<div align="center">

GNSO/SSAC
International Registration Data Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 29 August at 15:00 UTC

</div>

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO/SSAC International Registration Data Working Group on 29 August 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://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ird-20110829-en.mp3

On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#aug

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
Steven Metalitz -- GNSO Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial
Bob Hutchinson -- GNSO Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG)
Avri Doria – NCSG
Jim Galvin – SSAC -Afilias

ICANN Staff
Julie Hedlund
Steve Sheng
Glen de Saint Géry
Dave Piscitello

Absent apologies:
Edmon Chung - ALAC
Sarmad Hussain - CLE-KICS, UET
Yao Jiankang, GNSO Registry SG
Scott Austin - IPC

Coordinator: Welcome and thank you for standing by. I would like to remind you that the conference call is being recorded. If you have any objections please disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you, (Tanya). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the IRD call on the 29th of August. And on the line we have Rafik Dammak, Jim Galvin, Owen Smigelski, Bob Hutchinson, Avri Doria and Steve Metalitz.

And for staff we have Julie Hedlund, Steve Sheng, Dave Piscitello and myself Glen de Saint Géry. May I ask you all to say your name before speaking for transcription purposes? And thank you and over to you, Jim.

Jim Galvin: Thank you very much. I'm guessing people are here and you've all seen the report as distributed by Steve. Again this is - it really is an extended outline. It's intended to be fairly complete. We may still have some text we want to add or some changes that we want to put there. It's undergone quite a bit of work over the last couple of weeks. And I want to thank Steve for that and putting his time into all of that.

I guess, Steve, you and I didn't actually talk about how we wanted to proceed through this document at this time. Do we just want to focus on the recommendations or did you have a different suggestion on how to proceed? We could also just ask for questions.

Steve Sheng: Sure. There are a few editor notes. I need some guidance. And also I was wondering whether people have read it and if they have any comments that would be helpful. But I think I agree with you; right now the key is recommendations. I put out some, you know, a few ones there but, you know, as we mentioned earlier it was kind of incomplete and maybe we need to refine it and change or add recommendations.

So that would be my recommendation to focus on the recommendations. And if people have comments for specific sections then we can do that.

Jim Galvin: Okay so let me suggest the following. I think that we have three things that we want to make sure that we get done. We'll go through the recommendations. We have the editor's notes where you're expressly asking for additional comment or text or opinions. And then of course we want to make sure that we address any additional questions that people have.

Let's start with the recommendations section and ask for - we'll just sort of step through those one at a time here and get some discussion going on those, see what people want to say about them.

So let me just turn it over to you, Steve, to walk through the recommendations and let's see where that takes us.

Steve Sheng: Sure. The first recommendation is...

Avri Doria: This is Avri, can I ask a quick question as to where exactly I pick up the document that's being talked about? Which specific document - I'm behind on that. So if someone could tell me?

Julie Hedlund: Avri, this is Julie. I'll go ahead and send it to you.

Avri Doria: Oh okay, I can't find it on the wiki. I was on the wiki trying to...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: I'm very sorry; I neglected to put it on the wiki. But let me send it to you right away. Thanks so much.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Avri. So hopefully you'll have the document shortly. There are - currently there are three recommendations. The first recommendation it reads that ICANN staff should develop in consultation with the community a data model for domain registration data.

The data model should specify the elements of the registration data, the data flow and the formal data schema that incorporates the standards that a working group has agreed on for internationalizing various registration data elements. This data model should also include tagging information for language and script.

So the background for this recommendation is the - essentially three. So for the first one is there is no consistent data model used today by the various service providers so there is a need for a data model.

The second one is the IRD group has been discussing, you know, go down the Whois - not the Whois - the registration data various elements and talk about what standards can be applied to internationalize it. And to that extent this recommendation ask that data model to incorporate that.

And the last point is it must also have information - tagging information for language and scripts. So those are the - kind of the three background points that goes into this recommendation.

I would like to open it up for comments, thoughts and rewordings. Thanks.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I have a couple of comments.

Steve Sheng: Go ahead. Steve.

Steve Metalitz: First in terms of specifying the elements of the registration data are you suggesting that that would be different and - we have elements of registration data that are specified now or at least a minimum set in the registrar accreditation agreement.

Obviously a registrar could collect additional information but at least it has to collect the information that's spelled out there. Are you suggesting any change from that or are you saying that we would start with that - developing this model? That's my first question.

And my second question is more procedural which is let's assume this recommendation were adopted and ICANN staff did this what would that model - where would that model go then? Would it - what would be done with that model? Would it go to the IETF? Would it go to some other standard setting body or what would be the next step, you know, once we have this model what would be the next step?

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. I guess I'll respond a little bit to your comment, Steve. With respect to what is the baseline I think you're right that we deliberately in this recommendation are, you know, I guess we are being vague about what the baseline is and what we start from.

I make the observation that the RAAs actually do have some data elements specified. You know, register agreements especially for the gTLDs also have some data elements. I'll simply make the observation there's not 100% agreement between those two things as to what the data elements are.

