

**GNSO/SSAC
International Registration Data Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 07 February at 16:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO/SSAC International Registration Data Working Group on 07 February 2011 at 16:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:
<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ird-20110207-en.mp3>

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

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)
Jim Galvin – SSAC -Afiliat

ICANN Staff

Steve Sheng
Gisella Gruber-White
Dave Piscitello

Absent apologies:

Avri Doria - NCSG
Edmon Chung – Group Leader
Julie Hedlund

Coordinator: This call is now being recorded.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone.

And today's IRD call on Monday, the 7th of February, we have Rafik Dammak, Steve Metalitz, (Bob Hutchinson), James Galvin. From staff we have Dave Piscitello, Steve Sheng, myself, Gisella Gruber-Gruber. Apologies today from Edmon Chung from Avri Doria.

And if we could please everyone to state their names when speaking for transcripts purpose. Thank you. Over to you Steve.

Steve Sheng: Thank you Gisella and welcome today to the IRD call. (Julie) sent out a few agenda items, a few items. One of them is to see if we have any updates or any feedback on the draft outreach slides. I know some of you had provided on your feedback and I've updated the slide accordingly.

The second question on the item is if you - and how we're going to do additional (reach) beyond the Webinars - the two Webinars - planned, an outreach for the ALAC community and the (APEC).

So those are the two items I have. Now do you have any other items?

James Galvin: I just wanted to ask about - this is Jim Galvin - ask for a (specific) follow up on some of the action items from last time. I know one was to me to reach out to (Bobbie Flame) and I - I don't have anything to report there. I actually did not do that.

But we also had a couple of actions to - let's see, (Bob Hutchinson), right, he did his part with his questions and I wondered if we could have some discussion about that. And (Owen) had some actions to reach out to some of his (contacts) in the Secret Service and some privacy contacts so that we could do some additional outreach to folks with respect to our four options.

Steve Sheng: Thanks Jim. I did - one of the items - action items for our staff is to reach out to (Tina) and the (IDN) team to see if they have any feedback on (Robert)'s question so I did forward the email to (Tina) and (Ella). Neither of them has responded to me.

I forwarded them to them (like) early last week and neither of them has responded to me. So that's my update. I will - I guess I will check with Naela

sometime today in the office to see if she has something to say. Any others?
What about the other action items? Can someone give an update?

James Galvin: Well I don't think there was much discussion on (Bob)'s questions. I don't if (Bob) has anything that he wants to add about that. He - I thought I heard his name. He's on the call right?

(Bob Hutchinson): Yes I'm on the call. We just have (questions) (unintelligible) relatively good interchange on the email. And I thought that it's appropriate to send that on to whoever's relevant within ICANN working in the IDN space. But my research indicates that while they answered the question in terms of how to encode characters for IDNs, they did not attempt or there's not a lot of leverage ability with the work that they have done into our space but I want to hear that from them.

And so I would like to actually have a call, you know, perhaps with them on the next call or something like that. Steve is - did you - you just forwarded the email? You did not (entirely) speak with them?

Steve Sheng: I did. I don't have access to (Tina). The only access I have to (Tina) is by email. So that's what I did for the email. I can speak with Naela again to see if we can come up next call. (Bonana) is only taking the fast track process. But so far he's the only person. So I'll reach out to her again.

(Bob Hutchinson): I see. Is Dave Piscitello on this call today?

Dave Piscitello: Dave Piscitello, yes, I'm on the call.

(Bob Hutchinson): Oh maybe you want to chime in, Dave, and you seem to have a fair amount of feedback (to) the questions anyway and where that discussion was going.

Dave Piscitello: I'm sorry. I'm - chime in on what specifically?

(Bob Hutchinson): On language tagging and the identification of what a language tag means in terms of its character set.

Dave Piscitello: Well I guess I have - I admit that I sort have always had in mind the kind of language tag that you see in XML records. So you can identify what, you know, what ISO, you know, form of language tag you're using in that - the tags reset that you're transmitting, you know, as part of the XML page or record if you want to - so to speak.

