

**GNSO/SSAC
International Registration Data Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 28 November at 16:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO/SSAC International Registration Data Working Group on 28 November 2011 at 16:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ird-20111128-en.mp3>

On page:<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#nov>

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

Present for the teleconference:

Avri Doria – NCSG

Sarmad Hussain - CLE-KICS, UET

Jim Galvin – SSAC -Afiliis

Bob Hutchinson -- GNSO Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG)

Steven Metalitz -- GNSO Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial

ICANN Staff

Steve Sheng

Dave Piscitello

Nathalie Peregrine

Absent apologies:

Rafik Dammak -- GNSO Non-Commercial Users Stakeholder Group

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

Yao Jiankang, GNSO Registry SG

Edmon Chung - ALAC

Julie Hedlund

Steve Sheng: Okay. We have Sarmad Hussein and we have (Dave) and myself, Steve (unintelligible). (Jim), I'll be - over to you.

(Jim): Okay. Thanks, Steve. So as I understood what you were saying before in being organized - so we've gone through the ALAC comment and we're okay there. The (intecomment) we're going to continue to next week.

We're waiting for more information from Sarmad about script tag versus language tag and we have the question of must be present versus may be present phrase from the (WEIRDS) comment. But we're going to take that comment and address it in the context of going through the MOG comments.

So I believe - so that's our agenda for this morning is to focus on the MOG comments. Anyone want to suggest something different or add anything to the agenda?

Avri Doria: Yeah, just a question, this is Avri. So we're really looking at the subject as presented by MOG and (WEIRDS). Is that what we're doing? This is Avri.

(Jim): Yeah.

Avri Doria: Because it was the topic and they seem to be at first reading opposed so is that - I mean, they seemed to have different notions of what it meant to be must have or what was the reason for - so we're looking for both of those in comparison or is that what we're doing?

(Jim): Let me just say yes. I guess I didn't really think that hard about how to drive this, Avri, so, you know, let me let you drive.

Avri Doria: I didn't want to drive. I was just looking at them and they seemed to disagreeing with each other from my first reading so that's why I was thinking we had to deal with them in comparison.

Steve Sheng: This is Steve. I think that's a good idea. Maybe we can look at the (WEIRDS) comments first about the must be present versus may be present and look at the specific section from the MOG comment about the must be present.

(Jim): Yeah, I guess - so, you're right, Avri. Let me propose what I think is a summary of what each is doing and just make sure that we're all on the same page here. So if I get this wrong just let me know.

But you're right, I think (WEIRDS) is saying that they want to soften the requirement for a required single language and MOG seems to actually be pushing for a single choice for a language to be present. Would you say that's true, Avri?

Avri Doria: That's the beginning of it. I think there's another aspect in the (WEIRDS). I think that they're saying - and if there is a must be present that that must be present is governed by local law and would be the local whereas the MOG is saying and of course the must be present is asking. At least that's another new issue that I seem to be correcting from both. Am I correct? Is that how others read it?

(Dave): So, this is (Dave). One of the things that I'm trying to understand with the MOG comment is what the purpose is in (unintelligible) English. So trying to extrapolate and trying to imagine being back in a MOG meeting, you know, the first reaction that I imagine I would hear is well, everybody knows English, you know? Or most of the people who chase after spam know English.

And that's the reason that's not as legitimately articulated a reason as the one that came from - that came and talked about requiring or making certain that what you have is the information in the way that it can be used in legal representation which means I can go to a local jurisdiction and say these are bad actors, I need to take action against them.

I actually am more sympathetic to the way that (WEIRDS) has approached this and the way that - there is one individual, (Andrew) or somebody, who mentioned new representation and I perceived that that was a couple of other people offline and they said, yeah, what we need this to be able to take

something and present it, you know, present it in a manner where there's a legal representation. It's not a John Doe, it's not scribble, you know, it's, you know, it's something I can go and say this is the party that I need to be able to actually take action against.