So - and I think that's important just as - but I mean, I guess I'm trying not to be - in this recommendation I'm trying not to be - I'm suggesting that we shouldn't be overly prescriptive.

If you think that we should say more and be more specific about what's included and what's not and what the baseline should be, you know, then sure if you want to propose something I think that would be - that would be very helpful. But other than that I think it's just a generic suggestion that there should be a uniform and consistent data model.

As far as where it would go next I'll just give you my personal view. I think that ICANN and the community - the ICANN community at large is the right forum for specifying the data model in the way that it's described here.

And then the actual details of how that would be implemented just to cast it in something concrete so you understand what I'm talking about say the, you know, the XML schema for what that data model is. I would think that would in fact go to the IETF to be developed. That's really the technical standards making body on which, you know, ICANN primarily depends for those kinds of issues.

And I'll add as a third comment this thing here says ICANN staff. I would probably prefer that it say the ICANN community and sort of

leave it as broad and general because I really think that this is something that in particular the GNSO and ccNSO at least together should figure out how to develop this data model. Certainly want to include the ccNSO and ccTLDs in any work that's done.

So I'm not even - I would prefer that ICANN staff be changed to say the ICANN community. But I'm open for other comments on that issue. Thanks.

Avri Doria: This is Avri.

Steve Sheng: Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. Yeah, I would certainly second that notion that Jim put forward that it should be community with staff's help developing this. I had another small issue. In the last sentence the data model should include - and I guess information jumped out to me and I think it should probably say, you know, tagging elements.

And I would think that tagging and scripts are one example of tagging things that people might want to add but I don't know that we want to restrict it to saying that so I would leave that more open. That would include, you know, tagging elements. For example language and scripts would work as a change for me if that's acceptable. Thanks.

Steve Sheng: Thank you. Are there any comments on this recommendation?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz.

Steve Sheng: Go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: As far as the - Jim's suggestion and - my concern about saying the
                   ICANN community is that again let's say this recommendation is
                   adopted. Then what happens? I mean, it's not clear who's supposed to
                   take the first step or just what's supposed to be done.

                   So the advantage of saying ICANN staff in consultation with the
                   community is that then ICANN staff gets started and there obviously
                   does need to be some form of consultation with GNSO and I guess
                   with ccNSO as well. But the advantage of the way it's formulated now
                   is it's clear whose job it is to get this started.

                   And I'm not sure if you just say the ICANN community then you have to
                   spend a certain amount of time figuring out who's supposed to do
                   what. That's my only comment - my only response to Jim's suggestion
                   on that.

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. And thank you, Steve. I actually like that formulation. I've
                   been struggling with the right formulation for these kinds of things. And
                   I like that - ICANN staff in consultation with the community.

                   You know, I don't like staff because it just seems to say that no one
                   else is included so you want to say community but you're right, you
                   need to target someone to have responsibility for it. So I like that
                   change; I'm comfortable with it. Thanks.

Owen Smigelski: This is Owen. I was just wondering if perhaps we want to - because I
                   know we talked about, you know, wanting to get the ccTLDs involved.
                   Should we specify a desired parts of the community that we would

absolutely want to have participate so that there's a little more guidance on that or just leave it broad to the community in general?

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. I would prefer at this time to leave it broad and say community general. And I'll tell you why; there are a lot of, you know, interested parties in what's important in a data model and they have different and various needs. And that's one of the things that concerns me.

I mean, this data model for this obviously feeds into, you know, Whois discussions here, right? You have a data model for registration data it's going to feed those discussions too. And I think that part of the problem here is there are many varied interests. And I don't really know what the right way is to organize all of them.

And if we try to pick out two or three we run the risk of leaving someone off. I think it's better to have it as an action for the staff after the fact to figure out who all the right participants should be as part of their consultation. Just my view.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I'd like to add that it needs to be the entire community. I can't say one piece of it that shouldn't be consulted. Thanks.

Owen Smigelski: This is Owen. I...

((Crosstalk))

Owen Smigelski: Oh, sorry I agree. Just hopefully the right groups and parties do participate and get involved and, you know, don't pass on the opportunity. But hopefully that won't be the case.

Steve Sheng: Thank you. Jim, I have a question for you on this recommendation. You mentioned earlier about ICANN and IETF so I want to be clear what's within ICANN's purview and what's within IETF's purview?

So you are saying the ICANN communities should - that the data model should describe what data to include and specify at a high level how should that be internationalized. Is that what you're intending the ICANN community to do?

Jim Galvin: So, Steve, I guess that would be what I would expect to happen. But...

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Jim Galvin: ...you know, Steven Metalitz asked the question and I responded with my, you know, just my opinion and view. But I didn't take Steve Metalitz's question as a request to change anything in the recommendation. So maybe we should go back to him and ask if he wants to change something.

