GNSO/SSAC
International Registration Data Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 27 September 2010 at 15:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO/SSAC International Registration Data Workign Group on 27 September 2010 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/#sep
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ird-wg-20100927-en.mp3

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

Present for the teleconference:
Rafik Dammak -- GNSO Non-Commercial Users Stakeholder Group
Avri Doria - NCSG
Bob Hutchinson, GNSO Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG)
Jim Galvin – SSAC -Afilias
Edmon Chung – Co-chair - GNSO Registry Stakeholder Group

ICANN Staff
Julie Hedlund
David Piscitello
Gisella Gruber-White

Absent apologies:
Steven Metalitz -- GNSO Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, CSG
Andrei Kolesnikov -- Nominating Committee Appointee
Jeremy Hitchcock - DYN-DNS
Steve Sheng – ICANN Staff

Gisella Gruber-White: Absolutely. (Sam) would you be so kind as to get this recording started and let me know soon as it's started? Thank you.

Coordinator: Yep. Sure. One moment please. Thank you. The recording started. Please go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Thanks. Gisella would you be so kind as to do a roll call.

Gisella Gruber-White: With pleasure. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. On today's IRD call on Monday the 27th of September we have Avri Doria,

Jim Galvin, from staff we have Julie Hedlund, Dave Piscitello and myself, Gisella Gruber-White, and we have apologies from Andre Kolesnikov, Steve Metalitz, Edmon Chung and Jeremy Hitchcock.

If I could please just remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Thanks so much Gisella.

Rafik Dammak: Sorry. Gisella you forget me.

Gisella Gruber-White: I'm so terribly sorry. And we have Rafik Dammak on the call. I don't know how I could possibly have forgotten him. My apologies.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you so much Gisella. Thank you Rafik. This is Julie Hedlund. Welcome to everyone. I have some very good news to convey to all of you, (Steve Shang) cannot be on the call today but for a very good reason, he and his wife (Phoebe) have welcomed into the world a new daughter (Teresa), their first child. So he has I think a very, very good reason for missing to the call today.

And what I'd like to do today, we, it does not look like we'll have our chairs joining us. We'll continue with the call I think as long as we feel we want to discuss these items because we do have work group members on the call.

I sent around and to the working group two documents, that notes that (Steve Shang) had taken from the last two calls and also the staff summary document that we've been using as the basis of our discussion for the last several calls.
We've been working through the preliminary recommendations in that document with the view to see, the goal to see if we can come to some consensus on these issues and as of the last call then we had proceeded

through to Page (unintelligible) summary document and that brought us into the issue of registration status and how to address that.

And based on the notes from last fall the staff noted that the Whois specification and the new GTLD guide book is to choose option two of the options that we set forth which was always publish the exact EPP status code and leave it to the clients to decide whether to localize it or not.

The parties on the call agreed that the work group should follow what ICANN has required in the new GTL guide book, GTLD guide book and I just wanted to ask whether or not the working group members on this call feel we need to proceed for further discussion on this particular issue or to move on to the next issue.

All right. Hearing no objections I think that we can go ahead and proceed to the next item for discussion, and I'll ask Dave Piscitello to lead us through the technical aspects of this but I will go ahead and tee it up.

The next item was how to address entity names and address including registrant admin contact name and addresses technical contact name and addresses and recommendations concerning entity name, which will come a little bit further in this discussion.

The preliminary recommendation on entity names and address was the Whois data field should be separately internationalized, specifically Whois output for our domain names, sponsoring registrar, telephone/fax, who now address should be internationalized as discussed above.

And there were some observations that staff had made in this regard. Although the IRDWG discussed the issue of internationalizing each element of registration data separately it did not discuss whether nor not to internationalize or localize the labels for these elements.

So the question we could discuss here is should the labels always be in U.S. ASCII or it should be, should these labels be localized. So perhaps we can take up that issue here on this call if you're like. Any thoughts?

Oh and I see that Bob Hutchinson has joined us. Bob welcome. And...

Bob Hutchinson: Good morning.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah. Good morning. Just to let you know we're on Page 6 of the staff summary document that I've sent around to the list and we are proceeding from the discussion on last weeks call to go through the various elements and possible recommendations on how to address each of these issues.

Bob Hutchinson: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: I'm not sure exactly when you joined but we're now on the issue of the address entity name and should the labels for these be in U.S. ASCII or localized.

And Dave jump in if you'd like to expand on any of these items as well. I'm just basically reading out from the staff summary document.

