## GNSO/SSAC
## International Registration Data Working Group
## TRANSCRIPTION
## Monday 16 August 2010 at 14:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO/SSAC International Registration Data Workign Group on 16 August 2010 at 14:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#aug
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ird-20100816.mp3

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

Present for the teleconference:
Jeremy Hitchcock - DYN-DNS
Avri Doria - NCSG
Rafik Dammak -- GNSO Non-Commercial Users Stakeholder Group
Bob Hutchinson, GNSO Commercial Stakeholder Group
Yao Jiankang, GNSO Registry Stakeholder Group, CNNIC
Steven Metalitz -- GNSO Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial

ICANN Staff
Steve Sheng
Gisella Gruber-White


Absent apologies:
Julie Hedlund
Andrei Kolesnikov -- Nominating Committee Appointee


Coordinator:    Recording has started.


Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. On today's
                IRD call on Monday the 16th of August, we have Jeremy Hitchcock, Rafik
                Dammak, Avri Doria, Steve Metalitz, Jiankang Yao; from staff we have Steve
                Sheng, myself Gisella Gruber-White; and we have apologies today from Julie
                Hedlund.

If I can also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to (Jeremy) and Steve. Rob Hutchinson...

Steve Sheng:      Thank you...

Gisella Gruber-White: Sorry Steve, Rob Hutchinson has also just joined the call. Thank you.

Man:              Okay. Hi (Bob) - or hi (Rob).

Rob Hutchinson:   Morning.

Steve Sheng:      Morning. Thank you everyone for joining and on today's IRD call (Jeremy) is - our Chair is on the line. (Jeremy), do you have any agenda?

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is (Jeremy). Not specifically, but I guess it's to continue going through, you know, getting to some consensus on a few items and towards an actual report.

Steve Sheng:      Okay. You know, our last meeting we discussed about variants - the handling of variants. And I have also sent out a summary of the IRD Working Group discussions so far. Where do you want to start? We can go over the document or you know, we can continue to talk about variants (unintelligible).

Jeremy Hitchcock: I think there was about the same group of people on the last call so we could keep going on that or slightly move on, what is the - does the group have any particular preference?

Guess not. Why don't we pick up on a quick summary on variants from last time and go from there.

Steve Sheng:   Okay. So where we left off with variants last time; so variants are essentially characters of different form -- the same meaning character but of different form in a language.

And usually these variants, for example for Chinese or for Indians they could reach tens, if not 100s - probably tens - it's ten variants for giving a unilabel name, it's a good number. That also depends how long the domain label is.

And the question we discussed is, "What to do in WHOIS -- you know, how do we display them and" - it's not a question how but, "whether we allow the capability to display a query."

And since where we left off, I think -- correct me if I'm wrong -- is we are calling for study of the issue of variants and that's where we left off. And the study could be, you know, done by the IRD Working Group or you know, it could be done by ICANN. That's where we left off.

Jeremy Hitchcock: And for the - this is (Jeremy). And for the purposes of kind of just having a general sense of where the - how much variant or what the going forward strategy or desires between us tackling that issue or having it be a staff briefing; what does the group feel? Avri, what's your opinion?

Avri Doria:   Sorry, my attention wandered.

Jeremy Hitchcock: That's all right. Curious on just trying to get a sense of the flavor from the last meeting and the - for variants and whether or not it's a - something that this group tackles or this...

Avri Doria:   Okay.

Jeremy Hitchcock: ...or something that we kind of leave up for future groups?

Avri Doria:    I guess, strangely enough I would say, "Neither." There's so many groups at the moment that are facing variants as part of their discussion. We're talking about it in the JIG, we're talking about it here. In different terms, the IATF is trying to tackle what one does in you know, cases of what we're calling variants and what are and aren't the requirements for dealing with that.

So I don't think it's something that can be discussed just here, but - or is it something that we can put off and say somebody else is going to take care of. I - so I think at the very least, this group in terms of its problem, has to be able to express what its understanding and requirements for variants are.

And then we need some sort of venue where we can bring together the various different perspectives that are coming from these different groups into what our requirements are, what is needed. And you know, then others in collaboration can figure what is possible and we can go back and forth.