You know, I mean, I'm find with just the couple of changes we talked about here, the last sentence and the first phrase. So we should be asking Steve Metalitz I think if he wants to change something based on that comment.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, this is Steve Metalitz. No I was really just asking so that I, you know, to understand what the impact of this recommendation would be. And going back to the first point I raised on the elements of registration data I agree that it's not uniform now but I guess my - I'm trying to understand whether we think this - we're expecting the staff to

come up with entirely new set of registration data elements? Or are we expecting that they will work from the status quo which while not totally uniform, you know, is sort of a definable universe anyway?

So I'm just - I'm raising that question. I don't know if people have a - I don't have language to suggest on this but I'd be interested in people's reactions to that.

Steve Sheng: Okay thank you, Steve.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Galvin: So Steve...

Steve Sheng: No go ahead, Jim.

Jim Galvin: Yeah, I was just going to say, I mean, I agree with Steve Metalitz. I mean, you know, I'm trying not to be overly prescriptive but I do think that we want to be clear. And so, you know, Steve is raising a good question. And maybe we should re characterize it. Let me try to rephrase a little bit and just suggest do people believe or agree that there's enough here that the right thing can happen?

I mean, certainly we could say more but, you know, given that we are such a limited part of the community I'm concerned about being overly prescriptive because I'm hopeful that, you know, when this - if this recommendation is taken and the staff react to it that there might be other things that will need to be included or considered. And we don't want to, you know, exclude those things in any way.

That's my only reaction to what you're saying, Steve. I mean, I guess I agree with you but I'm deliberately trying to be not - to be less prescriptive than more prescriptive but I'm open for any specific suggestions.

Steve Sheng: Okay. So perhaps with those two editorial changes we can meet the recommendation largely as it is now? So the editorial change would be in the last sentence. This data model should also include tagging elements, for example, language and scripts.

And then the first sentence now reads, "ICANN staff should develop in consultation with the community a data model for domain registration data."

Julie Hedlund: Steve, this is Julie. I think I heard people say that they wanted to read in consultation with the entire ICANN community so entire and ICANN I think would be included in there. Others can...

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: ...correct me if I'm wrong.

Steve Sheng: All right in consultation with the entire...

Jim Galvin: Yeah, I mean, I think Avri was trying to make a point more than she was trying to editorialize. And I think saying the ICANN community really is sufficient. I mean, I don't think we have to emphasize entire; I think that would be implied. But why don't we give Avri a chance to speak against that if she really wants to see the word entire there.

Steve Sheng: Avri?

Avri Doria: It was taking me time to unmute. Yeah, I think having the word there is okay but I agree with Jim that if we say the ICANN community that would implicitly include the word. The community was a little bit too general but I think the ICANN community includes entire. So I don't care if the word's there but I don't mind if it's not. Thanks.

Steve Sheng: Okay. So if there's no strong reaction I'll keep the word entire. Okay so Recommendation 1, any other comments on Recommendation 1?

Bob Hutchinson: Bob Hutchinson. This is Bob Hutchinson.

Steve Sheng: Go ahead.

Bob Hutchinson: We have discussed - well there's a couple of comments I have. One is using the term data model here I'm wondering whether that's confuse - would be confusing to - in the context of this document because of the use of data model other places meaning transliteration models, okay, that's one comment I have.

The other is that we have discussed using XML as a representation language or as a meta representation language. And I'm wondering whether that shouldn't be in this recommendation. Those are my two comments.

Steve Sheng: Good points. What do others think?

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. I have I guess a partial response. On the question of whether the data model is confusing I think we should go back and

look through the rest of the documents to see if we're consistent in how we talk about data model and how we develop that definition.

I would hope that by the time we get the same data model and the recommendations that there's no confusion. But it's a fair question to ask and so, Steve, we should probably take as an action just to go back and check all of our other usage and see if we developed an appropriate definition for it so that there's no confusion by the time we get there. So that's my answer to that.

On the issue of XML I'm not opposed to saying something if somebody wants to, you know, craft up some text and some words for exactly what we want to do here.

But I'm not inclined to make a specific recommendation. I think the choice of a representation language more properly would belong to the IETF because, you know, ICANN would specify functionally - the ICANN community would specify functionally what it wants and what it wants included and describe that in words.

And, you know, the IETF would choose the specific representation of that in a technical sense. But I could be swayed a different way if somebody wants to make a different proposal.

Avri Doria: This is Avri, can I comment?

Bob Hutchinson: Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay, yeah, I think I agree with that mostly. I think that if the staff authors who are doing this in addition doing - which is indeed what

most ICANN participants would understand best did something like a (unintelligible) that took a first swing at an XML that got fed into the IETF as a starting place because that was the methodology they used to understand what was being written in text and to make sure that the text had its proper structural flow.

Then that would seem okay but to require them to produce an XML to feed to the IETF may be one step more than is needed. But certainly if it's the tool they're comfortable using to do the work then including it as a - for example here's a first practice with the XML.

But you know when you start discussing XML first you get into the esoterics of XML really quickly and then you spend a lot of time over XML-smithing and I don't think that's an activity we would think of as an ICANN activity. Thanks.

