GNSO/SSAC
International Registration Data Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 25 July at 15:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO/SSAC International Registration Data Working Group on 25 July 2011 at 15:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is   incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is   posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not   be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jul

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
Bob Hutchinson, GNSO Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG)
Jim Galvin – SSAC –Afilias
Scott Austin

ICANN Staff
Steve Sheng
Gisella Gruber-White
Dave Piscitello
Julie Hedlund

Absent apologies:
Avri Doria - NCSG
Rafik Dammak
Sarmad Hussain
Owen Smigelski

Coordinator: Please go ahead. The call is now being recorded.

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

                      call on Monday, the 25th of July. We have Steve Metalitz, Bob Hutchinson.

                      From Staff we have Julie Hedlund, Dave Piscitello, Steve Sheng and myself,

                      Gisella Gruber.

Apologies today are noted from Sarmad Hussein, Owen Smigelski, Avri Doria and Rafik Dammak. If I could please also just remind you to state your names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Gisella and thank you everyone for joining us. We'll use as I mentioned before the call started, we'll use for our discussion today a version of the draft outline that Steve Sheng had sent and then I had resent last week to the working group, the extended outline for the IRD-WG final report dated July 13.

The version that we'll look at today is the one that Steve Metalitz has provided some edits to. So we'll go ahead, I think, and just use the outline as our discussion - to guide our discussion today.

And in that respect I'd like to go ahead and turn things over to Steve Sheng to start going through the outline.

Steve Sheng: Thank you Julie and good morning and good afternoon everyone. I hope on this call we can discuss the outline. First of all, thanks to Steve Metalitz for the helpful edits.

Before we begin, maybe we can all pull out that version that Steve had sent last night. And let me know if you all have it.

Julie Hedlund: I think we can assume that that means Bob and Steve both have it, so if you want to...

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Bob Hutchinson: I've got it.

Steve Sheng: Okay. That's good. So I suggest we go over section by section and address, you know, any questions, concerns, edits and additions. Is that - sound like a feasible plan?

Steven Metalitz: Sure.

Steve Sheng: Okay. So Section 1, Introduction, is pretty much boiler plate information that's taken from our last - taken from the interim report. In fact, I don't think we changed anything, so I assume there isn't much to discuss in here, but I'd like to hear your thoughts.

                  Yes? No?

Bob Hutchinson: Yes, in Section 1, under the IRD working group membership, it enumerates a couple of names but I believe you should take the names from the Wiki page.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Bob Hutchinson: For the membership of the group - for the ICANN staff.

Steve Sheng: Okay. I'll make sure to do that.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, and in fact, Steve you might even just - you know, just include the link or, you know, either list them all or include the link but that's something we can easily take care of it.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Yes, that's something we can...

Bob Hutchinson: I think you've already got the link there in the footnote, too.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, that's right. It's already in a footnote.

Steve Sheng: Yes, okay, although we need to check the update for that link. We may move to compliment Wiki.

So I want to highlight Section 1.1, the IRD-WG Objective and Goals. So the Board asked us essentially one question that is to study the feasibility and suitability of introducing submission and display specification to deal with the internationalization of registration data and while we're doing that to engage participation from all ICANN SO MACs.

So on the second bullet, I think it's kind of important essentially is we separate the Board's question into two issues; one is the suitability issue. The question is, is it suitable or desirable to have internationalized registration data. So that's one question. The other is feasibility; is it feasible to introduce submission and display specifications to deal with IRD.

As you note later on in the report, for example in particular the findings and recommendations section, I tried to use, you know, these two questions as the foundation, you know, kind of answer them one by one.

So does the working group have any questions with this breakup of the questions? Issues or...

Bob Hutchinson: No. I think we need a larger forum to discuss this.

Steve Sheng: Yes, probably, yes. So Julie, this is another question I guess for you. We only have two members on the call. How do we ensure we'll have consensus on this outline?

Julie Hedlund: Well clearly we're not going to have consensus today.

Steve Sheng: Yes, that's what I mean.