But at this point so many - I mean it is like the problem of the day almost in a lot of places. And I don't think we can - I don't think we can punt on it and ignore it.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Okay. Steve?

Avri Doria:    I'm not sure that was useful.

Jeremy Hitchcock: That was.

Steve Sheng:    Hello? Hello?

Jeremy Hitchcock: Hello, Steve?

Steve Sheng:    Yes, go ahead.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Steve Metalitz, sorry. I'm just trying to trying to kind of, poll the room and get a gauge for what the thought on variants are of - you know, how much further to go down or how much further to discuss on the topic.

Steve Metalitz: Hi, this is Steve Metalitz, I'm sorry. I was on mute there for a minute.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Yeah, no worries.

Man: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: I would tend to...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Steve Metalitz: ...support what Avri said. I think these variants issue is coming up in so many forum, there needs to be some unified way to deal with it.

Jeremy Hitchcock: So the - this is (Jeremy), the - so you, kind of the similar in perspective to Avri which is, "This group can't be the final authority on it but should participate in some sort of more global or larger conversation on variants."

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, this is Steve Metalitz. I would say so, with the caveat that since I've missed the last few calls here I'm certainly not up to speed on this issue the way others on the call are.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Okay. Rafik? What's your thought on variants?

Rafik Dammak: I think I agree with Avri, maybe we need to see in other working groups. Because I am also (unintelligible) until to have maybe common opinion across the (unintelligible) yeah, to see what other maybe to - we can ask them or something like that.

Steve Sheng: This is Steve Sheng. It seems so (unintelligible) or ICANN is forming a kind of internal variant group. So for example the staff supporting, you know, various working groups that touches on variants, we get together and discuss this issues. This is for your information. I don't know whether that would help the IRD group or not.

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is (Jeremy). It's certainly good to hear that it's not a problem that's only faced by us, but trying to determine what are the salient points that are related to WHOIS only and I think are important in terms of - there's an obvious choice in terms of what - however both WHOIS implementations are or - and how much data is given back.

And that's something that I think, you know, that I guess is - helps weigh whether or not we recommend one particular route or another. And I think in the end it will be, "There's a choice and there's a continuum and based on what other people think in terms of the variant issue, we're not..."

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Jeremy Hitchcock: What's that?

Steve Sheng: On the other hand though, I think - so I was thinking, maybe what we can take - so I know there are some disagree in the variants, you know, how variants are handled in different languages.

But on the other hand, I tend to feel that as an IRD group, we can take - we don't need to resolve those definitional issues and how variants are handled in different languages; we can take them as, you know, simply as given and define, you know kind of, the WHOIS requirement.

So here's what I mean, I think no matter how variants are handled in different languages, they are probably end up in two types of variants; one variant is called Activated Variant, I mean those are the variants that we put into DNS

dump file and subsequently be able to resolve, you know, through queries. So if someone were to query a IDN unilabel, a variant, you know if it's put into the dump file, it can resolve.

And the other type of variant is called, you know, reserve variants. You know I mean, these are not putting to the dump file, therefore no one else can register them.

I think different countries or even different language groups, you know they would be fine, you know what is activated and what is reserved. But generally those are the two categories.

And maybe what the IRD group can do is to take this as given. So you know, we are not define what is reserve and how to reserve them; but we take what is given and say, you know, "How do we display activated variants and how do we display reserved variants?" That's my understanding so far -- limited.

Jeremy Hitchcock:This is (Jeremy).

Yeah, I've always thought of it as a, "Does the - when you're interacting with the WHOIS client, if you query for, let's say a name that's based on one of the reserved or one of the names that isn't actually registered in DNS, do you actually get back results that relate to - that result with the actual name that's in DNS that's the big - and by the virtue of the fact that they have a - that you're querying based on a variant which does - or that would be on a reserve list you actually get the one that's the actual entry."

Is that - would that also be the case?

Steve Sheng:      Yeah I mean I think that's up to the working group to decide. I think the consensus, last time in the working group is, if a name is in the DNS for example, if it's a activated variant, WHOIS query should allow that; they should be able to query any name that's in the DNS and get results back.