Steve Sheng: So I take from the action item is to check the usage of the data model to make sure it's not confusing here throughout the document. And also I think perhaps it's helpful to define the term data model early on in the document. Excuse me.

And for the second comment about XML representation I didn't hear any exclusive direction to change the current recommendation so that's my - what I get. Is that correct?

Bob Hutchinson: Well not to - this is Bob Hutchinson again. Not to spend too much time on this. I guess I'm - I don't believe that the IETF will - or should be involved in the - how can I say it the formalization of whatever the data representation that ICANN comes up with for Whois data - I guess my

take on what the IETF would or should be interested in in terms of Whois is whatever the protocol is and not the data itself.

They have never - they've never specified or been involved in the specification of any of the data within the current Whois protocol. And I would expect that that's a precedent that is congruent to the way the IETF operates in almost all cases.

In other words the IETF is interested primarily in the technical specification of protocols on the Internet not in the information that flows over them or the form of the information that flows over them in so far as it does not affect a protocol.

So I would like to hear comments from Avri and others who believe that's not the case and why now we would think that the IETF would be interested or be a party to the specification that we're coming up with here aside from the protocol which we're not discussing in this forum.

Jim Galvin: So, Bob, this is Jim. Speaking as chair let me jump in here and ask you the following question. Rather than getting into a discussion of where the boundaries of lines of work are drawn between ICANN and IETF and, you know, policy versus technical let me take a step back here first and ask is there a change - what change is it that you would like to this text?

I'd like to evaluate your question in the context of the change that you're asking for in this text rather than trying to discuss where those boundaries are. So, Bob, if you're talking...

Bob Hutchinson: Yes.

Jim Galvin: ...we're not hearing you.

Bob Hutchinson: No, I'm not - I'm not objecting to anything in this text. All I was interested in is the - there are assertions being made about the role of the IETF and I was trying to get straight my own perception of where those boundaries lie. And if there are no comments from the team about that that's fine.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I can give you an answer on what I was thinking.

Jim Galvin: So okay Avri, I mean, I'll let you comment. I know you have a lot of experience in this. But I really don't want to spend a lot of time in this call talking about those boundaries. I think those boundaries can be defined by whatever working group comes into existence to deal with this work. But, Avri, please go ahead; we'll give you the last word on the topic.

Avri Doria: No and I agree with that. What I would be thinking of is in that fuzzy border are things like, you know, XML schemas, schema definitions and, you know, perhaps DTPs if that was being used. So that kind of structure that defines what can appear in it and what the options are and what the possibilities are the actual data model itself.

                So you're right I think when you asked the question what do we mean by data model I think it falls into. But I think letting the working group deal with that is the right place.

Dave Piscitello: This is Dave. Bob, you might want to just look at like RFC 3982 to see something similar to what I believe Steve is discussing or describing.

You know, that's the domain registry XML schema that was developed for (Iris).

So there's an example of where, you know, the IETF developed a protocol and data framework and in fact there was sufficient interest on the part of, you know, at least at the time parties to develop a, you know, a standard model and schema to actually codify it as an IETF standard.

I don't necessarily think that that means that the IETF would dictate what elements, you know, comprise the data that ICANN would use. That certainly would be, you know, the ICANN community's remit.

But having those experts be able to, you know, help us develop a syntactically correct and optimized schema would be the value of going to the IETF in this case.

Owen Smigelski: This is Owen. If I could also jump in? IETF is already considering this. I don't know if - I think maybe Steve was involved a little bit on the (WEERD)'s email list. They already have a draft proposal and are considering it. And ICANN is certainly one of the things that they're considering. It's still in the very informational stages but the discussions are already ongoing.

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. Let me just jump in and try and close off this discussion. I think, Bob, your concern about a boundary and where it is is certainly a valid question. But, you know, I think we all agree that the boundary is kind of fuzzy.

And I apologize if any comments that I made or certainly any of the rest of us - I think we'd all agree - we're trying to be overly specific about, you know, where that boundary is or isn't because the IETF really just doesn't work that way, there's just sort of a natural inclination to go in one direction or another but certainly not a requirement.

So with that, Steve, let's go back to you to look - we'll do a last call on Reformation 1 and then move onto Recommendation 2.

Steve Sheng: Okay I guess any further comments on Recommendation 1? Hearing once, hearing twice. Okay let's move onto Recommendation 2 then. The GNSO Council should develop an issue's report on translation and transliteration of contact information.

The issue's report should consider whether it's desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script. It should also consider who should bear the burden and who is in the best position to address these issues.

The report should consider policy questions raised in this document and should also determine whether to start a policy development process. Open to comments.

Avri Doria: Yeah, this is Avri. Can I make a quick first one? Which is...

Steve Sheng: Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay. The GNSO Council in its policy development process requests an issue's report. Now the question is so this group can certainly ask

the GNSO Council to request a Issues Report. As part of that process - just want to make sure you know that the SSAC can also request an issues report from the GNSO.

So there's actually no reason in this recommendation that we wouldn't request, you know, or indicate that, you know, that the GNSO can request the Issues Report on its own or, you know, SSAC could be wanting to decide to request it.