Julie Hedlund: I think we're going to have to do two things. We're going to have to get positive confirmation from people that they can attend the next meeting that we set and...

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: ...two, I think that we need to get positive affirmation from people who cannot attend a meeting that day, you know, except whatever version - you know, final version of the outline...

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: ...you know, versions of the document, you know, as we write the document, as well.

                  There is a procedure for consensus that's in the charter and I can call it up and send it around for people to remind them but it is - it's rough consensus. So it's, you know, generally I think, you know, a majority of the members -- I forget the exact terminology -- but...

Steve Sheng: Right.

Julie Hedlund: ...it is important to get affirmation and also note any objections if there are any. So we'll make sure to pay attention to that part of the process.

Steve Sheng: Okay. So maybe at the end of the day after our discussion today with Steve and Bob, you know, and Dave and you and me, I will revise the outline based on today's discussion and basically that will be an updated version.

                  And maybe after that, you know, you can take care of, you know, trying to make sure that, you know, the described like two steps, make sure they attend our next call. If they don't, then make sure to send us comments on the outline. Is that possible?

Julie Hedlund: I will - when we send - when you send this revised version around, I would ask that you ask people to either send changes or affirm that, you know, that this is good to move forward with when you send that around and we can of course do a reminder, as well. And when I send the meeting notice, I will ask people to specifically RSVP.

Steve Sheng: Okay, sure. Thank you. Okay, so moving on to Section 1.2, Terminology...

Bob Hutchinson: Steve, can we go back to your 1.1...

Steve Sheng: Go ahead, yes.

Bob Hutchinson: ...observations? Okay. As I read this and I admit fully that I haven't spent a whole lot of time studying this document. I did go through it last night and realized it has changed substantially from other documents that we've discussed, so it is important, I think, to get the other members of the team to take a good look at this.

                  How do your recommendations tie to these two questions? I'm not seeing a one-to-one correspondence or the answer to suitability and feasibility in your recommendations.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Maybe - that's a good question. Maybe when we come to the recommendation section, we will make sure that I'll either explain or if it hasn't been clear then make sure to address it. Is that okay?

Bob Hutchinson: Fine.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Any other questions on 1.1? Okay, hearing none, so let's go on to 1.2, Terminology. So here the - at the outside in the interim report we separate the work Whois into Whois data, Whois protocol and Whois service.

So in this draft, we refine it further so the Whois Data we now refer to Domain Name Registration Data. The Whois Protocol is now called the Registration Data Access Protocol. And the Whois Service is called Registration Data Directory Service.

So this terminology is also in line with the ASEC document that ASEC is currently working on on this trying to clarify the terminologies using Whois.

So I kind of got a preview of that and copy and paste what that means here. Do we have any questions on this; Whois related terminologies?

Okay, hearing none, so terminology should be standard. That includes - also includes some IBM-related terminology, basically any terms that are used in the document that needs to be defined in the precise way is defined here.

One of the comments we received from the interim report is some of the terms are used kind of not very precisely so I'll make sure to address that.

And one way to do that is also to site any relevant definitions from IETF, RFC 3536 the latest version about terminologies regarding internationalization.

So just to make sure that, you know, have the terms defined here that when we use a term, we know exactly what it means and people don't get confused and we invite criticisms for this report from the technical community.

So that should be pretty standard background.

Section 2, 2.1, what is Domain Name Registration Data? Do people have any comments here?

Gisella Gruber-White: Sorry to interrupt, Scott Austin has joined the call.

Scott Austin: Thank you. I'm sorry I'm a little late.

Steve Sheng: Oh, hello - okay.

Julie Hedlund: Welcome Scott, it's Julie. I just wanted to let you know we're going through the outline document that was sent around and this is particularly the version that Metalitz sent to the list and made a few changes to just last night and I think we've just covered the terminology section and we're now in the background section. Is that correct Steve?

Steve Sheng: Yes, yes. And welcome Scott.

Scott Austin: Thank you. Appreciate it Steve. I'll pull it up.