The difference is, you know, what if (unintelligible) simply reserved but not in the DNS, should we enable the query capacity or should we not? I mean in that case what would we return? So...

Jiankang Yao: Hello this is Jiankang Yao. I - personally I agree with Steve Sheng's point, there is (unintelligible) variants some are (unintelligible) the answer for - the answer resolution others are for the reservation. So we (unintelligible) something how to display them.

And about the variants definition; I think is very difficult to have a accurate correct definition. Because different organization in a different country may have a different variants definition. So we - if we dropped the variants into two forms, active forms in the (unintelligible) and reserved forms we have to display them. I think it is a simple question. Thank you.

Jeremy Hitchcock:This is (Jeremy). So it seems like the - seems like at least the question of, "Do we display every variant," the answer to that seems like it's, for the most part a no. It doesn't sound like that there's any real desire for any - for all the variants to come back. But it seems like if you query for a name you're given the actual entry.

You know, based on previous conversations, it looks like you're given the A label and the U label back. And if you're querying on a variant that matches a - an actual name then you're given back the actual name and the variant. Is that - does that seem like something that the - a point to agree on?

Man: Yeah, that...

Man: I guess I didn't understand the - all of the scenario that you put there. The querying of any variant should return all variants; is that one of the options?

Jeremy Hitchcock:No, I'm saying specifically that if you query for a variant - so the case is - so you query for a name and you get the name back. You query for a variant, which is related to an actual name, and you get the actual name returned, but not all of the possible variants.

Man:              Yeah I guess we - the consensus we've had before is that if you query for a name you get all the registered variants. The question was, "What about - what does WHOIS do when queried on the reserved variants?" Maybe I was wrong about what we had as a discussion last week or last time.

Jeremy Hitchcock:Right, and I'm saying that if you do a query on one of those reserved names you get the actual - you get a - the corresponding name back.

Man:              Yeah, I think as a use case, from user usability viewpoint, if I'm using WHOIS to verify the availability of a name and a non-registered variant does not respond in WHOIS, I think you have a very strange system at that point because then I can't tell a name that is reserved but not registerable. In other words, so I guess that's the...

Jeremy Hitchcock:Well are you...

Man:              ...use case that...

Jeremy Hitchcock:...using WHOIS to determine whether a domain is registered or whether or not a name - or looking for the associated contact information of a domain?

Man:              Well I guess in this use case I'm saying that, "Somebody would be using WHOIS to determine whether or not a name is available to be registered." Okay?

Jeremy Hitchcock:So if you do a search for a variant which cannot be reserved and you get back the name that is the reason for - or essentially the record that exists that would prevent that registration then I would think that that would be

consistent with the behavior that you get with WHOIS which is either; a name is returned, which says that it's not available for registration; or there is no record that's respond - there's no record that corresponds with a query so then it should be available for registration.

Man: Right. And the question is, "For the reserved variants, do you get the root name of why that is reserved," or do you just get back - do you get back, "The name is not in use," do you get back, "The name is reserved."

You know, "What do you get back in the case of a reserved variant - a query on a reserved variant?" Okay.

Jeremy Hitchcock: I think I would be saying that it'd be the root name would be the name that would be given back.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. When you say the name would be given back do you also include that all the information on that name, or just a reference that that name is not used because it is a variant of this other name? Or do you mean you would substitute the whole WHOIS record for the registered name?

Steve Sheng: Two choices.

Man: Yeah.

Jeremy Hitchcock: I would think that would be the actual name. It would be as a substitute. And I guess kind of, the English ASCII version would be if you submitted a query all lowercase for a name, you're given back the actual record for the uppercase name - semantically they are the same.

And so I guess trying to use a similar type of logic for variants, I guess that would be how I would initially come to what would actually get returned if you use a variant that's related to a reserved name.

Avri Doria:      Yeah but - this is Avri again. It - in that case they would resolve the thing, which in this case, there's no necessity that they would resolve the thing.

Man:            Yes, I think that's what (Jeremy) is contesting.