So I just think, you know, but it's basically they request it, staff is the one that does the Issues Report just to sort of clarify the who does what in that. Thanks.

Steve Sheng: So Avri do you have any suggested wordings? So maybe the - it would be the GNSO Council or SSAC should request an Issues Report? Is that...

Avri Doria: Yes basically that an Issues Report should be requested by either the GNSO Council or SSAC. Yes, that would work for what I said.

Steve Sheng: Okay, thanks.

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. You know, I mean I have a question. My first reaction actually to this was to suggest that the opening phrase should be the similar to recommendation one.

The ICANN staff, you know, should develop in consultation with the community. Do we need to direct the issues report to be with the GNSO Council?

I'm concerned that I don't want to exclude ccTLDs in this discussion. And then we get into the question of making sure we're inclusive of everybody. And I think this topic is important enough that I don't want to be overly, you know, prescriptive about who's a part of it and who's not.

Any reactions to that?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I'm not sure I have an answer to that question. But, you know, basically if - and I think Avri is correct that - she's certainly correct about the procedure that applies to an Issues Report.

My concern - my only concern about this recommendation is that I think people will look at it and say I - that's what I thought this group was set up to do. That's why we set up this joint GNSO SSAC group to, you know, kind of develop some of these issues.

So wha- and the staff was obviously holding the pen on this. And what would be different I guess about the Issues Report that would be requested here from what this group tried to do?

Would it delve deeper into the - this issue? Would it canvas other sources of information about how to address this question?

I'm just not quite sure what the difference between the report we're talking about now and the Issues Report that is called for here would be.

Avri Doria: Hi. This is Avri if I can attempt to answer some of those.

Jim Galvin: Go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay. I think in one thing the conversation we were just having of, you know, in terms of a policy issue is this where the boundary line are what's - I mean one of the parts of an Issues Reports is the boundary lines.

I think Jim's right, it's important that the Issues Report, you know, the ccNSO should probably do one too.

The Issues Report is a formal mechanism that's required by either the ccNSO or the GNSO Council. I believe ccNSO also requires something like an Issues Report to start a PDP.

So if a PDP is supposed to come out this there needs to be an Issues Report.

So if we're contemplating any policy development related to this then that - that's a process that needs to be gone through.

I think that element - it would be good to add some of the elements that we would hope for in an Issues Report, you know, it may look at - certainly should take this report into account.

It may look at some of the policy issues that this account brings up but it doesn't discuss that a policy development process would need to cover especially if you look at the new PDP requirements out of the GNSO, what it means to do an Issues Report, what it means to do a policy development process.

So if we think there's policy to be developed and we want the GNSO and of course the ccNSO because it would apply to both, then I think Issues Report even needs to answer that question. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: And this is Julie. I just want to point out for those who may not be familiar that the Issues Report, the process for the policy development is actually described in the ICANN bylaws. So there are very specific rules that apply.

And as Avri has noted, there are several entities within ICANN that can request an Issues Report. The board can, the Advisory Committees can. The ccNSO can.

And then, you know, the Issues Report is a necessary part of the policy development process. Anything that involves policy has to start with an Issues Report.

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. I'd like to give a response from the point of view of chair of this working group.

So here's my answer to you Steve speaking as, you know, one of the chairs of this working group, you ask a really good question. And I think that to a first order this working group should have addressed this question. But here is my response.

I think that as Chair one of the things we did in our interim report last November was suggest four models. And we looked for some insight and advice from the community on those four models.

And I most definitely felt as chair that we got very limited if really - I mean we got a couple of significant comments. But strictly speaking we got really very limited input not, certainly not sufficient to declare any kind of consensus on what the right way was to deal with translation and transliteration.

So taking a step back what occurred to me was I think that this group could declare success in the sense that we've identified a very specific issue inside of this larger space that needs more attention.

I think that the participants in this working group have really because it's dragged on so long it's kind of thinned out.

And I think that we can all agree that we don't have a complete set of the right set of people to really talk about transliteration and translation and where it should exist in the process and who should bear the ultimate burden.

I mean if you look at our four models, you know, the basic idea there was moving the (translition), translation and transliteration burden around to different parties. And we were not able to get consensus within our group as it was currently constituted.

So what I believe is that this is a detail of the work that we were doing. And I want to carve out this particular detail and recommend that this particular detail be revisited by a different group, perhaps a broader spectrum group of people to focus on this.

So that's my view speaking as chair about what I think about this recommendation and its origins and why it's important to be there. So thank you.

So Steve since you asked the question did you want to comment on that?

Steve Metalitz: Yes.

Jim Galvin: And if you're speaking we're not hearing you.

Steve Metalitz: No, no I'm sorry. I was thinking about my response. Steve Metalitz. I think that - I appreciate that response and I think I agree with you that we've taken this as far as we can which is far - as far as identifying it and coming up with some options but not much farther than that.