(Jim): So I agree with you, (Dave). I think that MOG as I look at their, when their evaluation, their response and discussion when finding four dot four they use a phrase that says the primary concern is maintaining the global usability of domain name registration data and then in the discussion they actually boldface the word must and in the following phrase which is the existing operational usability of domain name registration data for broad global audiences must be retained.

So what I interpret MOG to be after here is they in fact like that the who is the current existing who is protocol and the current existing registration data as normally presented, the fact that it's in U.S. ASCII exactly the feature that they like and they insist that be carried forward, that that legacy feature needs to be continued to be supported.

That's my interpretation of why they're asking for what they want based on those phrases that they put there right there at the bottom of page two and into the top page three.

(Dave): Well, I like (unintelligible) addresses. I mean, so - I mean, I hate to be flippant about it but I don't see that we even have to continue the already working group if the goal is to keep, you know, to keep things in ASCII.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. We're not continuing the IRD working group. Aren't we trying to wrap up here and integrate the comments on the final report and then put our recommendations forward?

(Dave): I'm sorry. Then I'll rephrase and say I don't see any purpose in continuing work on internationalized registration data if the only goal, you know, is to keep it in U.S. ASCII.

Avri Doria: This is Avri.

(Dave): I don't think that's true. I think one of the options is that was presented is that a lot of the options talk about translation and transliteration into a must be present script. If that's U.S. ASCII then the question is who's responsible for - if there is going to be a must be present script who's responsible for making sure that that happens.

So that's what we've been spending a lot of time over the last two years talking about and it's what we've suggested that the two bodies in ICANN have a commission and issues report about. Isn't it?

Avri Doria: Yeah. Can I comment?

(Jim): Yes, Avri. Please, go ahead.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. In a sense we're recapitulating the discussions we already had. I think - and remember, we're sending this out and, you know, looking for an issues report to explore things further.

And so I don't think we need to decide between one or the other. I think one of the things that we may need to capture - and also there's a point is if a must have is ASCII it may also be that there is other stuff that can be there that should be there that is not ASCII. So of course there's still a reason to do the internationalization work even if we're saying both have to be there.

But one of the things that we need to capture and I think Steve brought up some of this in his email is that there's sort of the extra considerations that came up and the comment probably should be fed into the issues report.

The considerations that both of them gave, one of them for the legal purposes versus the purposes of the sort of universality of understanding and making sure that, you know, ASCII being the probably world's second script is explained and is there in the issues report request. But more than that I don't know what it is we can do with those comments other than make sure that the issues report request is as complete as possible. Thanks.

(Dave): So this is (Dave). I think one of the things that I'm struggling with here, Steve - and I have a great deal of sympathy about being able to display things in a language that makes legal representation, makes business usability of WHOIS. I have a harder time understanding how that translates into storage.

So must be present to me means it must be present in the data base whereas transliteration and translation are actions on given data. And so that's the part that I find sort of frustrating because I suspect that the people think that the world is going to be much easier is there is an ASCII database of everything plus some numbers of permutations of translations and transliterations.

So maybe - I hope that's a little more articulate than I was earlier because I've only had one cup of coffee today.

Sarmad Hussein: This is Sarmad to comment.

(Jim): So, yes, Sarmad, go ahead. I was waiting to see if Steve wanted to have a follow-up comment. Please, go ahead, Sarmad.

Sarmad Hussein: I'm okay if Steve wants to go.

Steve Metalitz: Sarmad, go ahead and I'll come in after you.

Sarmad Hussein: Okay. So there was something I was raising on the last call I think a couple of issues for must be present script. First of all - and this is something which we've probably not been discussed before- if we require a must be present script by a registrar who's registering the names in a different language, we are in essence requiring that registrar to maintain double the amount of data at least double amount data than other registrars who are just dealing in ASCII-base domain names.

And that in a way causes some imbalance in this competitiveness between the two registrars because they do not just have to maintain the double amount of data, they also have the double amount of data and they also have to check the accuracy of double amount of data as for the (RAA). So I'm not sure whether that's fair.