Man:            You know, but then I think there's also issues. So for example, if a user even typing a variant - a reserved variant and he saw the - he or she sees the WHOIS record, and then he or she may want to say, "Well now it's in the WHOIS, you know, let me put into the browser."

               Well when he or she put into the browser, you know, this name could not be resolved. And then would that lead to confusion? Because (unintelligible) you know, could easily be resolved by the browser. I mean because, you know, what do others think of this scenario? No thoughts?

Man:            So I think the - what Avri and (Jeremy) was essentially outlining two proposals, right? If I understand correctly. What (Jeremy) is outlining is a query of reserved variants should return the original WHOIS record - I mean the - like the lowercase and uppercase; you could query the lowercase, you should get the uppercase back, or vice-versa.

               And Avri, if I understand what you are suggesting is, "When you query a reserved variant, we do not display the whole records, but we put a indication that you know, "This is a variant of XYZ." Is that what you're suggesting?

Avri Doria:     I was - I - this is Avri again. I was asking the question. But yes, I guess I would tend towards that, unless there was some sort of guarantee that they did resolve, like upper and lowercase resolved -- which of course is not necessarily a safe assumption.

               So yes I guess I would tend that way. But I was more asking the question...

Man:            Okay.

Avri Doria:        ...trying to differentiate the two cases.

And to add a third thing, even on the unregistered variant, I think we have to perhaps think about going a step further because it isn't necessarily registerable for; it may not have been reserved, but that - or does it?

Is the question I guess I'm again asking, "Does that mean just because it wasn't reserved that it therefore can be registered?"

Man:               (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria:        Because there may be policies elsewhere up and down the road that would or would not support that -- even without reservation.

Jiankang Yao:      This is Jiankang Yao. My main suggestion is if we use the query for reserved variants then you use (unintelligible) your query name is reserved then this creates a active variant. Thank you.

Man:               So you're agreeing with Avri's proposal.

Jiankang Yao:      Yeah.

Man:               Okay. Avri, I didn't get your last point about (unintelligible)...

Avri Doria:        Right. The last point has to do with the names that aren't reserved -- and maybe I shouldn't be talking about it now but wait for later -- is there's a presumption now that if something is not reserved and is not registered it is therefore available.

Man:               Right.

Avri Doria:       And I'm questioning whether that assumption remains true in an unreserved variant -- might that variant not actually be available but be unassignable due to some other policy somewhere along the road? So do we have to think and change the notion of what it means that just because there isn't a record does not mean it is necessarily available?

Jeremy Hitchcock: I think that that's true or that is something that's going to happen -- where there will be names that cannot be registered because of - they're too similar to a name that already exists.

Man:       Right.

Jeremy Hitchcock: And so I guess the question is, "If WHOIS DNS contact information and does a Web address resolve - like right now we have a pretty consistent behavior between a record existing in one system all being the same and there's one-to-one wrappings everywhere.

And in a variant scheme, that's not always the case and you might get cases where you get records back and resolving no - no actual DNS to - that can be resolved and no Web address that would exist. And I guess the hope is that - or the goal with any sort of proposal is to make them as consistent as possible.

Man:       Right.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Or I guess as an underlined assumption I don't know whether or not the group agrees with that. But I think that that would be the case that we'd want them at least somewhat consistent with what the current working reality is.

Man:       Yep.

Man:       Rafik, you have any thoughts?

Rafik Dammak:     (Unintelligible).

Jeremy Hitchcock: Go ahead.

Man:              Okay, so what do we want to do I guess? (Jeremy)?

Jeremy Hitchcock: Well I guess to try to come to some closure. I guess if it'd be possible for staff to come up with a quick rundown of some different scenarios in terms of how the variance would play into the how verbose or how much data (Ruiz) gives back would be helpful. And we could come to some closure on this particular side.

Man:              Okay. Closure on any proposal really means the alternative ones that we analyzed on the phone call today right?

Jeremy Hitchcock: Yes, the alternatives. And that way we can look and decide based on the pros and cons of each one what's the right way. So just seeing what the implications are and then in a future phone call determining which proposal seems like the best thing to use going forward.