So I guess if I understand it, the idea is that if this is kind of recast as an Issues Report which could lead to a policy development process we'll have a better chance of getting all the affected players involved in this. Which I mean, I guess I mean, you know, as you're referring to registries and registrars for the most part.

So that may well be right. I - and so I don't have any amendment to suggest to this recommendation. It's just somewhat disappointing that we're - I think we're really asking a different group to kind of plow the same ground and maybe plow it deeper and with more horses pulling the plow or whatever the metaphor would be. But I'm - I don't have an alternative to offer at this point.

Jim Galvin: So thank you Steve. So Jim again, I guess, you know, in all of these things it's always about spin. And I would spin this a little bit more positively when I think about this working group and what we've done.

I think that, you know, we've had a lot of success in that we've talked about the individual elements. We've observed that there are certainly, you know, existing standards where our elements can be standardized.

I mean in the context of the other recommendations we've identified some other additional work that needs to happen that really was outside of our scope.

I think in this particular case we have come to the conclusion that translation and transliteration are definitely solutions that need to be considered. But - and we have highlighted I think in the discussion parts up top and in the models which we are going to keep as an appendix because we don't want to lose that work because I think that's important.

So, you know, we've gotten it down to a much more specific and finer question. And I actually regard that as success as opposed to, you know, thinking that well we didn't quite go far enough or didn't quite get enough done.

I think that we've achieved a great deal and being able to be specific about a remaining question that we think needs to be revisited I think is a - I view that as a significant success.

Just, you know, I guess maybe that's a personal comment more than a chair's comment as the rest of it was.

Steve Sheng: This is Steve again. Are there any suggested changes to this
                 recommendation? Any other comments on this?

                 (Unintelligible) it's reverted - reworded sorry as an Issues Report
                 should be requested by GNSO Council or SSAC on translation and
                 transliteration of contact information. That's the first sentence
                 (unintelligible).

Jim Galvin: So yes. So this is Jim and going back to speaking personally here, do
                 we want to call out the GNSO or SSAC about these Issues Reports?

                 I mean I'm concerned that we want to direct the staff, you know, in
                 consultation to get Issues Reports to come into existence by the right
                 set of people.

Julie Hedlund: But I'm sorry, this is Julie. Jim, the request has to come from the
                 board, the GNSO, the Advisory Committee or the ccNSO. The staff
                 can't request an Issues Report.

Jim Galvin: And this group can't request an Issues Report correct?

Julie Hedlund: Right.

Jim Galvin: We can recommend that somebody - there's only a finite number of...

Julie Hedlund: You can recommend it, but - yes, this is Julie. You can - that's right.
                 You can recommend it. But the Issues Report by the bylaws -- and I'm
                 including this in the notes I'm producing from today -- according to the

bylaws can only come from the board, an advisory committee, the ccNSO, the GNSO.

Jim Galvin: Okay so this is Jim. So if I understand what we're saying here to ourselves then, because this group is a joint GNSO SSAC group then it would be appropriate to - for the recommendation to point back to ourselves and just say that one of us, perhaps both of us but we don't need to clarify that, should ask for this issues report. That's what I hear us saying?

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Jim Galvin: Okay, that works for me.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Are there any other comments on Recommendation 2? Last call going once, going twice.

Woman: So...

Steve Sheng: Oh, go ahead. Who was that?

Julie Hedlund: I think that was just background noise. This is Julie.

Steve Sheng: Oh okay, all right. So Recommendation 3, ICANN staff should work with the community to identify a directory service that meets the needs of internationalization and the service requirements enumerated in the report, in the Whois Service Requirement Report.

Thoughts? Comments?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I don't quite understand it.

Steve Sheng: Yes, I can (unintelligible)...

Avri Doria: Is there something we're going to do after other work or I guess I'm not quite clear what we're asking staff to do.

Steve Sheng: Okay (unintelligible). I think the background was there are some (unintelligible) in the Whois protocol itself that it does not have anything to signal encoding.

Avri Doria: Right, okay.

Steve Sheng: So today...

Avri Doria: Yes, no I understand that.

Steve Sheng: So and then the - so I guess how do we address that? And that's - I mean I wrote - originally I wrote something like, you know, should - you know, discuss with IETF what to do something and now it's changed to this. But yes, this recommendation needs a lot of work.

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Galvin: I'm sorry, did someone else say they wanted to speak?

Steve Metalitz: Yes Steve Metalitz but I'll go after you Jim. Go ahead.

Jim Galvin: No that's okay. I feel like I speak a lot Steve. Please go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Yes I kind of shared a little of Avri's confusion because if you
                   look back on Page 6 of the report where we're talking about
                   terminology we say registration dated directory service refers to the
                   services offered by registries and registrars to provide access to, et
                   cetera, et cetera.

                   So are we - it almost sounds as if we're saying, you know, this registry
                   has a good service and that meets the needs of internationalization or
                   are you really referring here to a registration data access protocol
                   which is again part of our terminology on Page 6? I just wasn't sure
                   what this was referring to.

Steve Sheng: Good point. Good point. Good point.

