supported by the registrants. So I actually
                    agree with him so I - but what does the working group think?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. Isn't this similar to what I think Sarmad suggested
                    when we first had comments on these four models a while back and that is
                    that maybe we don't need a must be present script. I thought that was - we
                    kind of took that on board as an option. But I may be wrong about that. But
                    weren't we also seeking - didn't we - isn't that something, for example, that
                    the issues report that we're calling for might address?

Steve Shang: Yes. Yes, but I think here he's saying the must be present it must be the local
                    representation. In our report when we talked about must be presenting we're
                    talking about almost a - like it should always be in so he's just saying must is
                    too strong so.

Steve Metalitz: Well I think what he's saying is that there wouldn't be any single script that
                    would be required to be present across the entire universe which is different
                    from the four models. The four models all assume that there would be and

then the question is who's required to come up with that, who's required to present that if the registrant doesn't.

So I think he's suggesting that - he says so the must should be for the local representation. I'm not sure what that means. But even - it seems that each registrar or each TLD - I'm not clear - would decide which script must be present. Then there's no longer a single type of script that must be present across the entire spectrum. So I think that...

Steve Shang: I understand it differently. So here's how I understand it. So for example a - let's say an Arabic or a Chinese registrant registered a domain name. He put his information first of all in Arabic or in Chinese. That is a must be present. Right so it's the local presentation - local representation.

And then, you know, if - and then he defined may be present meaning if registrar or registry policy allowed, you know, maybe has a ASCII version of that registration data and he called that may be present. That's how I understand his comments.

Steve Metalitz: Well but it still would be the case - this is Steve Metalitz again. And I think it would still be the case then if that - so if that registrant provided the data in Arabic script that wouldn't mean that all other registrations and all other TLDs had to be in Arabic script. So there wouldn't be any single script that would be required across the board. And...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Shang: Yes.

Dave Piscitello: Steve, this is Dave. This is Dave Piscitello. I think that (Alessandro) was interpreting must much more literally than (unintelligible) in the report. I envision that registrars are probably going to support multiple local languages.

You know, I mean, think of trying to be a registrar and providing registration services for people who live in Switzerland. I mean, most people that are, you know, speak three languages, four languages, five. They should be able to choose which of those that they're most comfortable with and (unintelligible) who knows.

So any of those would be appropriate if the registrar provides it as the local representation because that's what the user intended to submit. And if he also says you can default to ASCII, if you can type it in, you know, in ASCII in a way that is a legal representation. So I think there's a big conflict here.

We can probably, you know, answer this relatively straightforwardly and I think Steve Metalitz is, you know, his interpretation of this is not wrong, you know, I think it's, you know, it's well within what he intended.

Sarmad Hussein: This is Sarmad.

((Crosstalk))

Sarmad Hussein: So I think (unintelligible) issue which has been raised here is that (unintelligible) requirement. So if (unintelligible) data (unintelligible) country is the local language then a registrant may actually object to a registrar requiring data in ASCII or English because that's sort of contrary to the local (unintelligible). And so actually could put the registrar - this requirement in conflict as (unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: So this is Julie. My question is - and maybe we should pick this up at the next call. We'll need to decide how we want to address this comment. Is there something that we would want to change in the report? Do we, you know, see this as a favorable comment or not?

But since we only have a couple minutes left I guess I have a question for this group and that is would people be able to meet at this same time for another call next week to continue the discussion on the comments and how to address them?

Owen Smigelski: This is Owen. That works for me.

Julie Hedlund: Let me rephrase it. Is there anyone who cannot be on the call next week? So this is Julie. I'll go ahead and we'll go ahead and we'll set up a call for next week at this time. Jim and (Jabber) with me today confirmed that he's available at this time next week. And we'll continue this discussion on the comments starting with this comment from (Alessandro) and then also going through the MAAWG comments.

And in the meantime I'll send around some notes today based on what we've discussed in today's call.

Steve Shang: Julie, before we go can I quickly summarize what I heard from today?

Julie Hedlund: Please go ahead, Steve.

Steve Shang: So regarding the ALAC comments it's overwhelmingly positive. We simply note their comments and their support for the recommendations. For the INTA comments it was also positive.

We note and regarding their timeline and their request for addressing these comments - addressing this issue expeditiously and in the summary analysis will say, you know, we know this and agree that this is an important issue for the community. And we also note other activities along the lines related to it.

Regarding the WEIRDs - also regarding the INTA comments we have a discussion on the language tag, script tag and also encoding tag. And Sarmad is going to send some - send an email to the IRD list. I personally

would like to be educated on the subtle distinctions of the three so, Sarmad, if you could do that I'll personally really appreciate that.

On the WEIRDs comments it seems to me this is something we have to pick up in the last call as well at the (unintelligible) working group. So (unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: ...Julie. Thank you, Steve. Is there anything anybody wants to say before we close the call? Then thank you everybody and we'll look forward to talking to you next Monday the 28th at the same time which is 1600 UTC and I'll be sending some notes shortly.

Steve Shang: Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, everyone. And, Operator and Nathalie let's please go ahead and adjourn the call.

END