Dave Piscitello: So Julie, this is Dave, I have one question. The staff summary document that I have only has three pages and you said you're on Page 6?

Julie Hedlund: Yeah. There is nine pages total.

Avri Doria: Yeah. I've got nine.

Dave Piscitello: Oh I see...

Julie Hedlund: But I sent around I think, Dave did you get what I sent, it should be a, did I send a PDF or I can't remember if I sent that or if I sent that as...

Avri Doria: The note file (unintelligible) sent out...

Dave Piscitello: Sorry. I apparently just got your e-mail.

Julie Hedlund: Oh okay. Great. If you could reference that document that should the complete version. And I'm sorry Avri, I didn't mean to cut you off.

Avri Doria: Oh that's okay. I was just saying that the note thing you sent around only had three pages.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. And the notes are brief, that's true. That's absolutely correct.

                     So you have the document Dave?

Dave Piscitello: Yes I do. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Julie Hedlund: Oh you're very welcome. So anyway I'd like to go ahead and open this up for discussion and among the working group members please go head.

                     Any thoughts on entity names and address?

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. I'll just speak out and say I'm generally in favor of them appearing in ASCII, the labels staying in ASCII with an option to localize it if they want to.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. Thank you Jim. That's helpful. Others?

                     Any thoughts from others? Any disagreement with that option that is that the entity names and address would appear in ASCII as well as the labels but there would be an option to localize?

Dave Piscitello: This is Dave I just have a question for Jim. So are you envisioning say two sets of, two sets of information or one set of information? So for example will I have an ASCII you know, an ASCII contact, full set of contact information with an ASCII label and then perhaps an, a UTF (unintelligible) information with ASCII labels? So I'm just trying to understand the permutations that we have here.

Jim Galvin: To be honest I'm trying not to cast an opinion on that particular issue. You know we've discussed this issue in the same way with values, right, with the labels should they be allowed to appear twice. And I don't, I don't sense that we have real consensus on that issue across the board yet either so I guess I'm trying to be open minded about the answer to that question at the moment.

Dave Piscitello: Okay. That's fine. I think that the one value that we have with keeping the labels in ASCII is that a great deal of work has already gone into automation for you know, for the legitimate purposes and having labels in multiple languages actually would, it would create a I think a significant penalty for automation.

Jim Galvin: I actually agree with that, you know I'm with you. I tend, well I'm trying to stay open minded about what we ultimately do but yes I agree with that observation and believe it's pretty significant.

Dave Piscitello: So should we, should staff document that in, yeah, as a note or an observation in the report?

Jim Galvin: I would say so.

Julie Hedlund: So this is Julie. Thanks Dave and Jim. Are there other suggestions, comments on this (unintelligible)?

Avri Doria: This is Avri, for those with wandering attentions what exactly are we saying
                 has to be added to the report?

Dave Piscitello: Avri this is Dave. I made an observation to Jim that if you have labels in
                  (unintelligible) other than ASCII a great deal of existing automation for
                  legitimate purposes would have to be rewritten and the sort of complexity of
                  trying to, or trying to match records becomes even more so when you've got,
                  you're not quite certain what the label is.

Avri Doria: I understand that but what, are we drawing a conclusion from that or are we
                 just raising a flag that says therefore more work needs to be done, or are we
                 using that to somehow say and therefore maybe we shouldn't worry about all
                 this stuff?

Dave Piscitello: Well only with respect to labels I think it would be worthwhile having people
                  who in particular do a lot of this automation, weigh in, so I was simply raising
                  the point and making, thinking that we would make the note and see what
                  kind of comments we get back from the broader community.

Avri Doria: Okay. That works for me. I just all of a sudden I wasn't sure whether I had
                 lost track of and therefore we were saying that maybe it shouldn't happen, as
                 long as we're not doing that I'm find with raising the flag.

Bob Hutchinson: Yeah.

Dave Piscitello: Okay. In fact if you want what we can do is make certain that call, you know
                  ask specifically for, you know, for some comment by those who develop
                  automation.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. Did I hear someone else trying to comment?

Bob Hutchinson: Yes. I was going to make the observation, this is Bob Hutchinson, that a great
                 assumption that we have in current ASCII left to right is that everything is left

to right and when you localize into a number of different Arabic languages things are no longer left to right, I believe Hebrew is that way as well.

And I don't know how that affects labeling and how in those environments they would prefer to see this done and if you don't address that that's probably another corner case that sort of needs to be addressed here.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks Bob. Other comments?