Steve Sheng: Yes, so 2.1, What is Domain Name Registration Data, so I tried to extenuate what in Jim's proposed outline for the final report by listing the RA requirements for the kind of the domain registration data and subsequently the subset that it will be displayed in Whois in the directory services.

                  Do people have any comments on this section, Section 2.1?

Bob Hutchinson: Wasn't this supposed to also include technical contact, another - I think there's another contact. I don't get the list in front of me but...

Steve Sheng: That's a good question. Okay, so I have the - it's 3.3.17, the technical contact for register name. Bob, it's 3.3.17.

Bob Hutchinson: Yes.

Steve Sheng: It's in there, yes.

Bob Hutchinson: Oh, it is in there, okay.

Steve Sheng: Yes. So the key here is what I did was I take these data elements and I group them in the several categories, so there will be a category for domain name, registration status, name server, information and the names, you know, owner, admin, technical contact, address, phone, fax numbers and dates.

The reason for this categorization is the working group has discussed these data elements can be applied to - separately internationalized by applying the latest internet standards. And that's kind of the background here. I separate that.

And I also added here is in ccTLDs, you know, there's no requirement on what needs to be displayed as each ccTLD sets its own policy. So just to kind of clarify our scope, you know, to make sure we do not overreach.

So it's kind of very general. Do people have any questions on Section 2.1?

Steven Metalitz: Yes, this is Steven Metalitz.

Steve Sheng: Go ahead.

Steven Metalitz: Is there a reason that you should - you have addresses as the fifth bullet.

Steve Sheng: Yes.

Steven Metalitz: Does that cover both postal address and email address? I think those should probably be dealt with differently, shouldn't they? I mean the email address is fairly...

Steve Sheng: Sorry, Steve, yes.

Steven Metalitz: You know, it looks like it's talking about postal address but email address is...

Steve Sheng: Yes, I should change that into postal address. Actually - thanks for that. Actually I forgot the email address. So I will change the address into postal address and then I'll add an email address at the end.

Bob Hutchinson: Also, your numbers - I mean if the numbers are supposed to be 2.1 numbers, they're wrong.

Steve Sheng: What numbers?

Bob Hutchinson: Three point, 3.1...

Steve Sheng: Oh, the 3.3.1 is coming from the RA, like the relevant sections in the RA.

Bob Hutchinson: I see. Okay.

Steve Sheng: Yes. Okay, well thanks - and thanks for catching that Steve. I will add an email address there and I'll change the address into postal address. Thank you.

Any other comments on this? Staff?

Julie Hedlund: Steve, everyone - this is Julie. I just want to let you know that (unintelligible) he is going to try to join. He's going to try to get on via his mobile as soon as he gets to a quieter location.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Bob Hutchinson: I'm not sure - someone has got a little background noise here, maybe. My suggestion - I don't need to go through these unless people want to but I think it's just to state that registries - some registries have somewhat different requirements about what has to be displayed.

Steve Sheng: Right, right. Yes. Also, I see your addition in there.

Bob Hutchinson: Okay.

Steve Sheng: Yes. Okay, so hearing none on 2.1, let's go onto 2.2, where different registration elements are collected, stored, managed and displayed.

I'm actually not quite sure what Jim wants in this section, but what I did is separate that into submission and query.

Jim Baskin: Jim is here. I just joined.

Steve Sheng: Oh, hi Jim. How are you?

Jim Baskin: My apologies folks. Sorry for missing this call.

Steve Sheng: We're working on - no, we're working on the outline and then we are starting with Section 2.2 of Steve's added from last night, so if you can pull up that, that would be good.

Jim Baskin: It's going to be about ten minutes before I can get online and do that, so...

Steve Sheng: Oh, okay.

Jim Baskin: ...I'm just on my phone at the moment making my way around this very large complex here.

Steve Sheng: Sure, sure.

Scott Austin: Excuse me, this is Scott Austin. Can I ask one question on 2.1 before we move on?

Steve Sheng: Go ahead, go ahead.

