

**GNSO/SSAC
International Registration Data Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 24 January 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 24 January 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/gnsso/gnsso-ird-20110124-en.mp3>

On page:

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

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

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

Present for the teleconference:

Edmon Chung – Group Leader

Bob Hutchinson, GNSO Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG)

Avri Doria - NCSG

Owen Smigelski, Sunrider International, Intellectual Property Interests Constituency,
Commercial Stakeholder Group

Jim Galvin – SSAC -Afilias

ICANN Staff

Steve Sheng

Julie Heldund

Gisella Gruber-White

Absent apologies:

Steven Metalitz -- GNSO Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial

David Piscitello

Operator: The call is now recorded. Please go ahead.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon to everyone on today's IRT call on Monday, the 24th of January. We have Jim Galvin, Edmund Chung, Avri Doria, Bob Hutchinson. From staff we have Steve Sheng, Julie Hedlund, and myself Gisella Gruber-White.

Apologies noted today from Steve Metalitz. And if I could just please remind you to state your names when speaking for transcript purposes.

Thank you. Over to you, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Gisella. This is Julie Hedlund, and let's go ahead and get started, and hopefully some more working group member will join us as we go along.

One of the first orders of business I would like to mention today is that as you had seen from the email traffic, the AFAC has selected as its representative for the working group Jim Galvin. And Jeremy Hitchcock unfortunately had to step down due to you know, workload issues.

So, the charter provides for the working group to appoint or to approve -- shall we say -- the co-Chairs of the Committee, and as I may remind you, the co-Chairs are selected from the GNSO and from the AFAC. And then, I would like to present to the working group members on this call, and I will also follow-up in an email from this call, present Jim Galvin as the person selected from the AFAC for the co-Chair, and ask whether or not the working group members on this call approve that selection.

I am hearing no dissention. May I take that as approval?

Jim Galvin: I'm over here chuckling to myself. I'm like, "Okay. Don't all jump in at once now.

Julie Hedlund: Some resounding silence.

Jim Galvin: I don't know if that's good or bad, but maybe we'll take it good and go from there.

Julie Hedlund: And let's be specific since we're on the call here, and be formal about it.
Edmond, do you accept Jim as co-Chair with yourself?

Edmund Chung: Absolutely.

Julie Hedlund: Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes. Well, not as co-Chair with myself.

Julie Hedlund: I know. I should phrase that differently. Do you accept Jim as a co-Chair with Edmund?

Avri Doria: Yes, of course.

Julie Hedlund: And Bob?

Robert Hutchinson: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much.

I will - since we have not many working group members on this call, I will - oh, I have - we have Owen Smigelski joining. Hello, Owen. How are you?

Owen Smigelski: Hello. Apologies. I had some computer issues this morning.

Julie Hedlund: No problem. Well, I'm glad you joined Owen, and we were just finishing up an important piece of business. Jim Galvin was selected by the AFAC to replace Jeremy Hitchcock as the AFAC's co-Chair on this working group. And, we're asking the working group members to approve that selection. And those who are on the call thus far, which is Edmund, Avri, and Bob Hutchinson, have approved the selection. And, I'd be interested in whether or not you would approve or disprove the selection.

Owen Smigelski: I approve as well.

Julie Hedlund: Wonderful. Thank you very much Owen. And as I was mentioning just now, I will send around a message following up on this meeting indicating that those members here on the call have approve Jim Galvin as Chair, and asking if there are any you know working group members who do not you know, approve the selection. But Jim, as all of you know, has been quite active in this working group, and I think from staff's point of view, very helpful in moving along several issues and complicated matters. So, I would expect that we could all welcome his contribution.

Jim Galvin: So thank you Julie, and thank you to everyone, and thank you to those on the mailing list who haven't responded yet. I guess we'll see how that goes.

Anyway, no - it's my pleasure. I'll certainly try to continue that we continue to do things just as we have been. So, maybe we should just press on at this point.

Julie Hedlund: That sounds great. Thank you very much Jim. This is Julie. And at this point, I think I'd like to turn over the meeting to Steve Sheng. Just to remind all of you, Steve sent around some draft outreach slides to try to reach out to the various constituency groups and other groups within the SOs and ACs within the ICANN community to try to encourage comments on the Interim Report. We do not have at this point any comments in the public forum, but I think as Avri has noted, those often come in at the 11th hour, or if not the 12th hour.