Dave Piscitello: This is Dave. Bob do you want us to make an observation about that too?

Bob Hutchinson: I think personally I think our job is to actually make recommendations on this and I think we need to understand what the, you know, all of the nuances of this particular problem are. This is kind of core central to what we should or should be concluding out of this report I think and so that's my take on it. Maybe is the, does the group feel that we're, the extent of our responsibility is to outline the problem or is the extent of our responsibility to propose a solution?

Dave Piscitello: So this is Dave, I'll take a shot at answering that. What we're, I think we're attempting to do in time for Cartagena is provide an interim report that identifies the progress thus far fully cognizant of the fact that we don't have you know, all, you know, sufficient information and input to make the recommendations that you're absolutely right, the group ultimately will have to do.

So Avri, the words that Avri used earlier I think are applicable, you know further study is needed in several areas here and the two we talked about here I think are two very typical candidates of where we need to do more work and get more input.

Jim Galvin: Yes. This is Jim. I think this issue of U.S. ASCII by default and other representations optionally and whether the permutation is you always display

both or you can do either/or I think this is a pretty far-reaching principle that applies in multiple places.

So I think that for now pulling it out is an observation in the specific areas where it matters is very helpful and at some point we're going to have to look at all of those circumstances, to all of those situations and see if it's possible to come to a consensus view on what's the right thing to do and it may very well be that we need more input, this group of people is you know, insufficient to have a complete discussion on the issue.

Julie Hedlund: Further comments on that particular item or this issue in general?

Okay. Thank you.

Bob Hutchinson: So for Cartagena what is this, is there any consensus in this group as to what we're going to say about what Jim just stated for Cartagena? Is it that we will outline some of the thinking around localization of string names, enemy names and basically say, we conclude that more work needs to be done here or will we go further than that?

Jim Galvin: I think as you said we'll state that these are the points of discussion at the moment and I don't think that we as a working group have come to a conclusion for recommendation where, so it's still under discussion in the group, so more work needs to be done inside the group but we're not recommending more work outside the group yet, I mean this is still just an interim report.

Bob Hutchinson: I'm happy with that.

Julie Hedlund: Oh go ahead. Was that Bob? I'm sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt.

Bob Hutchinson: Yes that was Bob. Sorry.

Julie Hedlund: Oh please go ahead, I didn't mean to interrupt you. Were you going to respond to what Jim said?

Bob Hutchinson: I said I was happy with, you know, with that as Cartagena, you know it, to be in the report there's essentially an outline of the problem and the observation that the group will eventually put forth recommendations but it's not at this point not feasible for us to do that.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. Dave, any thoughts on that? I know that we've been trying to see if we can move this group to consensus on recommendations. I think we do have consensus on perhaps some of the issues we've been discussing and that's what we'll be trying to capture in a draft report that we're, staff is currently working on and that these discussions are being, you know, folded into.

                  But I guess my question is for everyone is what I'm hearing is that you know, there may be some things that we might be able to make recommendations on in this preliminary report but some of these issues for instance relating to entity names and the issue of whether an ASCII or options for a localization are issues that are fairly broad and will require more in depth discussion.

                  And perhaps a call in the preliminary report for prior comments and discussion perhaps with outside parties to sort of allow this group to gain some additional insight.

                  Any thoughts? I'm just trying to see if I can, you know, distill what you're saying and keeping in mind that we did product sort of our, a set of you know, issues for, we were preliminarily discussing that we presented in Brussels but you know, perhaps with the report we can take some of the issues a little bit further while realizing that some of these broader issues bear further discussion and perhaps research within this group.

Dave Piscitello: I'm not sure what you're asking me. I think that what we have at the moment is an answer to the staff observation number one that says we don't have a recommendation at this point.

And I have some notes about what we would put in you know as a discussion for the issue of internationalizing labels.

I also have a note about the issue of localization which is broader than the label but is relevant to the label because it's like international domain names where you have com at the end of an Arabic string.

So I think I have enough for Steve and I to actually write something that you know satisfies both Avri, Jim and Bob issues here.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks Dave and I apologize I didn't mean to necessarily direct it - just the question to fit you but I was trying to paraphrase what I heard here and I'm glad that you have captured it as well.

I just wanted to confirm what I heard which is that you may have some areas in which we will not be prepared to make recommendations in this preliminary report that we'll release for Cartagena.

So I guess I'd like to move a little bit further ahead on the last several calls some of the issues we discussed included how to address name server names and email address and then as I said registration status.