The second issue is that suppose this registrar is located in a country which has official language - in only a single official language in some other script and that's a very likely scenario. Then what legal basis does the registrar have in that country to require data from registrars in ASCII script?

Actually the registrar doesn't have any legal (unintelligible) on a registrant and if the registrant does not give English or ASCII data that sort of puts the registrar in the situation where the registrar's accreditation with ICANN becomes jeopardized.

And so because of anything that the registrar is doing could because of the district (unintelligible), of local law, and the space in which the registrar is working. So I'm not really sure how the must be present script can be enforced globally through a registrar agreement.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. Can I get in the queue now?

(Jim): Yes, please, Steve, go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, I mean, I think Sarmad just said is arguments against some of the models that we've talked about and particularly the one that requires the registrant to submit the data in a must be present script.

And I think (Dave)'s point is valid as far as - or Sarmad's other point is valid as far as the possibility that if there's a must be present script then some registrars will have to store more data than other which is true anyway depending how may registrants the registrar has.

But I think - I tend to agree with Avri, I don't think it's our job to try to - we're already shown we can't reach a consensus on which model should be used whether it should be a must be present script or whether there shouldn't be and if there should be who's responsible for providing it.

So I think that I would agree with Avri that our job now is to make sure all these viewpoints are reflected in what we send forward and let's send it forward.

(Dave): This is (Dave), can I get in the queue.

(Jim): So, go ahead, (Dave), one last comment and I want to see if I can close up this discussion but go ahead.

(Dave): I'm fine with making the comments but I think that staff is tasked with writing issues report. I think one of the issues that we're dancing around is, you know, what is meant when people say must be present.

From my perspective if a registrar chooses to have multiple data bases to do this that's his prerogative but it seems to me that what people are actually asking for is display part and by display I also mean the delivery of data that can be used in automation. They're not talking about storage.

And I hope that we all agree with that because if we're talking about must be present meaning storage then we're talking about an implementation detail that registrars ought to be able to, you know, ought to be able to decide for themselves.

(Jim): Okay, so this is (Jim) and I guess I want to try to speak as chair here. I want to go back to what Avri said. I think part of what we're doing here is rehashing comments and discussion that we've already had.

We've had quite a lot of discussion over a couple of years here about translation, transliteration, must be present, you know, may be present, single choice of language and I believe that the culmination of that has been our specific recommendation to ask for an issues report examining specifically the issue of translation and transliteration and where that should appear and, you know, when it might or might not be required.

I believe our document is intended to reflect that registrants should be able to use their local language and/or script that should be the minimum requirement that should be supported and anything past that we're leaving for further study.

And I see again speaking as chair what I see from the MOG requirement is they're expressing an opinion in favor of a must be present but that's an issue of what we've already discussed and we've already come to a certain conclusion.

So I think our only possible reaction to the MOG comment is, you know, thank you for submitting your comment, you know, we've already had that discussion and this is the conclusion we've come to so we're not going to change our conclusion but, you know, we'll make sure that your particular comments get fed into the future discussion of translation and transliteration.

So that's what I think about where we are. Anyone want to disagree or shape that a little differently?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can I comment?

(Jim): Anyone else want to comment or...

Avri Doria: This is Avri.

Steve Metalitz: And Steve.

(Jim): And Steve. Okay. So, Avri, please go ahead. Avri?

Avri Doria: Oh, yeah. Okay. Sorry, I was muting and de-muting. I think I totally agree. I think what Steve is saying is something that perhaps should come out in this issues report.

I think he's right I don't think we're prejudicing the issue of how this is solved, whether it's solved in display or in storage although I think at a certain (part) to be able to display will have storage implications. But that's a technical issue.

So I think that's something that can be explored in the issues report and perhaps the issues report can take an initial stab at where the technical policy divide line is and what some of the technical impingements on policy - and technical is sort of gives you the first approximation of what's possible. Then policy asks for more and technology comes up with it.

But by and large, technology gives you the first approximation of what's possible. So for the issues report to try and constrain the issue in the terms that (Dave)'s talking about makes incredible sense.