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. Yes I - what I would - speaking personally - be careful
                   about that. I would like for this recommendation to be speaking to that
                   third item there, a registration data directly service.

                   And I think that this recommendation at least in my view is born out of
                   our observation in the discussions about the fact that we're trying to
                   draw a distinction, an important distinction here between the protocol
                   and the service and observing that ICANN should define the service
                   and separate itself from the protocol that exists that is currently in use.

                   I think we do have some discussion about how the service that exists
                   today, you know, is insufficient to meet the needs of what we see
                   happening, you know, going forward.

It's certainly not meeting our needs today in terms of uniformity and consistency. And, you know, with that it can only get worse.

And so we - it's important to take a step back and figure it out what it is exactly that we want to achieve from an internationalized service.

Our goal -- and now I'll speak a little bit as chair -- our goal here was the feasibility of actually providing internationalized service.

And so we have now identified a deficiency whereby the service definition really doesn't exist. The service definition is inferred largely from the existence of a particular protocol that's in use and other proprietary solutions that have been derived from it.

So what we're doing here is trying to take a step back and say it's time to start at the top and specify the service definition and then other work will follow from that. So that's my comment.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Steve Sheng: So do you have these changes for the text?

Avri Doria: Yes, this is Avri. If I can suggest I think you could probably change the text fairly simply. First I'd say should work the ICANN and technical community because in this case that's where you're going.

And then it's to propose perhaps, and actually a - not just identify one or propose and then use -- and I forget exactly what our precise exact term is from the glossary but the exact term of what it is they should

start looking at. Maybe that's a sufficient change. Because that I would understand.

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. You know, again speaking personally that works for me. Steve Metalitz?

Steve Metalitz: I'm just trying to figure out how this fits in with all the other things that are going on in within ICANN. For example, we had a report on service, on the requirements for directory service.

We didn't use that terminology but I think that's really what that was about. And that was - the staff prepared a report on that about two years ago.

And now a team is working on developing a survey of the community to see if those, you know, elements of this directory service are the right ones or there are additional ones that people would like to see.

It's not focused on internationalization. That's one part of it I guess but it's focused on other aspects of the service.

How would this recommendation dovetail with that or we proposing some further parallel activity beyond that?

So I could direct it to the staff because the staff is involved with that.

Dave Piscitello: This is Dave. Steve I think I understand some of the problems you are - you're directing here. And part of the problem is that internationalizing the registration data is one piece of a very, very large set of committee work and, you know, and consensus development to, you know, move

us from the situation we have today with Whois and unstructured data to something that would be much more formal that SSAC began recommending several years ago.

And my view is that what we're - what the end game is the - a successor to Whois that allows us to structured extensible, you know, data and a transport or delivery mechanism that accommodates a number of the service requirements that Steve, you know, Steve and I put together on behalf of the GNSO well over a year ago.

And so what we really are not - I don't think the recommendation's necessarily have to reiterate what people are already recommending elsewhere but have to say this is one piece of that big puzzle. I know that's not great wording but I'm just trying to give you the context that I understand.

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. Thank you Dave. Let me offer the following specific suggestion and see if this responds to where we are with this.

How about if we were to change the trailing phrase there where it says, you know, meets the needs of internationalization and the service requirements enumerated in and say in this report and the Whois service requirements with an appropriate reference to it?

What I'm hoping to accomplish with that change is that it's a way of saying that this particular work needs to get incorporated into either new work or work that's already happening.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I - the problem with that formulation is that I don't think that that report that Steve and Dave prepared which I think

is a very valuable report, it's never been approved or endorsed by the GNSO Council or, you know, or anyone else. This still in process.

So I think the - if I understand it correctly the point we're trying to make here is that the internationalization question is an important one to be included in any definition or redefinition of the data directory service that ICANN undertakes.

Let's not leave this out. Let's make sure that while we're satisfying our wish list of what the service requirements ought to be that internationalization be part of that.

But I think that's - otherwise it sounds like we're proposing some parallel process. And I don't think that is an efficient way to proceed.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. I think we can also reference the board recommendation that kicked off this work. I think that would be appropriate place to put this.

And Steve Sheng can correct me if I'm wrong but this - we should make it very clear that this internationalization piece is indeed a piece of the overall work and has been identified as such.

I think in a couple different places - and Steve I think you could probably - Steve Sheng you could probably find a language.

But it's - so this is happening in parallel. It's just that, you know, that internationalization piece was indeed picked up and set apart as a key piece of that overall work that Dave has mentioned.

But there are specific places that we could reference that say that that this is a piece of a larger place and I'll - we'll see if we can pull up those documents. But at the very least we should reference the board tasking.

Steve Sheng: Thanks Julie. So in the service report, Service Requirement Report on the section about internationalization we just say this work is being carried out by the IRD Working Group.

When that working group finished the work with its recommendations will incorporate in the Service Requirement Report. So that's what's in that report.

Perhaps it would be to incorporate the work of this - the conclusions of this working group into Whois Service Requirement Report.