Man:              Okay. That's fine. That's fine. We can certainly do that. Yes, we'll do that.

Man:              Okay.

Man:              So we still have about half an hour. (Unintelligible).

Jeremy Hitchcock: I wasn't present for the call getting bumped a half-hour. But certainly do not defer to me. I'm guessing there was a scheduling reason for moving up a little bit later?

Man:              Oh yes. Yes, we had discussed that. So one of the reasons is someone, some participants have asked to see if the time can be moved later. Because

on the West Coast time, it's a phone call, it's 7 o'clock in the morning. Because of this global nature, you know, right now it's 11 o'clock.

Seven o'clock call in the morning for a US West Coast and 10:00 pm for Asia, for Hong Kong, and China. And we're trying to figure out a compromise.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Yes, fair enough.

Man: Yes.

Man: But even that, a person who can make it at 7:30 am so I guess this time will be inconvenient for US West Coast. But if it's too late it will be very inconvenient for Asia. So I guess what do we do about that?

Jeremy Hitchcock: There's probably no ideal time. And I was just curious on the half-hour but no worries. Looking through my notes...So if there's nothing else on time we can go back to the actual subject matter.

So just looking through my notes and I'm trying to see where we are on the working group discussion. Because I think what we'll do is we could do a quick rundown on what left there is to discuss. And then maybe call for adjournment a little bit on the early side.

I think we came to some sort of consensus around the A label-U label.

Man: Yes. Actually do you want to go through the document? The staff is prepared. Maybe that would bring everyone onto the same page quickly?

Jeremy Hitchcock: Sure this is the 30 July document which was kind of the staff summary of where our current discussions had brought us.

Man: Yes.

Man:                Yes.

Jeremy Hitchcock:So and I'm not going to go too much through the preamble but basically that there's no standard that exists for the submission and display of registration records, registration data which includes contact information, host names, sponsor and registrar and domain name status. And the general goal as chartered was the feasibility and sustainability of introducing submission and display specifications that deal with internationalized registration data.

So we're only looking at what's the feasibility-sustainability. We're not looking at any sort of policy outcome. This is more of kind of a technical primer or an expert opinion for the GNSO to consider this. And this is also in conjunction with (S access) in terms of an internationalized content coming out and being more prevalent. And there's not a standard form to display this.

So we broke it down into a few high-level issues. So one of them was the capabilities needed for WHOIS service in the IDM environment. So the working group members generally agreed that there was value in offering users with the ability to use U labels which is the Unicode form of an IDM label or A labels which is the ASCII form as it's used in WHOIS inquiries.

Users may most often prefer U labels since this is more visibly recognizable and familiar than A label strings. But users of a command line may want to submit and display A labels just in terms of keyboard accessibility I guess. So I'm assuming that that's still something that we fundamentally agree on?

Okay. The next bit that we came up with was the how and the breakdown of A labels and U labels in terms of what pieces of content were displayed and what formats. So kind of related to that, we're looking mostly at Port 43 WHOIS clients. But I think one thing that maybe hasn't been discussed as much is the name-based query tools and what their specifications are.

I think that their behavior also is a little bit more varied in how they respond. And especially because some WHOIS clients, some Port 43 WHOIS clients will actually say go using name-based WHOIS client.

Man: Excuse me; name-based WHOIS client.

Jeremy Hitchcock: What's that?

Man: I mean what do you mean by name-based WHOIS clients?

Jeremy Hitchcock: Oh sorry, a web-based.

Man: A web?

Jeremy Hitchcock: Yes.

Man: Okay.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Or I always get the actual I think it's called, you know, web-based queries web query tool in the RAA. I can't remember. But it's basically a web version for WHOIS.

Man: Okay.

Jeremy Hitchcock: So for the actual WHOIS, I think we've come up with a couple of statements. Port 43 WHOIS clients must be able to accept a user query of domain name in either a U label or an A label format. WHOIS clients must be able to display a result of both U and A labels for domain names and variance of a single A or U label query should be returned.