I don't see that that's an issue that we need to put into the issues report unless we do want to put something inviting staff to explore this particular issue as part of the issues report. Thanks.

(Jim): So, Avri, just as a point of clarification, every time that you said issues report, you're talking about this future issues report that we're asking for in our recommendation. Correct?

Avri Doria: Yeah, yeah.

(Jim): Okay. I need to ask a procedural question here of just of Steve and I guess, you know, Avri, you may have more experience than I do so if you have something to say there too.

We're talking about trying to say there's needs to be certain input to this issues report. How exactly do we deal with our comments here? I mean, we're supposed to produce something which says, you know, a response to each of the comments that needs to have a working group consensus associated with it.

And, you know, if we put in there a comment that says we want to hand off this comment to the, you know, whatever the issues report staff becomes, I mean, is that the right thing? Is there more procedure associated with this than that?

Avri Doria: Can I answer from my perspective?

(Jim): Yes, please.

Avri Doria: We are giving this back to our two chartering organizations as here's the final thing, we've reviewed the comments. Whether we have an appendix or a separate document that says for each of the comments has how it was

answered, you know, we make edits to our final report based on the comment.

That is delivered to our true chartering organizations and it contains the recommendation that they do further work. And I think it makes sense that, you know, if it needs a line in there because it's not obvious, you know, and we ask in this issues report that these discussions be taken into account.

But basically we as a group give it to and then (SLAC) can decide to request an issues report of the GNSO or the GNSO can decide - I mean to go through the issues report process or the GNSO can decide to do it on its own or they both can do it together or, you know, whatever, you know, works.

Then there's a vote and then they use this document as an initiation I would think into writing the issues report. That would be an expectation in our recommendation. So that's how I would think the process would work and historically and it matches the both the old and the new policy development processes if we're having the GNSO ask for it.

If (SLAC) had a different way of getting an issues report perhaps it follows that process. But we're making recommendations to our chartering organization.

(Jim): Okay. Thank you, Avri. Anyone want to add or clarify that?

Steve Sheng: This is Steve. I'd like to raise a question.

(Jim): Yes, please, go ahead. And Steve Metalitz, I haven't forgotten your comment. But Steve Sheng, please go ahead.

Steve Sheng: So my comment is, okay, the staff will be tasked to write an issues report. On the issue that the community have no consensus on - I guess if the working

group could provide more guidance instead of - other than setting the staff up for failure is substantive.

(Jim): Okay. That's a fair request. Let me set that aside though so we can stay on topic here for the moment. You know, I asked a procedural question and I apologize for that little tangent and, Steve, you're taking it to the next step there following up on the particular request of the staff.

But let's hold that for the moment and continue with the other discussion. So Steve Metalitz, you had something you wanted to add to my attempt to summarize this particular issue?

Steve Metalitz: My only concern about your summary was you said we've reached a we would say thank you for your comment, we've already reached a conclusion on this subject.

What is - the conclusion we reached is we couldn't reach a consensus, we didn't see a consensus on whether there should be a must be present script and, if so, how, who would be responsible for providing it.

I think that what the MOG comment weighs in on that issue and it takes a position on that issue, it's not that different from one of the models that we talked about.

But, you know, I think it articulates, you know, very well what the support for that model but I think at this point we can just say that that should be, you know, considered as the issues report is developed.

Obviously MOG would be one of the sources that the staff might turn to in developing the issues report. But since we - my only concern is when you said we've reached a conclusion. I thought our conclusion had been we hadn't found a consensus.

(Jim): Right. And I apologize if I, you know, biased or overspun my comments about a conclusion. Just to make sure I clarify one thing here - so, Steve, you're going to be writing this, you know, summary of these comments and so we'll all get a chance to review the actual words that are used to describe what I attempted to say here and, you know, didn't get - didn't articulate in a way that completely matched what folks are thinking.

I mean, I want to say that we're all in agreement and it remains to be seen the actual words that are used but we'll all get to see those, right, Steve Sheng?

Steve Sheng: Yes, of course.