And so moving ahead with the staff document I think to page 7 I'm just trying to see if I can follow this. One of the items that I think we haven't addressed, yet again we talked about it some time previously was that some of these preliminary recommendations or some of these issues raise backward compatibility issues that issued previous non-IDN registration records also conform to the new requirements.

Any thoughts on that particular issue here?

Bob Hutchinson: I guess my take on that would be that if we go forward with Port 43 and UTF8 response at least, when I'm talking about the response part of the Whois, the - we should propose some sort of a header comeback that identifies internationalized Whois responses.

And - or of this level, essentially a versioning so that automated tools will know or have a way of keying their partners to the kind of response that they're getting as a way of dealing with compatibility.

Dave Piscitello: So this is Dave, Bob I think that you're spot on with at least the sort of the first formal message exchange that would have to actually be incorporated into (sessor) to the Whois protocol as it's written today.

So you know we're at a point where instead of just having messages where it's the only obligation determine with the (unintelligible) county line fee and the world is a happy place to saying that was the old version, the new version that we're going to use is something that has very different characteristics and at least signal that we switched to that.

So the client can say I can't support it. It's a broader issue than just initial registration data. So I guess the one question I would have is how - should we make the observation that if we wanted to stay with 43 that some convention for illustrating or distinguishing between versions is necessary?

Or did you want to go further?

Bob Hutchinson: I'm just saying I think that that's a general direction that we as a computer person I would basically think that's a proven approach. I think that I don't - we never discussed this I don't believe in this group so if people have a strong feeling against going that direction or you know I guess we should probably hear that.

Jim Galvin: Is it - I mean it just strikes me that being - this is Jim Galvin, that being a significant technical issue that it might be more appropriate for discussion in a broader technical community than sort of the broad general community that we have in this working group.

That's a question, what do folks think about that? I guess implicit in that is that this is an issue where we would recommend that further study be considered.

Bob Hutchinson: See I guess philosophically I'm wondering where the dividing lines draw in the technical community.

When I looked at the RFC that somebody pointed out last time that's the current working RFC for Whois it essentially says you know it's a port 43, there's no constraint on what's coming back other than it has to be carriage return line feed delimited.

And when the server at Port 43 terminates the connection it closes the socket connection. I mean that's the extent of the IETF guidelines for Whois and the question is, is everything else besides the technical transport description for Whois which is that RFC, is everything else of Whois under the aegis of ICANN.

And I guess my take would be yes that ICANN essentially IETF is looking at Whois and I think they made the right decision which is we don't really care about this, it's a policy thing about what kind of information you put in Whois.

And we're talking about the philosophy of what is the information that you put in Whois and I believe that ICANN owns that turf and needs to define it soup to nuts.

Jim Galvin: Well I still wonder whether our recommendation here is about things to do to Whois protocol as a policy matter, things to suggest we'll require of people who have Whois servers in the ICANN context versus recommending you know IRIS which in principle solves most of the issues that we're looking at here and considering.

Not all of them of course, but a lot of them.

Dave Piscitello: This is Dave, I think Bob touches on a very interesting point because if you read the RFC this letter of - you know strict letter of the document, he's absolutely right.

However there's this - you get into the situation where as long as what we define in the ICANN world through your policy process is always interpreted as data among the servers that are supporting ICANN you know ICANN policies.

Then we can pretty - I believe it would be appropriate to say that if data is not protocol, if what we wanted to do was to standardize protocol in a manner where the internet registries and ICANN and anyone else who used Whois for any purpose wanted to have versioning then I think it becomes something that would fall under the IETF.

So - well I'm making a very, very sharp distinction between who gets the right to define the data that goes over Port 43 using the protocol that's defined in a particular domain, protocol domain.

So I think Bob's correct from that perspective. Now if we wanted to look at Whois in a broader context than IRT and say by the way as long as we're changing it there's 30 other things we'd like to fix, then you know IRIS comes into play.

And (recful) comes into play and lots of other things probably come into play.

Jim Galvin: So I like this distinction, this is Jim again and let me ask a question, so it sounds like what we're doing here then is we're really talking just about the data and we're talking about the format of the data regardless of how it's returned, although we're thinking of this in the context of Whois.

But we could also include a recommendation at the bottom that doing something other than the Whois protocol is worthy of future and more study and does that also take off the table this issue of versioning and Port 43?

Because we're just going to focus on the data. So I guess that's two questions, but what do people think?