That's really the notion that I had because that's the only standard that I'm familiar with. I don't want to prejudice everybody towards that but, you know, that was what I had intended when I was originally thinking about this problem three years ago.

(Bob Hutchinson): Okay that's an interesting proposal. I guess I'm not sure who controls those standards and I assume that they would be - are they all ISO standard or are they a patchwork?

Dave Piscitello: Well, I guess we can - you know, we can certainly look to someone who's spent much more time in the XML world than I have. I think conceptually what we've been trying to do is not necessarily drill down to the - you know, to the formal language specification yet but to sort of think about what, you know, what granularity we want in tags.

And I think we've made quite a bit of progress in terms of granularity. We've talked about, you know, having, you know, distinctions between contact information and distinctions between, you know, varying other elements such as, you know, date and time and email address and telephone number and domain name.

And I've actually talked about main server name. So, I mean, my sort of computer science and engineering orientation toward these things is that, I

mean, you know, when you want to discriminate among different pieces of data you have tag and a length and a value.

And sometimes you don't need necessarily - (have) a length if there's some way to bound it without a length. And so however we chose to do that I imagine would be, you know, somewhat of an implementation dependency on how we would eventually incorporate it into some protocol.

So how I might do this with, you know, something as trivial as the (term) whose protocol would be substantively different. Somehow I would do this with (Russel) who is - or with (Iris) or with active directory or however else people might imagine one might do tagging.

Man: (Robert), I have a quick question. Is there (usually a raise) a policy issue or implementation issue? That's my first question. And putting my engineer hat back on, the concern you have is about the tagging language versus scripts, right? Is that the key issue?

James Galvin: This is Jim. Is (Bob) still with us?

(Bob Hutchinson): Sorry. The policy part is whether or not each field within the registrar data is language tagged and how that language tag manifests itself. And then what are the language tags available? And then from an engineering standpoint, of course, how they correspond to scripts (or) characters. That's where we do want to designate them, okay - language sets and (where) the encoding of those language sets.

So I guess the answer is from my - the short answer is both policy and technical, you know. I mean, I would hope that we would be putting together a set of recommendations that are clear and implementable.

Man: Okay that's fine. I will reach out to the IDN.

James Galvin: So this is Jim. I think - let me ask you a question. I think maybe I've been, you know, misunderstanding a little bit of what's going on here. We are supposed to be putting forth recommendations for what's necessary for internationalizing (essentially) director services and looking specifically at who is.

I - it just seems to me that the way that the language tags would manifest would depend a great deal on what replaces the WHOIS protocol. I don't think that there's a mechanism for enhancing it or in changing it. And certainly it's not within our (privy) to recommend that. I don't think anyway.

If people disagree I'd be interested in that. But to me this goes to the heart of what Dave was saying before about, you know, XML. He said he has this model and it's sort of the same model that I have quite honestly.

I'll, you know, (it's close) to my (body) in that respect. You know, XML allows you the freedom to - you create whatever number of tags that you need for the data that you have to have and then each data element can have its own language tag that goes with it.

And XML, you know, let's you do that if that's what you want to do. So - and as far as the language tags are available, I don't see ICANN, you know, specifying those. They'll come out of whatever those kinds of things come out of, the communities that come from that define them.

So I guess I'm not quite - with that as my (bias), I'm not quite understanding then now that I think about it, the question that you're asking (Bo). So could you respond to that and help me?

(Bob Hutchinson): Okay so the - I think the observation you made basically says you can tag anything with any language tag that you want provided that the protocol supports that, okay.

And that's possibly a legitimate policy for us to adopt, okay. But it would mean that, for example, a person's name could be in Chinese, the line of address could be in Hindi and the city could be in Russian, okay.

Dave Piscitello: Well this is Dave. (Bob), I think that you're absolutely right, that that's - that if there's no complimenting policy to - simply saying that you would uniquely tag the objects then that would be a, let's say, unintended consequence.

But, on the other hand, if what the concern is for something like contact information, that all - that it all be in the same, "language," then what you do is you create a data structure (with all) this contact information and all the elements of the contact information would then be tagged with a single language tag. And that really...