So, that...

Jim Galvin: Could you remind me what is - when is the 11th hour?

Julie Hedlund: The 11th hour was extended to -- and let me just look because I have that up to remind myself -- was extended - once the translations were made available, was extended to the 14th of March, 2011.

Jim Galvin: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: And so, this would give us an opportunity to spend a little time doing some outreach to the community and reminding them that we have you know, this Interim Report out for public comment, encouraging them to comment. And there are a number of different ways we could do that, and Steve has provided some slides.

You'll note that the 14th of March does fall right at the beginning of the ICANN meeting. That's just to remind you the ICANN - the next ICANN meeting - the Silicon Valley meeting starts Monday the 14th and goes through Friday the 18th. So - and staff will provide a summary of the comments immediately as the comment period closes. And in fact, will provide any preliminary analysis, as comments are available, to guide the working group for any meetings or updates it may have in every ICANN meeting.

And I should mention that the GNSO Council will, I think as usual, like to have an update at their GNSO Council working session on Saturday or Sunday on the work of the working group, even if that is just that they are you know, finalizing comments and have conducted some outreach, and so on. And, we've also scheduled a time for a public meeting of the working group, probably to happen Thursday morning during the ICANN meeting.

Sorry, that was more than you asked for Jim, but I thought I'd throw that all in.

Jim Galvin: No, that's good. I was just taking notes.

Julie Hedlund: So Steve, why don't I turn it over to you, and if you want to talk a little bit about the discussion going about the outreach effort and so on, and can see how we might want to approach that.

Owen Smigelski: Julie, real quick. This is Owen. How definite is that Thursday am meeting for the working group (unintelligible)?

Julie Hedlund: It's pretty definite right now because of the fact that it has to be - because of the way the ICANN meetings are getting so booked up with sort of times that are sort of what we call protected slots. You can't schedule a Thursday afternoon because you can't schedule during the public forum. You know, some of the major events that all community members will want to go to. And, we have a couple of other things.

On Thursday morning, we have this joint security and stability working group, the DSSA WG that's starting up shortly, and that will also be scheduled Thursday morning. And then, that's also the DNS Abuse Forum, which we try to avoid scheduling and event. So again - so, we're - right now, we're looking at 9:00 to 10:00 for the IRT WG meeting.

Owen Smigelski: Okay, great. Because I think I'll go ahead and - I'm just - I'm in Los Angeles, so that's a quick flight for me, so I'll book a - I'll for that to (unintelligible)...

Julie Hedlund: Good. Yes, we expect that there's going to be quite a bit of attendance - a large attendance at this particular meeting because so many people are in the area, so...

Owen Smigelski: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: But yes, I think you can go ahead and pencil that in. I would be - that's the slot that I'll be requesting, and it's just about the only time that works without conflict, so I suspect that will stay.

Owen Smigelski: Okay, great. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Sure. You're very welcome.

Any other questions before we move ahead?

Jim Galvin: Yes. I have two. And moving ahead, you were going to get into this slide deck that Steve had prepared. So, I had notes - this is Jim Galvin. I guess I was supposed to say that up front. From my notes from our last meeting on December 20th, I had written down here about Steve preparing some Webinar material, and I'm presuming that this presentation he's put together is sort of in lieu of that, which is fine. But, I just wanted to clarify if there was some other action that was also going to be taking place.

And then, I also had a note here about inviting Tina Dam to come and talk with us about WHOIS with IDN.

Julie Hedlund: That's (right).

Jim Galvin: And, I wondered what happened with that.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Thank you Jim. You know - and I missed that meeting unfortunately, so I'll go ahead and let Steve answer your question.

Steve Sheng: I think Tina has left the company. So the short story is that, Jim. I will see again if I can - so anything she's doing, she'll be like participate on the community member basis, but I will check with her again to see if she wants to come next time to talk about it. So, that's the short story.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Actually then, I should have noted that too, Jim, and I'm sorry. I just - it just skipped my mind. Yes, Tina Dam has left, but I believe that Karla Valente is taking up the IDN role that belonged to Tina. Yes, we'll - Steve, if you want us to follow-up on that and see who the appropriate person...

Steve Sheng: I don't think that's the case, Julie. So with the IDN, Naela -- someone from ICANN staff -- is taking the fast track, so maybe we'll see what...