Dave Piscitello: This is Dave, I think in order to be able to positively deploy a new data model you'd have to actually have something in the data model that would allow clients to - and servers to understand that they're no longer just dealing with UTF8, or I'm sorry, ASCI or something other character set.

So I think people are using flags today and so something is being signaled between clients and servers to actually provide the ability to pass back UTF8 in certain implementations.

And we have several choices, we can just let everybody do whatever they want with their clients and their servers which I don't think is a particularly good idea but it's a choice.

Or we could establish some conventions for how to do the signal and claim that that's just part of the sub protocol that we're defining on top of the existing Whois protocol.

Bob Hutchinson: So then I'll come back to the question I asked before, maybe the observation that I made before two comments ago which was is it for us and in this group to speak to that technical issue?

I mean I thought I heard you Dave drawing a very clear line there about protocol versus data. So we might make the observation that the protocol needs a change to accommodate the change in data model that we're going to recommend.

Shouldn't that question be put out there for study by a technical group as opposed to the more generalist group that we have here?

Dave Piscitello: I certainly - I think there are people on this call who have written protocols, but I agree with you that a broader set of people might want to be consulted before we actually stepped up and said here's what we suggest and by the way here's this full fledged protocol that we think we should be implementing.

Avri Doria: This is Avri, I'd like to add that - I mean I tend to agree, it needs to go to the group and it's not that there aren't people here who have written protocols, it's that they're not here to write protocols.

And so that isn't the contribution that would be expected from them in this group whereas it would be expected elsewhere. So I think I'm agreeing with what you're saying, just sort of saying that even if we had a room full of the best protocol writers in the world here, is that not the job that we've taken on in this group.

Dave Piscitello: So it's outside of our remit. This is Dave I said that the development of a protocol is outside this working group's remit?

Avri Doria: Yep. I think so, this is Avri. We're just specifying the data and other, I think it's data and meta requirements is something that would be in the remit.

And that's not the technical requirements but certainly the how does it need to be used, what is the kind of data it needs to pass, etcetera that would fall.

Because that is more of a generalist, the fact that the group has people that are pure policy, that - and that are technical policy and that perhaps are predominantly technical helps us get to a reasonable statement of requirements that may be possible, requirements that may be impossible.

Gives us a certain understanding of you know what is feasible to ask for, what is not feasible to ask for but we certainly shouldn't be attempting to you know define a protocol.

Bob Hutchinson: Let me make sure I understand what you're saying Avri. Are you saying that anything that would require a modification to the IETF RFC is protocol or are you saying that - see there's a gray area between data recommendations of the general form of label and field content versus overall form of data coming from Port 43.

Are you saying that anything having to do with the overall form of the data coming from Port 43 or the request record going to Port 43, that is protocol work?

Or are you saying that that's within our aegis to do in this group?

Avri Doria: Okay, this is Avri again. I'm not sure that I would say that anything in an RFC is protocol because we're constantly mixing in policy with protocol and RFPs.

So I would never go that far, but I think anything that requires a change in how the protocol is used by clients and servers, anything that changes you know the bids going over the wire other than content.

So in some protocols you know I had to refer to as carrier protocols that sort of say and here be an XML block then obliviously what's inside that XML block gets defined elsewhere, may or may not be blessed by the IETF and isn't.

In its older protocol where there's a very tight linkage between the protocol elements and the syntax of the protocol elements and the semantics and the expectations of those semantics I believe we have a closer need to basically have you know IETF ownership on the links between syntax and semantics.

So I know I'm being a little wishy-washy about it but I'm trying to sort of find a fine point that if it changes the client and server's expectations of what they do with a specific packet when it's received then yes, I think that does need to be reviewed within an IETF context whether it's deserving of a whole RFC update or not that's a different question.

And it really depends on scope. It may just be an informative thing that goes through you know the IETF churn that sort of says listen, you know it's not really changing the operation of the instantiation of the protocol.

It's just you know something else but here's what explains it might be enough. But there is an IETF ownership in terms of making sure that things still work over Port 43 with the Whois protocol, that we do need to deal with.

Did that make sense? I hope I did.

Bob Hutchinson: Yeah, I guess again I think that the distinction you're making, I guess I'm not understanding what your point is relative to the discussion that we've had. My take on it is that nothing that we're proposing here in terms of data formatting would require any modification or reconsideration of the current specification for Whois Port 43. I forget the RFC number that we looked at last time.

So there is - I mean I think the IETF when they wrote the Whois RFC made a correct decision and basically said this is Port 43, this is how you request from it and you respond to it from our standpoint at the IETF.