(Bob Hutchinson): I understand (unintelligible) do it. That - yes. But I guess what I'm - I'm more interested in this case is if you adopt a technical method for doing it, which is like XML or something like that, it's fine with me.

Then you've left the policy question undone and I guess I would like to see some recommendation from this group about what the policy is for this stuff, okay.

Dave Piscitello: So I'll ask you a question kind of to explore in a little bit more about the issue because one of the things that I've raised on the mail list is whether or not you would have U label or A labels for name servers. And Steve Sheng and I have been having a, you know, a jabber conversation about the nature of the way that we've treated DNS thus far.

And one of the things that we've tended to do for 20-some odd years is users think of a domain name as what, you know, what computer scientists call a presentation syntax. It's the information that a user sees whereas protocol people think of, you know, of a domain name in a DNS context as what's

called the transfer syntax which is the (bits) that go across the wire between hosts.

And when we get to the point where we're talking about U labels and A labels we've actually tried in a very, very indirect way to make a discrimination between the two. Now granted, you can see an A label in many implementations but that's not really the intent.

So one of the things I was trying to understand is - and based on our, you know, discussions and some of the things we've agreed to do with the domain name in the WHOIS record specifically, you know, provides the - both the A and U labels, is I tried to understand how that affects other elements of the WHOIS records.

So, an example, I would like to see email addresses composed in a manner where we're not running around with, you know, with at XM, you know, dash-dash, mumble, mumble, mumble. And I also would like to see in a WHOIS record a name server name where I get a U label if I - you know, as part of what I can represent.

But that actually creates, you know, something very interesting from your concern which is, you know, what if my email address is in Chinese and the rest of the record is, you know, the rest of the record is not. Is that wrong? You know, what if I name my name server using Chinese characters?

As long as I have the U and the A label is that okay? And I'm not certain where we go with contact information because that's obviously the trickiest part of this whole information set that we're trying to deal with.

James Galvin: So this is Jim. I mean one of the things that occurs to me is that I agree with Dave. And let me put a slightly different, you know, context or character to what he was saying.

I mean, I imagine coming out of this group recommendations for each of the data elements so we want to speak to the issue of internationalizing directory services in this domain name lifecycle context and all the information that goes with that.

So I think that I can imagine us saying that you - we should speak to what would be the syntax of the domain names, the name servers. What should be the syntax of dates? You know, and maybe we should say what should be the syntax of contact information as a group to get to the issue, (Bob), that you're raising about, well, can we have a name and an address and each in a different language, quote-unquote kind of thing?

To me, the four recommendations in the four models that we are struggling with and we haven't decided between really speak to the issue of contact information. To me that's the hardest part in all of this is what do we want to do about the contact information because I think that that in many ways is some of the most valuable information which, I mean, all of it is in this context.

But, I mean, that seems to be the part that people have the most issues with, being able to understand and use that information. You know, I - I mean, I don't know. Correct me if I'm wrong. I think it's pretty straight forward to say what we want, you know, email addresses to be is to call them out separately and the phone numbers and the dates.

We didn't seem to have too much, you know, dissention about those even in our discussions here. So, I mean, I feel like we're almost done except for choosing between these four models which is why I want to make sure I understand if there's really an outstanding question or not, (Bob).

It's not clear to me if you're asking a new question or related to something that we've already said. So am I putting any more context on this and helping at all here?

(Bob Hutchinson): Well simply put, the question that I (unintelligible) is what is language tagged and what is the domain or the scope of that language tag with regard to the registrant data? And answering that by saying the protocol will define that, you know, I'm fine with that if that's what the group says and then some other body is going to do that.

I guess I was under the impression that it's, you know, one of the things that this group has to do in order to well define what the policy for collecting and storing and displaying registrant data is.

Dave Piscitello: Oh I understand now (Bob). This is Dave. When I was describing, you know, the language tag with respect to protocol, my orientation was that whatever granularity of tagging, the policy would - what the policy community would agree with appropriate for (in an SI I think) registration data.