Edmund Chung: This is Edmund. In my - in the other group that I'm working on in the (GIG), we were told - as Steve said, Naela, who has been working on the IANA...

Julie Hedlund: Yes, you're right. And, I'm sorry Edmund. You're absolutely right and Steve was right. I don't know what's wrong with my brain right now. This is Julie. So, if...

Edmund Chung: No worries. But, I was given the impression that Naela may or may not be taking up all the IDN responsibilities. But certainly, we should follow-up and figure out who would be the right person from staff to help us on this topic.

Jim Galvin: So -- this is Jim - I mean, the right - I mean, I asked the question obviously for all of these reasons. I think that at least my impression - and we should test this and make sure that people agree or if they have different ideas. I think that that's fine. But I was hopeful that inviting Tina, or whoever the next person is going to be, was about helping us to get some specific WHOIS advice with respect to the four models that we have here, because we don't seem to be promoting or motivating a lot of comments from others.

And, I really see that as an issue for this committee, because - or working group. Somewhere along the way here, we have to resolve that choice of four. We've got to find a way to come to a consensus about choosing one or a reason for choosing more than one, if that's the case.

So really, what I wanted to do was raise that larger issue of where we're going to go there, and I - you know, I mean whether we invite Tina, because maybe she can come as an individual anyway. She certainly has a lot of expertise and we can reach out and try and get that. Or if we want to get someone else, that's fine. But, I do think that we should decide what we're

trying to achieve by inviting someone and then you know, make the right thing happen to get someone here to cover the right topic.

My version to the topic was getting some additional insight on the WHOIS side of the work that we're trying to do. Others may have other opinions, and I'm interested in hearing those too.

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

Robert Hutchinson: Yes, this is Bob Hutchinson. I guess the reason you stated for having staff or Tina Dam take a look at our work is not what I believe we were doing, which was asking the people who are involved in the domain name internationalization what information standards, et cetera, that they had that we could reference in terms of language handling or language tagging and how they have divided up the character space, and what rules they're imposing on the use of character sets and languages, scripts, et cetera.

And, that would be relevant for this group in terms of tagging of the different name, address types that are in the proposal. And, that was primarily what we were after I thought.

Steve Sheng: Well, I think - Bob, thanks for the comment. I think what you said is right. That was - you know, there is no intent why we want to invite Tina for a meeting. But as Jim said, Tina has done - I mean, I think what you're referring is a technical issue right here, in terms of implementation which is very important for us to get it right. What Jim is saying is also on these policy issues, which I think if we are able to get Tina on the call, she should be able to answer both sets of questions.

Robert Hutchinson: Yes. I didn't mean that your - that we couldn't do the other. I just said I thought the intent was primarily the - you know, what I outlined.

Steve Sheng: So in order for the meeting to be productive, if we were to get Tina, then Bob how about what I suggested. Maybe you can write down a detailed set of questions and send it to the mailing list. Then you know, if you can get Tina on the call; that would be great. If not you know, at least I can forward these questions to her so that you know, we don't get you know all or nothing. You know, at least we get something.

Robert Hutchinson: Okay. I'll try that. In the next couple of days, I'll send something to the list that would at least give a tee up to whoever we can get from staff to address this.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Right. And, I'll take it - the action item for me to contact Tina again on this...

Robert Hutchinson: So, will she be available as a consultant to ICANN groups? Or, is - I have no idea whether she left for personal reasons or what. But...

Steve Sheng: I am not sure, actually. The last time I heard is she's going to do some consulting one way or the other. But, I'd have to check with management - update on that. I'm not sure.

Jim Galvin: Well - so this is Jim. I mean, her doing consulting, I think the inference there is that some money might change hands in getting her to come, or is that not true? Because, I'm thinking of just asking her as an individual and saying, "Gee. You know, maybe you could provide some insight here. We're not getting too many comments and it'd be good to get some comments from an expert in the space, if you will."

Robert Hutchinson: Sure. Yes. I had a call - a hallway conversation with her at - in Cartagena, and she understood what I was asking obviously. But you know, she's - she didn't have an off-the-cuff answer or any pointer. She said that there is material that's relevant, but...

Robert Hutchinson: Okay.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Right. And so, I'll take that as my action item again.