And I know there's some work going on to evaluate the requirements, you know, with a survey. So it's important to include, you know, the IOD work in there.

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. Speaking as chair especially since we're at the top of the hour so our call really is over let me offer the following action.

I like what Julie is saying and Steve what you've said here and listening to all this discussion.

Let me suggest Steve that you take as an action to try to propose a rewording of this recommendation that has some appropriate back references as Julie was describing but also gets to Steve Metalitz's point of suggesting that we want this work to be included in other work.

And that's really the specific recommendation. We just want to make sure that our work gets carried forward into things that are happening now and any future activities come around. So let's try to revisit how to reword this in a way that achieves that.

Let me ask first if anyone in the Working Group objects to that action?

And hearing nothing so Steve let me offer you that action. And you and I can talk about it more later and I'll try to be more helpful about what we can do here with this. And it sounds like Julie has some good ideas too.

Julie Hedlund: Yes and...

Jim Galvin: Okay Steve?

Julie Hedlund: ...I'll send out notes shortly. This is Julie. And I've included what I've heard here for that.

I do have a question now that we're finishing up. When do we want to have another meeting?

I should point out that next Monday is a US holiday and unfortunately I will not be available to do the call but if others want to do a call next week that's fine.

But I also understand that there's some rewriting the needs to happen and Steve needs to produce another draft I think for us to look at based on today's discussion.

Jim Galvin: So let me just jump on that question and ask does anyone object to our next meeting being - oh I'm looking, no wonder I'm confused. I'm looking at October.

I'm going to have a problem on the 12th. That doesn't mean that this group could - you can certainly me without me. That would be fine. But I will be traveling on the 12th. I'll be on an airplane so I won't be able to be part of it.

But I'd like to suggest that we not meet next week and we meet on the 12th. The 19th that folks don't want to meet on the 12th, but you'll be meeting without me on the 12th. Anyone object to meeting on the 12th two weeks from today?

Man: Well I'm not available on the 12th but that's okay. Steve and - there's plenty of staff to participate.

Julie Hedlund: Yes I'll be there on the 12th, this is Julie. And Steve can you do the 12, Steve Sheng?

Steve Sheng: Yes, yes I can do the 12th. I just want to know what's the timelines in terms of deliverables for this working group?

Julie Hedlund: Well if we want this document -- this is Julie -- to be considered in any formal way in Dakar it needs to be completed by the 30 September.

Steve Sheng: Oh less pages.

Avri Doria: Yes. This is Avri. Quick question, if Jim can't meet the meeting do we have a co-chair? I thought we had a co-chair but I forget who it is?

Julie Hedlund: Sure, Edmon Cheng is the co-chair. We'll see if we can get...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Edmon.

Avri Doria: Yes it'd be good if we could get the co-chair there but because it's good to have one of the chairs there.

Man: Okay.

Jim Galvin: I mean if we can't get Edmon if we're still really just going to the document I'm comfortable with Steve running the meeting if he is.

                 He does have some editorial notes in the document. He has some changes to make here so he can certainly produce a red line and put that out there.

                 And then what we really should focus on on that next Monday meeting is getting answers to Steve's editorial requests in the document and there are a few of those.

                 So I'd like to suggest that as a specific agenda items as well as answering any other questions that folks have.

Dave Piscitello: So I have - this is Dave. I have a question about, you know, just to help Steve.

In those areas they outlined where there weren't in particular objections I'm - it might help if Steve can, you know, can begin writing some of the - some of those sections in addition to just continue with an outline. It allows him to do things in parallel.

Jim Galvin: I don't have any objection to that. If no one has any objections I would welcome Steve into filling out, you know, any additional text that he could fill out.

And I would say why don't we give him, you know, a week to do that so that by next Tuesday he produces a red line document that we then can prepare for the meeting on the 12th. Anyone object to that? Is that okay with you then Steve?

Steve Sheng: Yes, okay with me. I'm committed to move this work forward.

Jim Galvin: And then also on the 12th what we should do is after you have some discussion on the 12th of about text and you and I Steve will have a chance to talk before then and we can certainly talk afterwards after I have landed to where I'm going here.

But we should also visit the question of whether the 30th is a target date that we can actually meet and come to closure by.

We have two more opportunities for meetings after the 12 so that should become an important question on the 12th to ask that question at least to hear what opinions we have.

Even if we don't come to a resolution at that meeting we should at least hear what people are thinking about whether not we can meet the 30th.

It'd be great to declare success sooner rather than later but only if we can get there. I certainly want to do the work right rather than push to a deadline that doesn't make sense.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Okay.

Jim Galvin: Okay. If there are no other discussions last call for the floor?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you.

Jim Galvin: Then I would say that we're adjourned. So thank you Steve and Julie and everyone who took the time to be here today.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you everyone.

Avri Doria: Bye-bye everybody.

Man: Bye-bye.

Man: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks.

Man: Bye-bye.

Man:	Thanks.

Glen de Saint Géry: (Unintelligible) (Tanya)?

END