That granularity has to be available in the underlying protocol. So I'm thinking more in terms of trying to make certain that the protocol that we - and the data structures that we utilize are able to support, you know, a policy of whatever granularity is determined by consensus, you know, policy development and I agree with you that there ought to be a policy. I think that (Jim) and I have talked about the fact that - you know at least from our perspectives - and this is an opinion. It's not necessarily you know ICANN's, and it's certainly not a staff position.

But, I think the contact information is the crux of all this, because almost all the rest of the information is relatively straight forward. And, the representation of it is often not that strongly in control of - you know, of the user. So sponsor and registrar, and named server name, and other things like that aren't always something that a registrant composes. But the contact information is the critical information for intellectual property, for you know the right to use, so to speak - the ability to deal with someone on a business or technical, or you know legal relationship.

And so I think there's where we're going to - I'm inclined to believe that what we want is one data structure for all the elements that we identify as "contact information", and it would be so tagged in a - with a single language. And, I think that that also - I hope that that also accommodates - I believe it was - it's Steve Metalitz concern about mixed scripts in name composition and (street and) - you know, and city composition is alike.

James Galvin: So (Bob), I'll give you my response to your two questions. You asked two specific questions. You know, what is the language tag and what is the scope of the language tag. And, I think the scope of the language tag is precisely - I think that's very much in scope for this group, and I think that's really the question that we are - we're trying to address here.

We - in order to internationalize the information, you know the obvious thing to do is you've got to tag it in some way with a language tag. And so what we've really been talking about is the data elements and the syntax - what standards exist for specifying the syntax of the data elements, and then to specify specifically that we need to have a language tag incorporated in that. Some of that is included in having you know, you label versus (unintelligible). There's some knowledge there about the language that may be present. Some of this (unintelligible) in the encoding, but I think that's the relatively straightforward stuff.

The question about what is the language tag - to me, the protocol actually does define that, so that manifests itself in whatever the ultimate representation is in whatever is chosen and the ultimate protocol that's chosen, which I don't think we're going to choose. To me, it's our job simply to specify the requirements for the next group that's then going to have to make the technical decision about choosing between a WHOIS - you know, enhancing WHOIS in some way again, maybe adopting IRIS, or doing something different.

That's what I meant by the first option. The second option would be the IRIS. The third option would be this (rest) for WHOIS. Those things would be the three choices that are out there. But, I don't think we're going to choose between those three choices. That's not what this group is going to do. We're going to put out the requirements that are going to lay the foundation for the next group to decide.

And you know from my take on it, I think we've got consensus on - really, on everything except the contact information, because that's what those four models are about, and that's where we ultimately would have to make our decision. To me that's the only real open question that we have, and I guess that's what I'm trying to make sure of here and act now. In my role as Chair, I'm just trying to make sure we have addressed everyone's issue, so I'm trying to understand the issue that you're asking about and determine if it's covered or not, or if there's a new question there that we haven't addressed.

Steve Sheng: (Jim), can I get into the line?

James Galvin: Yes, please Steve. Go ahead.

Steve Sheng: So I'm trying to understand (Bob)'s concern and Dave's answer. So one of the policy questions that I - I do see that maybe a policy question is to what granularity of the tagging of the contact information?

So for example, do we allow you know within the contact information there are different elements. There's the name, there's the address, you know, there's the name, city, and their other information. Do we allow - each of these elements appear in different languages, so you could have a Chinese name but you have like an Indian address. It does seem to me there are the policy questions, like the - almost like mixing scripts questions.

So I guess (Bob), is that the question you are raising?

(Bob Hutchinson): Yes. That's exactly what I'm asking. Yes. I think that without - well, if you do (specify it), it leaves the door open for anyone to use the maximum flexibility, which I believe would be used to hide identities, okay. And if you do specify it, then you have to specify it in such a way that is acceptable to the larger community, and I don't know what the larger community's acceptability for this is, because I'm not out there as a registrar doing this every day, and I would want to get the feedback from the registrar community about if we're going to constrain it in a particular way.