Jim Galvin: My general question of you know, providing some insight into you know, the WHOIS and IDNs and you know, sort of the other side of the work that we're doing. We're just looking at the registration data and obviously, the WHOIS presentation of it is an important part of that. I'm willing to just add that discussion to letting you, Steve, pick up with your presentation - your outreach discussion, because I think we have this general problem of how do we motivate and where do we solicit from comments on what we're doing here.

I'm very concerned that we're sort of operating almost in a vacuum, and that concerns me. So anyway, that's where I am. So, we can move on at this point unless somebody has any other comments or questions.

Steve Sheng: Jim, could you elaborate? You say we operate on some sort of vacuum, but you...

Jim Galvin: Yes. I don't want to - don't over interpret that. I think my concern again, is just that we have these four models here that we somehow have to you know, prioritize and select one.

Steve Sheng: Right.

Jim Galvin: You know, what I meant by saying we operate in a vacuum is just that - well, it doesn't appear to be an interesting question for people to speak to and offer comment on. Now as has been noted before, maybe we'll get comments in the 11th hour and so all of this will go away. But you know, I just observe that it concerns me that we're only talking amongst ourselves about these four things, and we're really interested in some external input. I don't have a good answer on how to get it.

This outreach discussion is hopefully going to - you know, we'll talk a little bit about that and what we hope to get, and you know who we should reach out to to try and get something from. But, that to me is the issue.

Steve Sheng: Yes, Jim. I agree with you. We haven't been getting much comment. But hopefully, the outreach will change that. So maybe, we'll put Tina as the first candidate for outreach.

Jim Galvin: Works for me. But let me turn it over to you Steve, to go forward with your topic here, and we'll see where that takes us.

Steve Sheng: So, there are two questions right. The first question is who do we do outreach to? And second is you know, what material do we use? The slides I prepared is kind of a straw man proposal for the - to answer the second question.

I think in this meeting, you know we can first tackle the first question. You know, who do we want to reach out to and what kind of format do you want that to be? (Andre) from the GNSO, who's also on the (RNE) working group, suggested we do an outreach to the ccTLDs, and I've initiated a conversation with our policy staff that supports the ccTLDs. And (so) far it seems to be positive on that.

So hopefully we can arrange a session for ccTLDs, because a lot of the deployment we experience for IDNs are happening at the ccTLDs, and this is a question of their interest I guess.

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. What is the mechanism - I mean, what is the process for the outreach? Can you say a little bit about what you think your options are and how you imagine this could play out?

Steve Sheng: Well, I think it's really up for the working group to decide. We - in the past, we've discussed several, so one is kind of Webinars - a series of Webinars. And for that, we discussed you know, Webinars reach to particular target audience. Webinars have - you know, tailor to specific time zones. Those are the things that...

And then, I mean besides that there's always you know other venues. If one of us is going to be in conferences that may be relevant, maybe in the - you know, not so much the IRR conference but like you're having - there's these regional meetings where this might be of interest, and you know those who are in there can also present and ask for feedback. I guess those are the things I can think of.

Robert Hutchinson: Yes. Steve, this is Bob Hutchinson. I think - so, there's what? One question of who should we be outreaching to. I thought the ccTLDs is a great audience. It's been mentioned we need to get law enforcement feedback probably also.

And Steve Metalitz isn't on the call, but whoever is handling the intellectual property (risks) group, they should definitely be part of it.

Steve Sheng: You say (unintelligible)?

Robert Hutchinson: Yes, exactly. So, the major constituencies should all at least get a point or two whatever we're doing for a Webinar, or a presentation. And I guess - so that's the audiences that I can think of off the top of my head. But you know, as many audiences as possible, you know. But, I think there's probably four or five of them that are pretty much checklist required.

Steve Sheng: Okay. So, I have ccTLD, law enforcement, IPC, registries, and registrant. Any others?

Jim Galvin: So, this is Jim. I mean, I guess they're not a big constituency, but certainly the RARs you know, do run a WHOIS service.

Steve Sheng: Right.

Jim Galvin: And you know, it would be nice to get their thoughts on this if we can. So if there's a way to reach out to those communities; that would be a good thing, too.

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

Avri Doria: Yes. I have a question on that. I mean, I certainly agree that sending it out to anyone and everyone that might comment, including ccNSO, is a good idea. On the WHOIS on addresses as opposed to names, there's - I mean, I think it's a good question.