Scott Austin: And this may have already been discussed but in your outline you've got under general the data that would be considered in the following categories, as far as addresses, is there a specific requirement for email addresses as well as a terrestrial address?

Steve Sheng: Yes, so - yes, so what I'll do as Steve just pointed out early, I will separate - will clarify the address just to mean postal address and I'll add an entry called email address. So separate those two.

                  There are, you know, internationalization standards for email address but, you know, we haven't talked too much about postal address. Those are separate elements. Yes.

Scott Austin: Okay, because I mean I see it in - and the version I'm looking at is the one that was a prior version and the numbers are a little off so it's like 3.3.1.7, references email address...

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Scott Austin: ...and 3.3.1.8, I think it should be - you know, obviously we got the 2.2.1.8. I see it there as an element. I just didn't know if that was something that's required.

                  And a minute ago Steve said that there's no requirement I guess on ccTLDs for certain policies, I guess. And forgive me if this is a naïve question but is there an overarching policy that requires what registration data has to be provided for a registry or a registrar - or just a registry?

Steve Sheng: So ICANN accredited registries and registrars, yes, so those are specified in the RA and also individual registry agreements with ICANN.

For - so for gTLD registries but for ccTLD registries there is no policy. As far as I know there's no policy. I could be wrong. Is there an overall policy for ccTLDs?

Bob Hutchinson: No. There's no Whois requirement for ccTLDs.

Steve Sheng: Yes.

Scott Austin: But I mean I guess like - is that something that should be recommended or is that something that falls outside of their scope, that's a UN or some other international body that over sees this?

Jim Baskin: No, no. So - this is Jim. I think the answer to this for this group it is appropriate for us to call out the issue of a lack of Whois policy. This is a well-known thing at ICANN. This is something that will come out of the Whois review team because one of their critical questions is whether or not there really is a policy per se.

As Steve just said, there are specifications or prescriptive requirements in contracts, so registrars that are accredited have contractual requirements and registries that are contracted with ICANN have requirements.

But outside of that there's - they have prescriptive requirements, which is the phrase that I've been using to talk about, you know, what's really there. But there's no policy, per se, in the traditional sense of a policy that exists. And so I think it's appropriate for us as part of our output to identify, you know, this distinction and this issue.

So we'll be one of several different groups along the way here that are going to identify this issue and hopefully that will cause, you know, some action on the ICANN side to try to create something that will address this issue.

But I suspect it will be driven more by the Whois Review Team than anything specific from us.

Steven Metalitz: This is Steve. I'm not sure that's responsive to what Scott was raising which was that there are, as you put, even prescriptive requirements for ccTLD.

Jim Baskin: Well, that's true, too. That's because...

Steven Metalitz: (Unintelligible). Can I finish?

Jim Baskin: Yes, please.

Steven Metalitz: Regardless of whether there's anything you want to label a policy or not, which I think is kind of an arbitrary label in some cases. There's nothing regarding ccTLDs, and this was an item of debate within ICANN ten years ago and...

Jim Baskin: Yes.

Steven Metalitz: ...ICANN decided not to impose any prescriptive requirements on ccTLDs with regard to Whois. And if we want to raise that issue, we could. I'm not sure it's within the scope of what we've been asked to do, though.

Scott Austin: No, and I hear Jim saying that but I guess my point is that if we all just sort of look the other way but know that it's a concern because I think one of the overarching concerns is stability and consistency.

And if folks who have these contracts and there must be something that drives the contracts, otherwise the contracts would be a patchwork that would be based upon negotiating leverage as opposed to, you know, some kind of a standard, so the contracts would be different among various contracting parties. And I'm assuming that's not the case.

So something must be driving the contract terms that's above that and that's what I would assume would be a policy or standard somewhere that's annunciated, otherwise how would the parties contracting know what the expectation is?