(Jim): All right. So let me say thank you for that clarification, Steve Metalitz, and does that answer your comment?

(Dave): Yes, that's fine.

(Jim): All right. So I think that deals with the (WEIRDS) comment and also the particular comment that came out of the MOG comments. So and I think that now I'm a little out of context here - I apologize. Was there anything else in the MOG stuff that we have to address?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I think there are two other things there that I just wanted to mention. One is they talk about a solution that's been implemented by some of the ccTLDs, specifically (JP NIC), and I don't remember that we actually talked about that. Maybe I just failed to recall this but it just seems as though there's, you know, there may be something there that we should've been aware of and we weren't.

So again, I think this would just be an indicator to the staff that this might be one place to turn for...

(Dave): This is (Dave). I wasn't certain whether they were referring to the use of a, you know, of a (flag) to indicate that they were going to be returning non-ask key characters. I mean, we have talked about that solution and I don't know anything else that (JP NIC) is doing at the moment.

Woman: (This is)...

Man: Let me add - go ahead.

Woman: I'll back off. You started.

Man: So the - I think what we did - as you mentioned, we did talk about the singling, that (JP NIC) uses. I did the - I did some queries myself and what (JP NIC) does, if you query with a flag, with IDM flag, it will display the information in Japanese, so for example, in you know, (here again or Cartagena).

But if you query without the flag, it will display the same information but in English. So that means for their name and address, they have both in the local script as well as in English and depending on the query, a user is submitting that they displayed different results. So that's what my understanding is. Thanks.

Man: And that's the issue that (Jay Daley) and I had debated a year ago about the scalability of every provider choosing a different flag, you know, and trying to use that sort of uncontrolled, you know, non-uniqueness property on a global, you know, global use scalable way.

I mean, that's one of the reasons why we've been looking at structured tag data.

(Jim): Yes, that's certainly valid. Yes.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, this is Steve Metalitz. Then I simply just failed to recall that discussion. So that was - I'll just withdraw what I said about that.

(Jim): The article that we (both for use nicks) covered that Steve if you want to go back and just take a look at the one, you know, one section of the article. It's only about a couple hundred words.

Steve Metalitz: Okay thanks.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can I comment on this a little?

(Jim): Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: I think part of what (this is in though) is - I mean, the issues report that we're asking for is essentially - we're asking for more depth than fact. We're asking for more of the considerations that one will have to look at in terms of making decisions that we haven't been able to make.

So I think that a little bit of research - it sounds like actually that's it's a lot of research, has been done on what one of the cc's do. I think having an intention in there that's carried over from the (mall work) with this, and see what are the solutions (that) have already been applied and (just what's) agreed they've been successful.

And some of them (did) the earlier work so it just gets carried forward but there may be more to look at. I don't know, but I think that's one way to sort of handle this, is to say, "Thanks," and to say a certain amount of research was done but certainly in the past have had an issues report. If there are other available solutions, yes, they should be summarized as well to see whether there's some nugget of gold and solution space there that, you know, is worth generalizing. Thanks.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. The last point that I was struck by in the (mod) comments was the issue of whether there's a - the potential for abuse if there's not a (must-be) present script.

And I think they discussed that again. I don't think we're going to reach a conclusion on this but I thought that point was worth noting. We did talk about that at one point I think in this group but I just thought they presented that. It's worth noting.

(Jim): Okay so - this is (Jim) - and speaking as chair, I think that we have this issue of a must-be present language and we have at least a principle for a way to respond to those things then we'll look for Steve to, you know, draft some words for us to consider.

But I don't think there's anything else then of significance that we need to respond to in the (mod) comments. I think that we thank them for their comments and everything else is covered by the first item here about the issue of must-be present versus not.

They make some good points and we'll certainly make sure that those are carried forward for future consideration but there's nothing that we're going to do in response to those comments other than carry them forward.

Anyone want to disagree with that or shape it in any other way? Okay, and I think that also speaks to the (WEIRDS) comment because we have a - now a principle for how to respond to those things and we'll look for Steve Sheng to develop the specifics of that response for us.