Man: All right. I think we - this document was sent out before the variance discussion. So it will be revised accordingly to what the working group has reached consensus on, how to display variance.

Jeremy Hitchcock:Yes. Which is the assumption that all variance are returned. That part I think has been discussed, you know, a week or two after, you know, before this. But before this session today but after this document was sent out?

Man:             Right, right.

Jeremy Hitchcock:And then the question of what do we do for reserve names. That's something that still has to be decided.

Man:             Yes.

Jeremy Hitchcock:So kind of going through the document in terms of the general high-level preliminary recommendations, that's something that people are familiar with and generally agree on? Okay.

So one of the wrinkles with this particular set of recommendations is that the existing WHOIS protocol has no mechanism for indicating a character set. I think what will come as a result of this is that there'll be a proposal to be sent to the IETF for consideration to modify, extend or do something with the Port 43 WHOIS. And we've had a couple of conversations about some methods of how that might come to pass.

Man:             Yes. This is a...What do other people on the call think about this recommendation? Hello? Hello?

Jeremy Hitchcock:We'll go around again. We'll do it the same order as last time, Avri?

Avri Doria:       Don't start with me. Please skip me or come back to me.

Jeremy Hitchcock:It's alphabetical order.

Avri Doria:       Yes reverse alphabet works good too.

Jeremy Hitchcock:All right, we'll do reverse alphabet. I don't have the list in front of me. But Rafik, why don't you go first?

Rafik Dammak:     Yes. Can you repeat your point? I didn't get it.

Jeremy Hitchcock:Sure. We're going over the staff summary. And one of the recommendations that is that because of the working group's position on Port 43 WHOIS clients being able to accept queries in U label or A label formats. And they should also display the A label and U label format then WHOIS doesn't have a mechanism for indicating the preferred character set.

So as a result, WHOIS would have to get modified and extended. And the way that we would do that is to have a proposal sent to the IETF to ask them about extending the protocol. So that way that functionality is included. And we're just trying to get a sense from the working group members of whether or not that's - what the level of consensus on that particular topic is.

So you're first. You get to say whether or not you agree with that.

Rafik Dammak:     Okay. You mean to send to IETF to request them to make that change? I'm not sure about the forces there but how do you see we will request that from the IETF?

Jeremy Hitchcock:We would just have a single-page or maybe a couple of pages that say that we'd like to have that. IDMs...WHOIS was a protocol that did not have internationalized domains as part of its initial design and initial assumption. And it needs to be extended in order to have that type of support. And to look forward to, you know, what type of modifications would come from it.

Rafik Dammak:     I agree for the idea but I'm not sure how we will handle that with the IETF. Maybe (unintelligible) knows better than me about whether or not we agree to the IETF about that.

Man:    My understanding was -- correct me if I am wrong -- is for IETF is someone come up with a solution and go through the standard process? Is that how it works?

Avri Doria:    This is Avri. What I was doing was trying to find out the last time anybody in the IETF actually talked about WHOIS.

Jeremy Hitchcock:It was a long time ago.

Avri Doria:    A long time. The last I could find is 2004 that the WHOIS name stopped being active.

Jeremy Hitchcock:Yes, that working group is no longer active and has not been active for some time.

Avri Doria:    And that's what gives me pause. I mean this would be something that would be sent almost, you know, as opposed to putting out an Internet I mean an Internet draft when there is an existing working group. That says, hey we'd like. This is almost going to IAB level.

    And the notion of getting the IAB to suggest any further work on WHOIS is just mind boggling. So while I agree from an ICANN perspective that we would want that. I don't see how we would get it. I guess I'm echoing what Rafik said.

Jeremy Hitchcock:And I'm separating my...I'm in the capacity of working group chair on this because I'm not a particular fan of this type of approach. Because I think what's going to happen is we're going to send a proposal to or we'll ask for some increase in feature and we'll either be referred to - we'll basically be told no.

    And we'll be referred to (Iris) and (Chris).

Man:                 Yes.

Jeremy Hitchcock:But that's, you know, for the recommendation - for having WHOIS Port 43 able to accept user queries and display those user queries...