There's always been sort of this division of we're only talking about names. We're not talking about addresses and such. But I guess that then does open up the question of is there any need/interest in the notion of internationalizing the information for addresses? And so passing it to them is a good idea, but that does open that question. Thanks.

Steve Sheng: All right. That's certainly a good question.

Jim Galvin: Yes. I mean, I agree with Avri. I mean, maybe this is partly about just raising the issue to their attention and seeing if they believe that it's important and relevant to them and they want to go down that path. Because if they do; it would be nice for our work to be aligned. And if they don't, well you know, having them say that they're not interesting would also be useful to know.

Steve Sheng: Okay. So any other constituencies you want to outreach to? How about SSAC (probably)?

Jim Galvin: Say that again, Steve? I'm sorry.

Steve Sheng: How about SSAC? The Security and Stability Advisory Committee.

Jim Galvin: Right. Right. Sure. I mean, I guess there's no reason to say no. Absolutely. We certainly should anyway, give an update, and we are talking about actually having a meeting during which we'd give presentations from each of our individual work parties and work actions in the SSAC. And, we should certainly put this on the list and call it to the attention to everyone. So, a good opportunity to do that.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I mean, SSAC and the GNSO being our chartering bodies, haven't we already done - I mean, I don't know, but haven't we already done a certain degree of notification to them? If not, obviously we need to. But...

Jim Galvin: Yes, I guess that's kind of where I was at with it, Avri. I was trying to think to myself about whether or not we have, you know, formally made a statement to the SSAC about the status of this group and I was trying to remember the last time that had been done to the entire committee.

I don't know that we would necessarily get any comments from anyone in particular, but certainly the opportunity needs to be available and we should make sure that we do that and we should do it for both groups, as you say.

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon. Speaking of the - so we talked about the ccNSO now the SSAC and terms of the ccNSO, I think one of the areas probably we specifically want to bring attention to is probably the registrars.

Because in our last update to GNSO, I think some of the suggestions we had immediately caught the attention from the registrars and they see potentially work for the, I guess.

Jim Galvin: Yes Edmon, yes. So I had registrars on the list.

Okay so I have ccTLD, law enforcement, IPC, registrar, SSAC, IRs. So I guess the question is how do we do these outreach and I'd like to hear your thoughts.

Edmon Chung: Well I'm good with a Webinar or a Webinar-related thing. You know, something along those lines, which to me means, you know, you've to a presentation that you're stepping through and you're talking to people and then you end with a call to action of, you know, please do give us your comments or advise with respect to the four models in particular, but obviously, anything that they want to say about where we are and what we're doing.

And I think that we should, you know - for some of these groups, you know, like the GNSO and perhaps SSAC, but maybe less so, you know, you might have to do more than one so that you can cover a couple of different time zones to make sure you get the maximum penetration of people.

And it probably applies to other groups too like, you know, like reaching out to the registrars. You might have to do - schedule a couple of them just to spread out the time zones so they're covered.

Jim Galvin: Okay.

Edmon Chung: And if we can get those done sometime over the next few weeks, certainly before the end of February, that would be great because come period ending March 14, that sets us up to get the 11th-hour comments we're hoping to get right?

Avri Doria: This is Avri.

Man: Go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: I mean, we've just about gotten outreach to everyone and once I've finished, we would have covered everyone, but just have we even mentioned any of this to both ALAC and GAAC, if they care.

I mean, you know, while we're talking about, while we're caring about user's perspective on thing, you know, and how this affects you as a user, ALAC may certainly care. While we're talking about, you know, law enforcement and such, the national representatives may care.

If we're doing Webinars, at least, I think we should be careful not to exclude them from invitation, because all of the sudden you get GAAC and ALAC together saying, "what (unintelligible), no one bothered to include us."

And then all of the sudden, we've got a mess where we don't need one, even if they're not going to say much or whatever.

Man: Right.

Avri Doria: I know that broadens outreach to everyone, but, you know, as it gets broader and broader, I worry about who we exclude.

Man: Okay, that's fine.

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon. I totally agree with Avri, in fact. But that also - we talked about Webinar, I wonder if - just getting on some of the calls of those groups would be...

Man: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Would be useful.

Man: Yes Edmon, I think that's an excellent idea. I know for some of these, for registries and ALAC, you know, they have calls, SSAC.