And I believe then that the only open issue for us is the (into) comment and we need to wait for some additional comments and input from Sarmad for that. Have I missed anything?

Bob Hutchison: This is Bob Hutchison. I think on the (WEIRDS) comment, I don't know that we should respond to the generic question of what is a must-be present language or what is - what does must be present mean?

I think we all meant generically that must be present means that's the language that the registrant data must be represented in. And here he uses must be present to mean must be present in the generic language of the registrant.

And I don't know that that's a correct interpretation of the work that we've done or the way we've used must be present. And I don't know whether it's worth trying to point that out to avoid future co- we know - see what he's doing is he's basically redefining the terms that we've been using.

(Jim): So if I understand the suggestion that you're making here, you're suggesting that we should somehow somewhere be more clear about what must be present means, because I think I would personally speak- personally phrase it a little bit differently than you just did, Bob, which is to say when we talk about must be present or must not be present, we're really talking about what's visible to the user of the registration data, because I think the point that (Dave) was making earlier is we should not be speaking to the implementation choice on the part of who's providing access to the data because they might, you know, be translating or transliterating on the fly.

They might store it in multiple ways. That's not something that we should be speaking to. We need to be speaking functionally to the requirement. So going back up to the top, I think what I hear you suggesting, Bob, is that we should be - we should define somewhere along the way here what we mean by must be present just for sake of clarity. Is that correct?

Bob Hutchison: Yes, I mean, to me it has to be - I mean, it has to indicate one way or the other. The interpretation that (WEIRDS) wants to put on what must be

present is a tautology. It's like saying, okay well, let's be present is whatever the person registers the name decides it must be.

(Jim): So let me propose an action to Steve Sheng and then see if anyone wants to object or shape it differently. Let's take as an action, Steve, to consider where we might put in a, quote definition, unquote, of what must be present really means.

And then as a follow on to that, we now have a specific way to phrase our response to the (WEIRDS) comment to say that, you know, that's - they're suggesting the use of must be present in a way that's different than what we intended and we've now clarified what we intended.

Man: Okay.

(Jim): Does anyone object to that or want to shape that differently? Okay, so back up to the top again here, any other - anything else that we may have overlooked here or are we down to just one item that we need to wait for some input from Sarmad about?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I wanted to ask - I know you were finishing up that other one while I was unmuting. But I wanted to ask a question. If they've got a different interpretation, do we respond to their comment simply by saying, "Nope. We meant it differently." Or do we need more constructive response that basically discusses the issue that they've brought up and have that issue carried over?

I guess I didn't see this thing as a tautology and I saw it as a different perspective that, you know - and I think again it's a perspective we don't have an agreement on, on which perspective one should take.

So I'm not sure that we answered their question just by saying, "You misunderstood us. We mean this." We may have to go a little further on exploring what, you know, the sides of the issue are there.

(Jim): Right, so I agree Avri. I didn't mean to suggest that adding a statement about we clarified our - what we mean by must be present to replace what I had said before.

Avri Doria: Oh okay. Sorry.

(Jim): Yes, so we should add that as a comment to also speaking to this issue of, you know, must be present script the same way that we're going to respond to the (mod) comment.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. (Okay).

(Jim): Okay, anything else that anyone wants to bring up?

Steve: So this is Steve - so what I'm hearing is through these comments there'll be no change in the report, right? Only just a summary and analysis and that's it?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. That's not what I understood.

Steve: Okay sorry.

Man: Yes, the one change that I heard about the report was speaking to defining, you know, what must be present is.

Steve: Right, right. Sorry - other than that.

(Jim): But other than that, I don't think there was any change to the document Avri or did you have something else in mind?

Avri Doria: Well, I thought in a couple places that some of the discussions in terms of the questions were being amplified bringing out the various sides that had been

seen between them and the two levels of what must be present that we've discussed, you know, were going to be conveyed in the report.

So I didn't think there was any, you know, major change or, you know, structural change to it. But I did think that there were a bunch of amplifications going on, you know, so...

Man: Okay.