Anything that's in there is somebody else's responsibility, in this case it's ICANN's responsibility. Therefore I think that everything within the data

formatting of request response of Port 43 is 100% within the purview of ICANN.

Avri Doria: This is Avri again, is it going to change the behavior of clients and servers?

Bob Hutchinson: Well it will - I mean if ICANN says that it has to be a particular way it will definitely change the behavior of servers in order for them to comply with whatever the new data formatting of Whois Port 43 responses are and requests are.

But I don't think that that's - I mean if we're talking about a world where what we're going to do does not ever - that it does not result in any changes to clients and servers then I guess I'm done with this conversation.

I don't need to be here if it doesn't ever change any client or server.

Avri Doria: No, I'm not saying that we shouldn't but I'm saying is that at that point I think we're in a gray area where at least some notion of joint responsibilities and you know perhaps it's only Saturday checking.

Perhaps it's just you know defining a type of record and at the moment I'm not going deep enough and I'll have to. But I definitely believe that it's in ICANN's responsibility to do the defining but it might also be in the IETF's responsibility to cooperate and confirm the - what it's done.

And I'm not sure about that, but I'm pointing to a possible gray area. I'm certainly not saying in ICANN we have nothing to say about it.

Dave Piscitello: This is Dave, can I make an observation? We've actually covered I think three topics and maybe since we're getting close to the top of the hour and I know Julie and I have to get off for another call, I'm sure others have other business too.

We've said first that some changes will be needed, whether they're data or protocol. We've also said that this working group you know is not tasked to actually look at the protocol but the data.

So some other working group within the ICANN community and possibly complemented by IETF you know people who also participate in the IETF are going to look over the data model and look over the needs for signaling and for versioning and whatever other requirements there might be for Whois protocol.

And come up with a recommendation for the ICANN community. At that point that working group probably has to decide how they want to advance the so called standard that they're going to create, whether it's going to be written into a RAA or whether it's going to be written as a self standing document that ICANN publishes.

Or whether it's going to seek IETF standards track or informational track processing. So I think that there's actually a chronology of events that falls naturally from the first several observations we make.

Jim Galvin: Works for me, this is Jim.

Dave Piscitello: Bob are you comfortable with that?

Bob Hutchinson: So let me try to rephrase or spit back what I think I heard which is do it in the order of figuring out what the data needs to be and then deal with the protocol if and when we need to in terms of the other organizations, is that right?

Dave Piscitello: Well three steps, one is this working party figures out what the data are that we need to have for international registration data and what the recommendations are for them.

Another working group - and part of our report would be it's not - the current Whois protocol can't signal this. So somebody else has to decide how we're going to actually signal this so the clients and servers know what they're doing.

ICANN has to then form a working group that actually answers that question. As part of the process of answering that question, that working group also has to decide who's going to publish this standard and whether it's ICANN or whether it's IETF is not up to us.

And it would be a recommendation out of that other working part.

Julie Hedlund: So thanks Dave for summarizing that, this is Julie. Any questions, further questions for Dave concerning the sort of chronology of the steps that he's described?

Okay, and I also just want to let everyone know that Edmon Chung was able to join the call, welcome Edmon, I'm not sure when you joined but we'll - Dave and I will put together some notes based on the discussion on this call.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Julie, I joined about half way, I was trying to catch up with the discussion.

Julie Hedlund: Great, thank you very much. I think this might be a good place to stop in looking at the staff discussion document the next section has to do with the various models for internationalizing registration data for contact information, registrant name, administrative contact, etcetera.

I think that could be a fairly lengthy discussion and perhaps we can go ahead and use that as a point of - to start the discussion on the next call.

In the meantime we'll send around some notes and encourage discussion on the list on the issues we've been talking about today for those who were unable to join the call today.

Does that sounds like a good way to proceed Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Sounds good.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Okay then, we'll go ahead and do that, is there anything else anyone would like to mention? We can go ahead and perhaps if not adjourn this call a little bit early so we can all move on to our next calls or other work.

Man: No, thank you, that was good.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you everyone, we - there will be next week a policy staff. Staff will be meeting - in meetings that week so we'll go ahead and schedule a call for two weeks from today and we'll send that information out to all of you and get the notes out as I said and of course encourage discussion on the list.

Man: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you everyone for joining.

Man: Thank you Dave, thank you Julie.

Julie Hedlund: And we'll look forward to talking to you in two weeks.

Dave Piscitello: Thank you all.

Man: Bye.

Man: Bye.

Woman: Thank you (Sam).

END