Jim Baskin: So in fact - you know, this is Jim. So in fact, no, there is nothing overarching that even drives the contracts and there are a couple of minor differences between some of the registry contracts. A lot of the original things were done for historical reasons. That's where they all came from. In fact where we are with Whois in general in ICANN is largely for historical reasons - not because it was driven by anything in particular.

ccTLDs, really are kind of a special case, unfortunately. Well, I don't know. I shouldn't pass judgment in that way. I mean that's just a statement of observation of facts. They are treated differently than gTLDs.

You know, I don't know that we necessarily need to make that distinction. I think that, you know, you're making a good point that we should identify the fact that it would be good if these things were uniform and then leave it to someone else to figure out how to make the distinction between gTLDs and ccTLDs.

I don't know that - guess we should decide if people want to make a summary statement about what does exist or doesn't exist for different groups. I know the Whois review team is going to a lot of trouble to put all this stuff together, so I guess I'm inclined to suggest that we probably don't need to do that. But I'll leave it to the group to decide what you really want to do and how you want to approach it.

Scott Austin: Well, I guess if I'm going to contribute anything or make at least a comment I guess I would say that even if we want to limit ourselves to engineering and technical and whatever is limited responsible, that still carries with it a policy statement. There is hidden inside any standard, whether it's Beta versus

Betamax versus VHS, whether it's any of the other standards that have been created for the way that systems operate with one another, there is a policy in there. And I think one of these - one of ours and to use an Internet - or an ICANN term, "overarching" policies, was stability and consistency.

I guess it would not be against our reign to suggest that maybe that stability could be better derived with something that was uniform, although, you know, the registries that don't - that aren't ccTLDs, that are just TLDs and gTLDs (unintelligible). I mean I think that we could see what the harm would be if there's inconsistencies in terms of Whois data. It would be very easy for a small country to not reveal anything about who owns their building names or have it so limited that no one could ever do anything about it.

Jim Baskin: I think - so this is Jim and speaking personally I agree with you. You know, I'm very sympathetic to that and would love to see something like that. But speaking as chair, whatever the group wants to decide to do, I think if, you know, we - you propose some text to go forward with that and then we'll see how people want to approach it.

Scott Austin: Yes.

Steven Metalitz: This is Steve. Just to...

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. I would just like to note that, you know, we do have a pretty small group on this call. I think that is a question we'll probably want to raise with the larger group. And I should also point out that the scope of this group is fairly narrow, and in particular, this particular group is not involved in, you know, obviously, making policy, but the recommendations that come out of this group could then be taking up by the GNSO which does make policy. And then the - you know, the procedure could be to create an issues report, a policy-development process, and so on based on the recommendations that come out of this group.

So there is actually a couple of steps to a policy process. It doesn't mean that this group can't make a recommendation relating to policy. And as Jim points out, it's very likely, and I think others have on this call, you know, pointed out that even if we speak only to technical issues in this particular report, they certainly could be taken up by the GNSO and worked into a policy.

Steven Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I would certainly support Scott's suggestion. I'm not sure what - I mean if we - even if we put our statement in there saying it would be good to have some degree of uniformity between what gTLDs do and what ccTLDs do with regard to internationalized registration data, I'm not sure what the path forward is from there. It would not be through the GNSO which can't set any policies for the (unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: Yes, good point. Sorry, Steve, yes.

Steven Metalitz: So I'm not sure what it would be, but I don't think there's any downside - I don't think there's any harm that I know of to our making that statement.

Scott Austin: Thank you, Steve, because that's what I was looking for with the history. I'm not trying to slow things down. All I'm saying is that we are in a democracy in this group and if we can - and to me, democracy is about reaching some kind of consensus. Sometimes that doesn't happen, but I'm just saying that what we write down is the only legislative history, if you will, for what people are thinking about at the time.

So that at least, at a later date, perhaps someone could go back and seize on that and say, "These people did raise the issue. It is an important issue. It is something that needs to be debated in the right committee and with the right decision makers." And that's all I'm trying to do, because I think because of the level of intellect and history and skill and talent in this group, it shouldn't be loss on a fear that we're going beyond our scope if we note things that still have an impact on this international process. I think we do ourselves a

disservice if we don't at least mention. If it's a suggestion, it can be shouted down quite easily.