This is also where law enforcement I think would be interested, is you know the - if we're going to go for a cycle of user feedback or you know outreach feedback, I would prefer to do that in this cycle. That's primarily why I raised this question, okay.

James Galvin: So - this is (Jim). So, it's - let me just - I think the question that you're asking is should we be allowing different language tags - should we recommend that different language tags be possible in different sub-elements of contact information? And in fact, perhaps that different contract information should be allowed to have different language tags. Or, should we say that all contact information should be in the same language?

So are you asking that as part of doing our outreach, should we include asking that question?

(Bob Hutchinson): Yes, because I believe that the people who have the most experience as to whether that's relevant or how relevant it is are both law enforcement and the registrar community, in terms of whether that fits the reality of the worlds that they deal in.

James Galvin: Okay. That makes sense to me, and I think that's a good question to ask. Because you're right, we should talk to the people who are actually working with this information and you know certainly dealing with the users, and sort of understand the usage model. I mean I'll confess my expectation would be

that individual - I mean contact information as a whole, whatever we decide to collect under contact information, I would expect to want it all to be the same language tag. I suppose it's possible for different contact information to be in different language tags, but I wouldn't expect individual sub-elements to be different.

But, I - you're right. We should ask the question and we should see what the usage models are and see what people expect.

Steve Sheng: Okay. I'll add this question to the outreach slides.

Steve Metalitz: Steve, this is Steve Metalitz. Could I get in the queue please?

Steve Sheng: Oh, go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: I think - if I've been following this conversation, and I'm not sure I have, I think this is already somewhat addressed in our models. I mean if you look at our Slide 7, it says you know Model 1 is you have to provide the contact data - the registrant has to provide the contact data and must be present script. I'm not sure why we continue to obfuscate this and not just say ASCII? But (unintelligible) - for - I know we've kept this must be present label here the whole time, but that seems to suggest that you have to put - if you're a registrant, you have to put all your contact data in using that script.

And then Model 2 says, you know as an alternative, it's whatever script is accepted by the registrars, and then the registrars have to do certain things to make it available. So 2, 3, and 4 all say that the registrants can use any script that the registrar accepts.

So, I'm not sure what the question - the new question is. It depends on which model is adopted. If it's Model 1, the registrant has to provide it in a particular script. If it's Models 2, 3, or 4, then it's really up to the registrar to decide what scripts would be accepted. Am I - I'm not sure that I'm - that I see anything

else added by the question as to whether - are you saying you could provide your name in one script and your address in another?

James Galvin: That - Steve, this is Jim. So, that's exactly the question. A sub-question in each of the four models is you know, is there a usage case - is there a use case where you might want to have different elements of the contact information in different languages? Presuming of course, as you say, that a registrar supports that, and you know a registrant is capable of entering that information? And you know, that's what gets pushed back up into registry for thick registries, and that's what's supported. You know, so there are a lot of assumptions behind all of that. But, the models really are based on the use cases.

But, I think that's the sub-question in each of the four models.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. I'm not sure it's a sub-question in Model 1. Model 1 says there's one script that you have to use, right?

James Galvin: Fair enough. I apologize. Yes, you're right.

Steve Metalitz: Models 2, 3, and 4, your - their add question is really could a registrar say we'll accept it partly in one script and partly in another? Isn't that...

James Galvin: To me, Model 1 is the keep status quo kind of state where as you say, we've kind of obfuscated it. But, Model 1 is all about you just keep everything in US ASCII.

Steve Metalitz: Right.

James Galvin: And so, you always have to encode things into an ASCII format in order to make it work.

Steve Metalitz: Right. Okay, that clarifies it. Thank you.

Steve Sheng: Okay. I'll add that to the outreach slides. It's a very interesting discussion.

James Galvin: So, I mean - this is (Jim) again. I think that at least for me the primary goal of the outreach is to get input with respect to those four models. You know, it might be appropriate to go back Steve for ourselves - for the group, maybe for our next agenda, just to make sure that we really do have consensus. Let's you know make a point of recalculating our document.