I'm not sure law enforcement, IPC and registrar have calls. The last time, you know, we did some (unintelligible) work and we were reaching out to the registrars, we were told they don't have regular calls, but we set up a Webinar anyway just for the registrars and we had about seven to eight people show up.

Man: Yes, understood.

Man: That's a good idea. Hello?

Man: Yes, that's good.

Bob Hutchinson: Hi this Bob Hutchinson. We keep referring to the term Webinar and I guess that's one form that we could use. I would - if we're going to for a more, you know, scattered, boil the ocean, feedback, which I agree we actually should do, I would think that we would put this into kind of (unintelligible) message and put it on YouTube as a, you know, short video that basically explains this is what we're doing and this is the critical problem that we're trying to get feedback on and then ask for feedback.

And, you know, try to do that in under five minutes of folks' time.

Man: That's an interesting though.

Bob Hutchinson: In other words, reference the full slide deck and - in other words, I guess what I'm concerned about is, maybe I'm wrong, but Webinar implies to me somebody actually putting together something, sending out notices, putting together the presentation and being there to kind of walk people through a Webinar. Okay? An online presentation.

And I don't think that's practical, given the kind of outreach you're talking about trying to do.

Man: You know, (unintelligible) think.

Jim Galvin: I mean, I like the suggestion and I think if we were just to sort of - this is Jim. So backing into a general principal, I'm inclined to suggest, Steve, that you would be the one who would be getting these presentations and following through on it and so I think it's appropriate to optimize for the best use of whoever we're trying to reach out for.

So in the case of the registrars, maybe something closer to the whole Webinar thing is the right thing, but leveraging off an existing regular teleconference, if that works for people, seems fine to me too.

I think that we should leave it to your best judgment to optimize this as best you can for each specific group.

Man: Okay thanks Jim.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Totally agree.

Man: I mean I was thinking one way we could do if Bob's concern is that, you know, people may - it's very difficult to find (unintelligible) to attend to these Webinars. You know, maybe what we can do is the - you know, we kind of record the Webinar and we put it - (unintelligible) on YouTube so that, you know, people who wants to see it can see it any time they want.

Maybe that's a compromise to suggest.

Jim Galvin: This is Jim. So I think that's a great plan. I mean, especially with respect to a Webinar, you know. Recording it so that you can then make it available and

we could have a link to it off the working group page so that anybody could go watch it at anytime that's convenient for them.

And then you could always refer to that and then in future presentations, you can always tack that onto the bottom. Here's the link to see a full a full-on Webinar. You know, getting to the issue of whether or not you can go through a whole presentation or you've got to get right to the meat of it and, you know, point people to that material to fill out the details.

Man: Right. Okay that's a good way to forward.

I want to get - hear your opinion. How do we recruit communities? Obviously, ALAC, you know, there's the establishment and put it on the agenda of their monthly cause.

Registries - how do we outreach the registry?

Man: ICANN has a well-defined contact list. I mean, I have to believe that they have a list that you can send an email message out to an appropriate point of contact in all the registries and similar with registrars.

Man: Right.

Man: Yes.

Man: And I think you just send it out and, you know, this is what you want to do and when and go from there. You just have to manage the process.

Man: Okay, all right, good, okay. What about law enforcement? I'm not sure we have a well-established contact with law enforcement it's not.

Man: Yes, that one's harder. The observation I make there is (Bobby Flane) in the U.S. with the FBI has been doing a lot to -- excuse me -- organize - I mean,

he's been coming around with a number of people to various ICANN meetings.

I'm sure some of you have seen him and the entourage that has resulted at the last couple of ICANN meetings. And they actually did an outreach here in the Washington, D.C. area back in, I guess it was, September or October. I forget exactly when.

And they invited all the local registry and registrars and then they had a number of law enforcement people come and they're actually having another one of those meeting in Brussels in February.

Now, as it turns out, I'm going to that meeting. Only because - I'm only going over there for this because I'm going to actually be in the area at the time so it was convenient for me to stay an extra day and go to that meeting on that side of the world too.

But maybe that's an opportunity to say something. His - I don't know. The meeting has a different kind of character though. The purpose of that meeting is to get law enforcement engaged with people involved in the domain name lifecycle, which (unintelligible).

Somebody's moving papers or something. Yes I'm not sure what that was. I don't know if anybody else heard that...