Steve Sheng: This is Steve. Can I make a suggestion?

Jim Baskin: Sure.

Steve Sheng: So maybe Scott and Steve, if you could put some text together, you know, describing this and maybe, you know, send it to the general mailing list, because we only have a few people here, you know, so that, you know, we engage a larger discussion on the mailing list. And if people feel, "Yes, let's do that," then, you know, we'll put it into the report. How's that sound? Is that a good way forward?

Steven Metalitz: Yes, that's fine with me. I really just think we need a - it would just be a sentence or too.

Scott Austin: Yes, I think Steve just stated it, quite frankly. I don't know if this is being transcribed, but his comment on uniformity as a suggestion that works for both TLDs and ccTLDs, I think, is really (unintelligible) help us.

Julie Hedlund: This is not actually being transcribed. This is Julie. It is - I don't think. Gisella, are we having a transcription done on these calls? In any case...

Jim Baskin: Yes.

Gisella Gruber-White: Sorry, I was on mute.

Julie Hedlund: ...I do know that they're being recorded, so I still would highly recommend that either Steve or you, Scott, would send actual text to the list, because I really think it needs to be called out to the list. I think it's a good, you know, suggestion, but I really would like everybody to pay attention to it and, you

know, either affirmatively say, "Yes, we want this in our report," or not. That would be very useful.

Gisella Gruber-White: Sorry. Gisella here. I was on mute. Just to say the calls are transcribed.

Steven Metalitz: Okay. Well, I'd be - this is Steve Metalitz. I'd be happy to circulate some suggested language on that.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks very much, Steve.

Scott Austin: And Steve, I'd be happy to make any contribution, I can, but I think Steve's captured it.

Steve Sheng: Okay, thanks. So before we move onto 2.2, are there any other questions regarding this section? Going once, going twice. Okay. So let's move onto 2.2, where different registration data elements are collected, stored, managed, and displayed.

So here, I really just focus on the gTLD environment, and I separate that into submission, the process when a registrant provide information and where those information goes. So it first goes to the registrars or the resellers. And then they store - the registrars store the information, and in the case of thick registries, you know, provide that information through the EPP into the registry and that's where the registry also has a copy.

So on the query side, when the end user query the registration data for domain name, contact information or main server information, if it's thick registries, you know, the query directly displays the data from the registry's Whois service. If it's thin registry, the query continues to refer to the registrar's Whois service and displays the data there.

Jim, this is Steve, is this what you have in mind or have I missed something here? I really need to seek your guidance here.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, the particular in larger scope issue that I'm trying to address here is really the thin versus thick registry issue. Now that's really a ComNet versus every other gTLD scenario, but also given the fact that there are no prescriptive requirements on ccTLDs, there is the opportunity for them to have a thin versus thick model too. But that's - in the large, that's the issue that I'm looking to have addressed in this section, and I think you've kind of broken that out pretty nicely. So I'm, you know, interested in what other people think about this and how we should approach it.

Steve Sheng: What do others think?

Steven Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I think it is useful to have this difference spelled out. I'm just not sure on the last bullet where it says, "The query continues to query registrar's Whois service," at least in Web-based Whois, this makes it sound automatic which it's not in Web-based Whois. When you go to the VeriSign Whois for a dotcom, it tells you who is - you know, which is the registrar, but then you have to go to the registrar's Whois service to try to get the other data.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Thank you, Steve. I think that's a good...

Steven Metalitz: So it's not automatic, is, I guess, the point I was making.

Steven Sheng: Okay. That's a good distinction and I can add that. I'll try to figure out some language in here, but I'll note it. Any other comments on this?

Scott Austin: I guess I would make the response congruent to the question and enumerate where the elements are collected from, where they're actually stored. I don't know that managed is relevant or how managed is meant in this term or in this question and why we would have it in this statement and then displayed. And I would expect your response to be, "Data elements are collected here.