(Jim): Okay, well I mean, obviously we do have an opportunity. I mean, Avri, if there are some things that you want to make sure are covered, we'll certainly - we'll have an opportunity for, you know, some additional editorial proposals for the document.

So Steve will do the one change that we are going to make here and then, you know, we'll have a review cycle inside the working group before we declare done this and distribute to our respective chartering bodies.

I think that that brings us to closure for this particular meeting. We have one last issue to discuss and we should try to - I think we should plan a meeting for next Monday at the same time here and look to Sarmad to provide us the input that we need so that we can close on that one remaining issue.

And then - so anyone object to that? I was going to then get into a discussion, a little bit of coloring- a calendar discussion here about remaining work but let me just make sure that everyone agrees that that's the end of our work.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. Could you remind us what's the remaining issue, what's the outstanding issue?

(Jim): The (into) comment about script versus language tag. I actually was not on the call last week so I'm going based on the notes that (Julie) had distributed that we needed to have some continuing discussion about script tag versus

language tag and Sarmad was going to provide some input to that discussion so that we could continue it. I need to look to someone else to say more if you wanted more Steve.

Steve Metalitz: No that - I do recall that so that's fine. Thank you.

(Jim): Okay thanks.

Steve Metalitz: Oh...

(Jim): Okay, so looking at timeframes, we're talking about having a meeting next Monday, December 5th at the same time to close on this one issue. Let me just confirm, Sarmad, that you'll be able to send out your input to us, you know, say by tomorrow or Wednesday at the latest? Sarmad, are you still with us?

Man: (So I'll) convey that to Sarmad. You know maybe...

(Jim): Okay.

Man: Yes. So the action...

(Jim): All right.

Man: ...for Sarmad to provide - to write an email to the working group on the issues of language versus grip tags.

(Jim): And then based on the closure of that discussion, then we'll need a, you know, some period of time for you to produce, you know, the next version of the document, Steve. I'm assuming that that the changes aren't going to be that substantial. Is it fair to say that you might get that done by the end of next week if not sooner?

Steve: That's possible. So we need to produce a summary analysis to be posted to the public comment forum and then add it to the document. So those are the two changes that we need to make.

What I'm hearing is in the main document there needs to be a place that talks about must be present, define that what it - what we really mean that. And also there are some - a few points that Avri mentioned then needs more elaboration.

So on those, if Avri could have some specific text, sections that need to be revised that it could be indicated to me, that will be great.

(Jim): Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes, sure thing.

(Jim): Okay, so I'm still looking, Steve Sheng, for you to say that, you know, a revised document in the summary of...

Avri Doria: Don't make me a dating factor on it. If I don't comment by the time you've made the changes you think to make, I'll comment when you come out with your version. Please don't make me a dating factor.

Man: Okay that's fine.

(Jim): Okay so, Steve Sheng, you have two things to produce - the response to the comments and a revised document and is Friday, December 9th, a good timeframe for you to have those done for review by the working group?

Steve Sheng: Yes, that's possible. Yes, I can do that.

(Jim): And then what I'm thinking is a one week review by the working group, so you know, if we can get that done by the 9th we can put it out on the mailing list

and say the 16th - Friday the 16th as a comments from the working group. And then what I'm thinking is ideally we won't really have any substantive comments so we shouldn't have to meet after that.

We should be able to close on the mailing list and say that we're done. You know, we shouldn't need a call to agree that we're all done unless something substantive comes up, but I'm going to go with the model that we are not going to have anything.

And so that means the week of the 19th, Steve, you can post the summary and during that week we can also do what needs - I assume there's some official process for submitting the final report to our respective chartering bodies.

Man: Yes.

(Jim): And that can happen during the week of the 19th, yes?

Man: Okay. Sure.

(Jim): And then I think that puts us in a pending closed state for this working group. Then we wait for reactions from our respective bodies but I think the intent is that this working group is essentially - is done at that point. We just wait for confirmation from our bodies. Do I have that correct also?

Steve Sheng: I have to check with (Julie) on that but I - that's what my understanding is.