Avri Doria:          That's right.

Jeremy Hitchcock:...that's the right way to go forward in order to have those things occur.

Avri Doria:          Well there is another way. I mean and that's -- this is Avri again -- and that's that given that we understand that the IETF is not about to do it. There's absolutely no block on someone else technically suggesting the solution. And, you know, doing basically proposing their own solution as a way to do it.

So if ICANN truly believes that -- and, you know, I don't mean ICANN as just us or as just staff. But, you know, we go through the whole process of figuring out that, yes this is a recommendation that we want is we can certainly pay to have somebody develop that solution. And work through the process of independent, you know, independent submission.

And so that can be done. And that would be the decision that I think we'd have to make. Because I think you're right; there's not a prayer that someone would do a working group to do this.

Jeremy Hitchcock:Okay.

Avri Doria:          Now whether an independent submission that was well-thought out, well done and, you know, an optimal thing would make it through the standardization gauntlet I think is an open question. And, you know, there's all kinds of variables in whether that would work or not.

I'm not sure that I'm suggesting it. I'm sitting here more like, you know, part of my life is working with various groups and companies sort of looking at protocols and figuring out whether it's worth doing an independent submission on something. In some cases you might consult (unintelligible) to it. And that strikes me as the only way one could do it. And I don't know whether it would fly or not.

Man:    So Avri, what you are suggesting is to have interested parties to submit proposals right?

Avri Doria:    What I'm suggesting is that is one possible way to do it if at the end of the day ICANN decided this is what we needed. I'm not sure that I am personally advocating it. But I'm looking at it and saying that is a solution path if we wanted one I think.

Man:    Okay. So you want to give ICANN the first right of refusal? Is that...

Avri Doria:    Well first of all my notion is we are ICANN right.

Man:    Oh.

Avri Doria:    So we as this group if this group says this is something that should happen to 43. And it goes through SX and GNSO and Board and they all say yeah this is something that we should do then yes. Then the next step becomes how do we do it? And this independent, figure out the solution ourselves, whether it's the people within the ICANN staff who have 43 talent. Or it's some external consultant that is a whiz-bang, you know, at WHOIS protocols and such did it.

Man:    Yes.

Avri Doria:      But go through that path. And as I say, I'm not sure where I stand on it. But from my consultant perspective, the thing people often pay me money for, is that would be what I would see as a solution path.

Man:             Okay. I mean I agree with you. The only thing I'm raising the question is whenever, you know, people will just criticize ICANN immediately say, well ICANN is really not a technical body, you know. They shouldn't do this stuff.

Avri Doria:      Yes.

Man:             I mean I'm mindful of that.

Steve Metalitz:  This is Steve Metalitz, may I get in the queue here?

Jeremy Hitchcock: Yes, go for it Steve.

Steve Metalitz:  Yes, just two observations on that. One is I think what's in front of us is the working group recommend interested parties to submit a proposal. So we're really just saying if people are interested in pursuing this they can go through the IETF route. Which I hear many people saying wouldn't produce - we're not likely to produce anything. But they certainly would have the option to do that.

                 My other question here really is would we really want this? I mean for example, elsewhere in this document we have statements about how certain things should be displayed. You know, that the name of the registrar should be displayed in ASCII.

                 Would that be trumped by a change in the protocol that says you can have a preferred character set for the display of the results? So that someone could say, I don't want this to be displayed in ASCII. I'm just not sure whether this, if there were such a new standard it would really be consistent with what we're recommending elsewhere in the document.

So that would be a reason in my view to just kind of leave it where it is. You know, the working group recommends to interested parties. It could just point out to interested parties that they have this option. But not having ICANN itself pursue this. Thank you.

Man: Steve I think this...let me try to understand. I think what you're saying is you're concerned about is, okay if someone were to when they extend the protocol or they change the protocol it may make impossible some of the recommendations this working group has? Is that right?

Steve Metalitz: Yes, it's possible depending on what the change was.

Man: Right, right. I think then maybe, yes...Then maybe, you know, whoever does that work would have to say, you know, this is what the ID comes up. You know, whatever protocol change you make you better not, you know, destroy this recommendation.