Data elements are stored here. Data elements are displayed." You see what I'm saying?

Steve Sheng: Yes, I see what you're saying and I'm trying to think here. I would like to store it. Okay I think I can make that change.

Scott Austin: Does anybody have any response to the question of why managed is in this question?

Robert Hutchinson: I assume it's in there because it's in Jim's outline that was attached as the appendix

Steve Sheng: Yes.

Robert Hutchinson: Managed, to me, means you're doing something to the data, editing it, so on and so forth, or protecting it in some fashion and...

Julie Hedlund: I'm sorry. This is Julie. Could I - could everybody please announce themselves? I'm starting - I think it's hard for the transcriber.

Robert Hutchinson: I'm sorry. This is Bob Hutchinson.

Julie Hedlund: Bob, I wasn't recognizing your voice. Thanks.

Robert Hutchinson: The - I don't know that we've ever delved into the management of Whois data and I don't think it's in-scope to this group.

Steve Sheng: Okay, that's a good question. Jim?

Jim Baskin: Yes, I'm not sure I have a good answer at the moment. I'm just - I'm thinking and trying not to jump to conclusions.

Steve Sheng: Okay. So while you're thinking, can we move onto the next section, and then, you know, if you've thought of something, we can come back? Is that okay? Because we need to move on for this outline.

Jim Baskin: Yes. Let me ask a clarifying question. Just so you're asking, Bob, whether or not - you were just asking a scope question? You're questioning whether or not this is in-scope or not? If you're talking, Bob, I'm not hearing you.

Robert Hutchinson: Yes. I'm - this is Bob Hutchinson again. I'm trying to get the answer to agree with what's being asked in the question and then I also question why we're discussing registration management or, you know, whether that's part of this group's charter. Okay.

Jim Baskin: Yes, I guess I'm going to have to pull back. And to be honest with you, I'm sorry, I'm just not sure I'm understanding the question. So I hate to ask you to repeat yourself but...

Robert Hutchinson: Okay. So the edit is to remove the word "managed" in the - in 2.2.

Jim Baskin: Is to remove the word "managed."

Robert Hutchinson: So 2.2 would read, "Where different registration data elements are collected, stored, and displayed."

Jim Baskin: Okay. Well if we reduce it down to that one particular thing, I guess I'm fine with that. I cannot off the top of my head think of a compelling reason to disagree with you, so that's fine. Let's just go with it. And if something comes to me later, I'll raise it again later.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Let's do that, so I can...

Robert Hutchinson: And I guess for summary's sake, my other observation was that the response should match the question. In other words, data - the response

should say, "Data elements are collected here, stored here, and displayed in this fashion." Okay.

Steve Sheng: That's okay. I can do that, yes.

Jim Baskin: Okay, all right. So now I'm onboard with you. So we also have a consistency issue as well as whether or not "managed" belongs there. And you're right. Since we didn't answer the question managed, so yes, so let's take that out. So thank you. That's a good thing to catch.

Robert Hutchinson: And for clarity, I guess, you know, for extra credit, if what you're trying to highlight here is thin and thick registries, you could have a different collect and stored and displayed set for, for thick registries it's done this way, and for thin registries it's done this way. Okay. I mean to be...

Jim Baskin: All right. Yes.

Robert Hutchinson: If we're just trying to highlight this thick and thin registry differences here, I'm guess I'm not sure why you would want to do that, but that seems to be what you're trying to highlight here.

Jim Baskin: Yes and I actually - so this is Jim and I agree with you. I mean a comment that I had not provided back to Steve is I think that one of the things I would suggest in the large for this document, throughout this document, so not just in this section, is I would prefer, personally, that we speak about Whois services independent of gTLD versus ccTLD unless that distinction is important.

So we should talk functionally about the service, because I think that I would like to see it. So I'm speaking personally again here, just to focus on the service requirements. And this distinction about ccTLDs and gTLDs, which does keep coming up even in our conversation here, you know, should be left

to the reader to take this on to figure out if they want to make that distinction or not.