Avri Doria: Yes I hear it.

Man: Sun spots.

Man: But it might be an opportunity to reach out to (Bobby) and mention to him that we have this thing. Law enforcement obviously has a vested interest, I think, in who is and how it's presented.

He might at least make an announcement at his meeting and he might have suggestion for a mechanism for how to reach out to others. That's my suggestion.

I mean, and I'm happy to reach out to (Bobby) and ask him about this at least to get this going. I don't know what else to say about law enforcement. I don't know if anyone else has got another suggestion.

Man: Do we have a law enforcement (unintelligible) on the working group? I guess not.

Man: No, I guess the only caution about (Bobby) is that it's U.S. centric and I think - I thought we had some people from Interpol that showed up to ICANN meetings. Avri do you know them or does anybody on the call know them?

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Man: Well, I mean, (Bobby) has those contacts because he had some of those people. He had a couple of European people and someone from Interpol who came to the Washington, D.C. meeting and my expectation is that in organizing the meeting in Europe, he's going to have more of those people there than he did in Washington, D.C.

Yes, I mean, your point is well taken. I absolutely take your point. We want to avoid being U.S. centric. He's my only convenient point of contact into trying to get access to law enforcement.

I mean, I think that if he has a way to contact others, he'll be helpful in facilitating that and I fully expect to ask him for that, for that assistance. But other than that...

Man: I'm happy with that.

Man: Yes, we should find out - I mean, anybody who has a law enforcement contact, you can reach out to them from anywhere, we should absolutely do that.

(Owen): This is Owen. What type of law enforcement are we talking about? Because I have a contact at the U.S. Secret Service. Is that something that you're interested in? Or were you looking for more of a - I'm not sure what type of - law enforcement can be pretty broad.

Man: Yes, you know, good question. We clearly need someone who is internet savvy and, you know, we're talking about ICANN committee here. So we need someone who is savvy with respect to that committee and the kinds of issues that we're dealing with.

I mean, the people who are about who is, are those at least primarily are interested in issues and circumstances that involve a domain name in some way. All right? So phishing, illegal sales, crimes related to Web sites doing things they're not supposed to, that kind of stuff.

I mean, even the Secret Service probably has a team of people who care about this issue.

Owen Smigelski: That's exactly who I have contact with.

Man: Yes so.

Owen Smigelski: I'll reach to them and see if I can get any follow up from them.

Man: Yes, I mean, maybe he knows a way to reach out to some others. I mean, I think the deal here is if Steve is going to be doing Webinars, what we want to do is alert people to the existence of the Webinar, as many people who - as might care as we can.

So that certainly at the end of it, when we say, "please give us your opinion about what we're doing", you know, hopefully they'll be interested in doing that. That would be really helpful if that could happen.

Owen Smigelski: Okay sounds good.

Steve Sheng: One quick question. Do you envision that the staff would do the outreach Webinar, or, you know, the working group members also want to do the outreach? Just want to clarify that. What do you - oh and Edmon and the others (unintelligible).

Jim Galvin: Well I had already suggested that I kind of figured that the staff would mostly take on the responsibility of giving the presentations, but having said that, I don't think we should exclude anyone from the working group who is available and it's convenient for them to give the update and talk to people.

We should allow people to do that if they're able and willing.

Man: Okay.

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon and, you know, I guess, (unintelligible) what Jim said. And, you know, I guess it would be great if Steve you can do the presentations where appropriate and, you know, just circulate the timeslots and see whether Jim will (unintelligible) whoever would like to be there as well. Maybe not to do a presentation, maybe to take questions and, you know, just talk about it.

Man: Okay, good.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I think for example the Webinars that you plan to actually record, it may be actually worth going to the effort of getting a few different voices to talk at various times. For example, explaining each of the models. You

know, especially if you can have someone who's a proponent of a model explaining a model or something.

It makes it more interesting. It gives it more depth and, you know, so and so. Especially on the recorded thing that you plan to put up somewhere. You actually might want to spend a little effort orchestrating, etc.

Steve Sheng: Okay that's also a good suggestion.

Okay so what - so from what I'm hearing - we're seven minutes after the hour. So what I'm hearing is - as a couple of action items.

First, the first one - first things first, I'm trying to get Tina into one of our subsequent calls and Bob Hutchinson will draft a list of questions to ask to Tina and circulate that to the working group so that the first action item.