(Jim): Okay yes. I mean, that is actually an interesting question is to what is the formal process that closes us down. So, yes, let's take that as a background action to figure out what's required there if anything.

Steve Sheng: Yes.

(Jim): All right, last call for any other business.

Avri Doria: Can I comment on all the things you just said? I'm sorry.

(Jim): Please. No, no, please do.

Avri Doria: One, I think the plan sounds great but don't be surprised if, you know, you end up calling one more discussion to close quickly any, you know, back and forth back and forth with comments. So I would leave just a provisional motion of one last meeting for comment and text talking as opposed to just writing back and forth.

I'm not as optimistic as you I guess. And second, I think that at least within the GNSO context within the motion that does something with the recommendation that's sent to them, they thank the group, they close the group, they do all that other group. Thanks.

(Jim): Okay good. Thank you. And as far as the provisional meeting is concerned, sure. It wasn't actually my optimism that was trying not to have a meeting. It was my being selfish that was trying not to have it. The logical time to have it, if there was something substantive, would be Monday the 19th of December, and I'm sorry, but I'm planning a vacation day that day.

And so what automatically happens here is the meeting gets pushed out for probably two or three more weeks to get past all the holidays I think, so.

Avri Doria: Why not?

(Jim): Yes, I mean...

Avri Doria: I mean, we could schedule it - you could schedule it then. Leave it optimistic and schedule it then if we haven't closed by the end of the year.

(Jim): So anyway - yes, so fair enough. You know, certainly a provision meeting, if we need one we'll have to do something. It's just that it won't be me on the 19th if we decide to have it then. Or we'll have to decide to push it out after the holidays. But fair enough. We'll come to that conclusion when we need to.

Steve Sheng: Yes, so this is Steve. I have one last point to raise that I raised earlier if possible here. So the point I want to raise is when the staff (in past) was writing the issues report, we're talking about requirements for translation and transliteration.

We have the working group deliberated and could not come to a consensus. So the question for us is what additional information could the staff provide that could help, you know, further con- to reach consensus on this issue? And we need - probably need input from the working group so that's...

Avri Doria: Can I comment? I have...

(Jim): Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, actually - I mean, I think that what the staff has to provide is all the - I mean, part of the issues report is formula and it's - is this thing and scope for the GNSO, et cetera, et cetera, if that's how it's being done.

The other part is doing a factual analysis of the issues or presenting the various arguments. I don't know that it's for you to actually build the consensus. It's for you to describe the issues in the full blooming so that then a policy process or whatever comes out of it, you know, joint working group across all, you know, across the two SOs, plus advisory committee, whatever comes out of this, has all the information it needs to then start talking the policy issues and arriving at consensus. I don't actually think you have to come to consensus...

Man: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...or to bring us there and maybe I'm wrong, but we have to find our way to consensus based upon full information and full understanding of implications and full understanding of the various arguments.

Steve Sheng: That makes me much less nervous. That's good. So what I'm hearing is the issues report needs to lay out the facts.

Avri Doria: (Yes).

Steve Sheng: And then all the various arguments for and against, and then leave that into the PDP to decide.

Avri Doria: And to the factual constraints from technology. So if technology does place - or at least we believe it places constraints on what can and can't be done, that's a good thing to include in there too I think.

Or if, you know, you're going to (wake) people what measure - so I think the facts, yes.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

(Jim): So I'll just agree both personally and as chair. I mean, that's my understanding of the issues report, what Avri just said. So, you know, it - your job is simply to lay it out as much as possible, as completely and as thoroughly as possible. And it becomes input to some other body which has to decide on what to do with it, so the PDP process that Avri was referring to.

Man: Okay.

(Jim): Okay, last call for any other business. All right, then by my clock I'm giving you back three minutes of your day.

Woman: Woo-hoo.

(Jim): And let's hope that we don't actually have to have another meeting.

Man: Okay.

Man: Thank you all.

Avri Doria: Thanks.

(Jim): So thanks everyone. Bye.

Man: Bye-bye.

END