I mean I would prefer that we proposed uniformity in that respect. So again, speaking personally, I like your comment, Bob, and I'm just sort of translating it into a larger action item that we do that throughout this document, because there're a few other places where we make that distinction, and I think we can, you know, move away from that if possible if folks agree.

Steve Sheng: Jim, this is Steve. I - the difficulty for me is, I guess, I - in principle, I agree with you. In practice, I don't know what the ccTLDs' practices are, and they don't - sometimes they don't disclose it. So I - you know, I'm at the risk of writing something when I don't know. So that's my - my approach is to be as conservative as possible so you don't write something stupid that - you know, write something that's wrong. That's my only concern, yes.

Jim Baskin: I understand. Thank you, you know. We'll just have to figure that out as we go here and so it's fine. I'll offer some specific comments to you about some suggestions about how to deal with some areas on this point.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Jim Baskin: And then we'll see how that goes with the group. That's all.

Steve Sheng: All right. All right, so I will - yes, I will update this section based on Jim and Bob's suggestion. Okay?

So are we done with this section, or are there more comments on this? Okay. We are about six minutes to the hour, and Julie, what do you suggest we do next?

Julie Hedlund: Well, Steve, you know, obviously, I think this is, you know, mainly, you know, something that you're working on, so I think it's best to do what's most helpful for you.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: As for what I would suggest is, if people are amenable, that we schedule another call for next Monday and, you know, have people confirm that they can be on the call and get a revision out based on the comments that you've received this far. And I've taken some notes that I'll send around to the work group just a little bit later today and - you know, and ask people to continue to look at the outline and provide comments and with a view to trying to wrap it up next Monday if we can.

And I - the reason I say that is because we actually have a deadline to be able to consider the final report in Dakar. If we want to present that report to the public or to the GNSO council in Dakar, that report has to be available for publication. It doesn't have to necessarily be its final, final version, but it does have to be available to be published by September 30. That's the publication deadline for any documents to be considered in Dakar.

So we're working back from that and that really isn't very much time. So we'd be working about the outline as quickly as we can.

Steve Sheng: Right. Okay. Thank you, Julie. I agree with you. We should try to schedule a call next Monday. But I was also wondering, for participants on this call, if you would be willing to go an extra half an hour to go to through this outline.

Julie Hedlund: Steve, could I - Steve, I'm sorry, but you know that people have a call starting in four minutes, the IDN Variant call.

Steve Sheng: Yes, I forgot that. Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. So we unfortunately do have a conflict and can't continue at this point.

Steve Sheng: Yes, yes. I guess we'll have to continue through the e-mail discussion then.

Julie Hedlund: Steve and Bob and Scott and Jim, will you be able to meet next Monday at the same time?

Scott Austin: This is Scott. That works for me. I'm fine.

Steven Metalitz: Yes, Steve Metalitz. I think that's okay at the same time for an hour.

Robert Hutchinson: This is Bob Hutchinson. I can do Monday next week also.

Julie Hedlund: And Jim?

Jim Baskin: And actually, I can do part of the call next week, because I'll be getting on a plane. So up until I have to get - step onto my plane, I can be on the call, but since you obviously progressed along just fine without me this morning, I don't think that's critical, so it's okay.

Julie Hedlund: Well, it is helpful to have you, Jim. Then thank you, everyone. I'll go ahead and send a notice that we'll have the call next Monday. I will ask people to affirm that they can attend so we can get good attendance. And in the meantime, we'll send around a revised version of the outline as far as we've been able to proceed today.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Thanks.

Scott Austin: Great. Thank you.

Steven Metalitz: Thanks.

Robert Hutchinson: Thank you.

Jim Baskin: Thanks, everyone.

Julie Hedlund: If nothing else, then this call is adjourned. I want to thank everyone and we'll look forward to talking to you next week.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Scott Austin: Thank you very much.

Steve Sheng: Bye-bye.

Julie Hedlund: Everyone have a good day.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you, everyone. Bye-bye.

Julie Hedlund: Bye-bye.

                            END