I'm trying to think about the last time I looked at our document, how specific the recommendations are and where they are. I wanted to make sure that we have consensus in our group on all of the other issues. I mean, are there any open questions right now? I don't think that there are. The only open question at the moment is how to deal with contact information in these four models. And so, the primary goal of the outreach is to make this visible and to get some input from the community about those four models. Does anyone think I've got that wrong?

Steve Sheng: We haven't talked about to date how the date to be internationalized, but that's a real minor issue compared to like contact information.

James Galvin: Okay. So, let's make sure that comes out in our next meeting so that we can get past that. And then use our next meeting here - and so, we should make this visible to people sooner rather than later, and you know try to declare officially that we're trying to say we've got consensus across-the-board except for the date that we'll talk about next time, and just confirm that we are down to where we really have to decide between these four contact choices.

I'd like to make sure - if there are any other issues I want to get them out on the table, because otherwise, I think we're very close to being done. And again, the goal of this outreach is to get some input for us so that we can make this last final hard decision of choosing between the four models. And, I want to make sure we cover everything - if anyone has any open questions

that haven't been addressed, I want to make sure we get those out so that we can deal with them.

Steve Sheng: Okay. I will take a note of this and send an email to the working group to see any open issues.

James Galvin: Okay. I think we might have - did we finish up here?

Steve Sheng: Pretty much. Go ahead.

James Galvin: No. Please, to you. I was going to say what's left on our agenda? I think...

Steve Sheng: Oh, there's one question of how to outreach to - I mean, ALAC and SSAC has - you know, we have - just going to have two outreach presentations to them. Do other communities want the same kind of targeted outreach we do for ALAC and SSAC? And if so you know, how should they organize that, or what's our role?

Steve Metalitz: Steve - well, this is Steve Metalitz. Could I just - have we finished? Have we finished - have we done Agenda Item 2 about the outreach slides, because I had one comment on that. (Unintelligible) back to that before the end.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

James Galvin: Please. Go ahead.

Steve Sheng: Go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. On Slide 13, I think - again, if I understand the models correctly, which may not be a safe assumption. But, I think - on Slide 13 where it says - it has a transliteration column and a translation column, I think it's probably an either/or rather than a both/and. I mean, we didn't specify whether - what the

registrant has to provide as simply a transliteration into US ASCII, and I think that was the expectation.

Steve Sheng: Right.

Steve Metalitz: I think there's some sense - some people I think are thinking it has to be translated into the English language or something like that.

Steve Sheng: Okay. So...

Steve Metalitz: I don't think that we - I guess I don't think that's what's intended by Model 1.

Steve Sheng: Okay. So what you're saying, for Model 1 it should be you know or instead of you know, either case.

Steve Metalitz: Yes. I mean, it can even be or...

Steve Sheng: So one or the other?

Steve Metalitz: Yes.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: Put an or between the two Model 1s.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you.

Steve Sheng: All right. That can be done.

James Galvin: So - this is (Jim). In getting to your question about outreach, you're obviously going to record these webinars, is that correct Steve?

Steve Sheng: Yes.

James Galvin: So...

Steve Sheng: So we're going to do the Webinar and record them and put it in a public accessible place. So maybe you know, then we could send to the different like mailing groups, for those who cannot make it to a Webinar.

James Galvin: I think that's what we're going to do going forward. I think that's important as we continue to you know try to find ways to make outreach to other groups. You know, we've talked about trying to find some law enforcement community, you know privacy advocates, and try to get some additional opinions about what the right thing is to do here. I mean, I guess if we can make presentations to them, we can certainly do that. But once we have these webinars, they have an opportunity to just listen to those and then get back to us with questions.

So, I'm fine with that. I think that we need to continue to identify groups, and I have the action to talk to at least you know one person, (Bobby Flame) in law enforcement. See if I can't get a view from him. I am going to a law enforcement meeting in two weeks in Brussels. I'll see if I can reach out to some of the folks on the European continent, see what interest they have in wanting access to the Webinar and getting them to pay attention and offer - you know, they (put) input to us.