I think that's, maybe that's...Would that be a fair way to go? And just let them know that, you know, this is what the recommendation is.

Steve Metalitz: Yes. I mean, sure but we're just making recommendations at this point. But if this went forward to the IETF then they would probably want to take into account whether what they would be putting in place was consistent with our recommendation.

Man: Right, yes. Okay, that's good. Another thing is, do we talk about (Iris)? And like (unintelligible) here? Like in the interim report, do we want to spell out those?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. On that question I think what we were doing and I think we may be getting to that point was first coming up with the requirements. And then

starting to look at can WHOIS do this. And if it can't then looking at well what are the solutions?

Okay, one we just talked about is fix WHOIS. The other is what else can do it? So perhaps, you know, at the point at which we've gotten to the end of these are our requirements, it does make sense to look at the other tools although I don't know if that's necessarily in the mandate of this group.

But take a look at the other tools. And say, yes, maybe that one can do it or no it can't. So, I guess I'm saying, yes, maybe.

Man:            Okay.

Avri Doria:     I'm so definitive today; sorry.

Man:            So I hear a maybe; any other thoughts?

Jeremy Hitchcock: I think it'd be worth doing. Going through and saying why, you know, WHOIS fails because of its inability to interact with U labels. So we should look at other systems that - and I think that the IETF would say, you know, there's a registry data system that they have worked on more recently that does have that capability.

                What are the...We should look at that in terms of how does that fit the functionality and the spec of what we're looking for.

Man:            Okay.

Man:            You're a yes.

Man:            Yes.

Man:            Okay.

Man:            You know, one of the reasons that, you know, we don't have any adoption of (Iris) is registries and registrars simply do not have the interest. I mean the economics is wrong. The incentives are misaligned, you know. Registries and registrars who have to put up a large cost developing (Iris) does not benefit from the improved WHOIS.

It is the IPC community through law enforcement that benefits that. I mean we can say about (Iris) but, we can, you know, mention it again in other replacement protocols. But unless someone works on the economics incentive issue, I think we're not going to move very far with (Iris).

Anyway that's my personal thoughts.

Jeremy Hitchcock:This is (Jeremy). I mean I'm going to speak somewhat out of turn. But it's also the currently mandated system. And (Iris) is more complicated and probably more costly. But right now WHOIS is the current system that is mandated by the community use. I can' remember what specifically contracted for the GTLD registries.

But at least for registrars, it's basically, you know, those couple of paragraphs would say how Port 43 and the web-based name query tool exists. And it's just past precedent that has really defined what that actually means. And because there's more IDM that exists out in the world there's been people that have had to kind of do their own thing in order to make that actually work to serve registrants and the community at large.

Man:            Right, right.

Man:            Any other thoughts on this recommendation? We are three minutes passed the time.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, this is Steve Metalitz. I'm going to have to drop off the call at this point. Thank you.

Man: Thank you. And I think we want to keep the recommendation the way it is or?

Jeremy Hitchcock: I think we want to keep the recommendation the way it is. And I guess what we would put together is a couple of - so kind of a couple of things that came out of this was that we're going to look at how variance play. And then the second one is that it seems like this will go into our final report which is a potential solution section.

And we have at least two solutions that are a modification to WHOIS and another one is looking at (Iris) and seeing how that fits. So I think that's something that should get explored is a little bit of background on (Iris) and why it works or why it doesn't work. Why it's partially used by some of the world. Why there's only one implementation that exists for it.

Man: Okay.

Jeremy Hitchcock: I think that would be a good topic for next call.

Man: Okay, sounds good. All right so any other further thoughts?

Man: (Jeremy) now we want to recommend we adjourn the call. Thank you so much for your participation especially for you in Asia this late hour of the day. But for everyone else and I know all of you are in multiple working groups at ICANN. So thinking from a staff perspective, I really appreciate your participation.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Cool. Well thank you as well and we'll see everyone next time.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Man:              Yes.

Man:              Thank you.

Man:              Bye.

Jeremy Hitchcock:Bye-bye.

Man:              Thank you.


END