In terms of Webinars, we want to do outreach to ccTLDs, law enforcement, IPC, registry, registrar, ALAC, (unintelligible) and GAAC. Perhaps the way to do that is to, you know, send through the GNSO, you know, constituencies.

GNSO has all these constituencies and registries - registrars, you know, IPC's among those, you know. As Avri points out, we don't want to miss others who have - who are passionate and interested about this topic. We don't want to exclude them.

So maybe the way is to once we have the time set up, we send it through the GNSO different constituencies to engage their participation.

In terms of - we also talked about the idea is, you know, a shortened version of the presentation, put it on YouTube or some other form. And Avri suggested that maybe it's a good idea to have different people. We'll certainly look into that.

With respect to law enforcement, Jim is going to mention to (Bobby Flane) and also Owen has a contact in the Secret Service he's going to reach out to. That's all - any - did I miss anything?

Man: Thanks Steve. That's a good summary. That's what I have.

Avri Doria: I would just add in almost a knee jerk way, as soon as people start talking about bringing in law enforcement, I could probably help make sure that we outreach to some of the privacy protection groups that, you know, always need to be either in the same space or in a reflected equal space...

Man: Right.

Avri Doria: That anything that law enforcement says, privacy concerned people can come and talk.

Steve Sheng: Okay. There's one question I have. With respect to, I think, kind of a major issue. Last time there was some participants mentioning that we wanted to do targeted outreach to each constituency or stakeholders. Others said we want to a, you know, different outreach tailored to different time zones.

I don't see that resolved. So I want to hear your opinion on what - and guidance on what to do next.

Avri Doria: I think - this is Avri again. I think you're going to get different sets of concerns. For example, when you talk to law enforcement and/or privacy, you'll have one set of concerns. You know, dealing with having enough information versus displaying too much information, etc. Those kinds of issues come up.

When you're just talking to the registrars and registries perhaps, you're going to have more, "gee how would one implement all this stuff" and so on issues.

So I think that kind of specific targeting - I think a Webinar, again, needs to be sort of general and longer and inclusive, but then I think following that, you may want to even have, if you've got the Webinar first, you may even have question-driven sentence - I mean, question-driven sessions where they've had a chance to review the material, they've had a change to watch the Webinar, they've submitted a couple of questions and then you target, you know, (unintelligible) specific interests.

I don't know, but, I mean, this is getting much more complicated with each word we're saying.

Steve Sheng: Yes, yes, you know. I mean, I agree that that's probably the best approach, but that's going to be very time consuming and also (unintelligible) staff resources for that.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: I would offer Steve that, you know, given what's involved in getting this done, you know, maybe what you should so is give some thought to prioritizing this to try to figure out how to reach the most people and sort of attack them in that order.

I mean, that would be my only suggestion for, you know, in response to your comment that there's quite a lot of work involved in setting these things up and organizing them and making them happen.

Steve Sheng: Right okay.

Owen Smigelski: This is Owen. In response to Avri's request there, I can contact some of the - reach out to some privacy advocates as well just to make sure we've got a balanced group that we're reaching out to.

Steve Sheng: That's good, that's good. Any other thoughts?

Okay I think we had a very productive session this morning and Julie, do you have anything to add?

Julie Hedlund: Yes just that we should decide when we want our next meeting. Do we want to meet in two weeks? That would be the 7th of February.

Man: Sounds good.

Julie Hedlund: I will go ahead - we'll go ahead and tentatively set that up. We can change it if we need to, but I think we've been more or less on a two-week schedule and since we actually have some action items we need to follow up on and we want to try and get things scheduled in February, it might be good have a meeting sooner rather than later.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Great. I don't have anything else to add.

Man: Sounds good. Thank you Steve and Julie and thanks to everyone for your support in my new appointment.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Jim. Thank you Edmun..

Man: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks everyone. Have a good morning, afternoon or evening.

Man: Okay.

Man: All right.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Steve. Goodbye.

Man: Bye.

Man: Bye.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thanks (unintelligible).

Woman: Thanks Gisella. I'll get the recording set now for you.

Gisella Gruber-White: Have a lovely evening.

Woman: Thanks very much. Speak to you soon.

Gisella Gruber-White: Bye.

Woman: Bye bye.

END