(Owen) had also suggested he had some folks that he was going to reach out to, and we should continue to move forward with that. And Steve, if you could you know, follow-up up on that and see if we can get some opportunities there, that would be good.

Steve Sheng: Okay. I can do (that).

James Galvin: Just to make the Webinar visible to them.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

James Galvin: And I think that's it for now. We have the Webinar scheduled for the ICANN community. We should follow through with those. You know, Edmund and I had both said that we'll be there for those Webinars. Other folks, please, are welcome and encouraged to join so that we make sure we've got you know, enough people representing the works and also to answer any questions that might come up. That would be helpful.

So Steve, actually sending out a note to the list and reminding our own committee about the Webinars and inviting people to participate just so that we have coverage would be helpful too, I would think.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Dave Piscitello: And this is Dave. I actually asked Steve Sheng this question, and I should probably ask the committee. There are mailing lists and audiences who are - you know, who are primarily law enforcement and operation security kinds of people who I'm very confident are not going to find time - you know, away from their day jobs you know to attend a Webinar.

Is it appropriate for us to share the - I mean, share a PDF from this presentation so that they have some data points that's kind of you know, midway between an Executive Summary and the report proper? And at least we'll give them a sense of whether or not it's worth reading the entire report and commenting.

James Galvin: I think so. I mean, this stuff is - and it goes up on the ICANN Web site in some place anyway, right, that's open and public. Isn't that true?

Steve Sheng: Yes.

James Galvin: So, I don't see any issue with calling it out to people explicitly. I mean, you can send them the PDF and save them the trouble, but you could just as easily send them a link to it, right?

Dave Piscitello: Yes. I mean, I'm happy with either. I just want to make certain that - you know, that the working party is - yes, is you know aware of that and in favor of it so it doesn't look like staff is (spamming) specific lists. You know, I mean obviously - you know, I'm going to send this out to lists of people that I know. You know and if everybody does that, then there's not an issue.

But I don't want people to you know look rather - you know, in a (certain respect) of what I'm doing in saying I'm - you know, I'm trying to foster more interest among law enforcement and op-sec than I am among you know public policy people, as an example. So - but...

James Galvin: I think we have a current goal of doing outreach. And whatever is an appropriate means to make that happen seems reasonable to me. You know as certainly there's no issue with sending another note to our mailing list and reminding people that that's what we're doing, and alerting them to the fact that we're doing this. I mean if you're going to send a note out to a few mailing lists, you might send a note out to the committee and say, "I'm doing this just in case you get some feedback, you know so that you can be prepared to support it."

But outreach is our task at the moment, as I understand it, so it seems completely sensible to me and perfectly within scope.

Dave Piscitello: Now do others feel this (similarly) (unintelligible)?

James Galvin: So not hearing any objections, I think the motion carries. But then again, I think there are more people on this committee than there are on the call. You

might be better served Dave by sending a note to the list and just making sure.

Dave Piscitello: I'll do that. Thanks.

Steve Sheng: Okay. So here's a list of action items to follow-up. (Bob) raised a - both a policy issue and an implementation issue. The policy issue that we discussed, is there a use case where - for registrants who submit data elements in different languages of the contact information. And we're going to add that to the outreach slides.

Regarding the implementation question that (it look) standard and to - for the tag, I'm going to reach out to the IDN people, particularly Naela, again to see if she has some thoughts. We're going to proceed with the Webinar, and I'll send a reminder to this group what is happening. And, I will also provide a PDF version so that people can use it and forward it along to their respective lists. I'm going to check up with - I'll follow-up with (Owen) some of his contacts.

So, that's all the - that's the action items I have. Did I miss anything?

Man: Sounds good to me Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you, Steve.

Steve Sheng: Okay. All right. I guess we can finish ten minutes early.

James Galvin: All right. Excellent.

Man: Thank you.

James Galvin: Then we're adjourned. Thank you very much Steve, and thanks to everyone for participating, and we'll meet again in two weeks.

Steve Sheng: Thank you.

Steve Metalitz: Thanks. Bye-bye.

END