GNSO/SSAC
International Registration Data Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 08 November 2010 at 16:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO/SSAC International Registration Data Workign Group on 08 November 2010 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-20101108-en.mp3
On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#nov

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

Present for the teleconference:
Edmon Chung – Group Leader
Jim Galvin – SSAC –Afilias
Andrei Kolesnikov -- Nominating Committee Appointee
Bob Hutchinson, GNSO Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG)
Avri Doria - NCSG
Owen Smigelski, Sunrider International, Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial Stakeholder Group

ICANN Staff
Steve Sheng
David Piscitello
Gisella Gruber-White
Julie Hedlund

Absent apologies:
Rafik Dammak -- GNSO Non-Commercial Users Stakeholder Group
Steven Metalitz -- GNSO Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial

Coordinator: Thank you. At this time, today's call is being recorded. If anyone has any

                     objections, you may disconnect at this time, and you may begin.

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

                     everyone on today's IRD Working Group call on Monday, the 8th of

                     November.

We have Edmon Chung, Andre Kolesnikov, Jim Galvin, Avri Doria, Owen Smigelski. From staff, we have Julie Hedlund, Steve Shang, and myself, Gisella Gruber-White.

I don't have any apologies notice for today, and if I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes.

Thank you. Over to you, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Gisella. I appreciate that. And thank you and welcome to all.

What I'd like to do actually, Steve Shang, if it's okay with you, is have you take over just because I had missed last week's meeting and also I know that, you know, you've been working on revisions of the report, and we've gotten some additional revisions to record, so I thought maybe you could help give us a sense of where we stand at this point.

Steve Shang: Sure. So Julie, we - for the Interim Report, we went through two iterations.

I circulated a draft -- the first draft -- about two weeks ago and Steve Metalitz, Jeremy, Owen and a couple of other committee members gave some very helpful edits and suggestions. So I incorporated it in the second draft, which was discussed at the last meeting.

At the last meeting, we also discussed Owen's -- no, Bob Hutchinson's proposal languages and we incorporated some of those into the draft.

So this draft, we got some - all the comments I received are very minor editorial comments, which I will incorporate them - which are incorporate all of them. So the draft, we have, it's sent. It's not much changed from the last iteration. So that's where we are.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Steve. That's really helpful.

So the comments from - I'm looking at specifically the version I think that Owen had made some changes to, which also, I think, with edits from Steve Metalitz.

Steve Shang: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: And so those are relatively minor, right?

Steven Shang: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: So that won't (unintelligible)?

Steve Shang: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: (Unintelligible) that's great. But what - where do we want to - how do we want to wrap this up? And I guess I have a question, because I think something that you had mentioned from the last meeting was getting this out for public comments. Is that something that the Working Group would like to do? You know, and that is putting this out for a formal comment - public commentary prior to Cartagena?

Avri Doria: This is Avri.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, Avri, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: I'd just like to say that seems like a good idea.

Julie Hedlund: That was - I'm sorry. You said, "That's a good idea"?

Avri Doria: I said - yes. Sorry, sorry. I said that, "You putting it out for public comments seem like a good idea."

Julie Hedlund: Okay, thank you. I wasn't quite hearing you. I thought that's what you said. Thank you.

                    Others? What do others think? Others...

Owen Smigelski: Hi, this is Owen. I certainly agree. I have no problems putting something out there earlier because the more feedback we can get, the better.

Julie Hedlund: And Edmon, does that sound like that would be a good plan to you?

Edmon Chung: Sounds good.

Julie Hedlund: Okay.

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: Well - then let's - maybe I can get a sense of how long we want the comment period to be.

                    I don't know - some of you are aware. Typically, when we put items out for public comments and if the public comment period coincides with an ICANN meeting, we generally, I think, try to extend the time a little bit -- recognizing that, you know, people are occupied, you know, with other things during the meeting and may not have time during the meeting to pay attention to the comment period.

                    If we were so, for instance, to put it out - and I don't know how long it will take, Steve, for you to get a final version. I will take a look at it too later this week. Then a 30-day period would take us right into the ICANN meeting and I think we would really want to extend beyond that.

                    Any thoughts on that?

Avri Doria: This is Avri again. Are we putting it out translated or just English?

Julie Hedlund: Well, I think that if we - I think we put it out in English and that's a good question. It will take a little longer to get out if we have to have it translated, of course, and on that, I'm not sure how long that will take. And it may - that depends on how many languages we want to have translated. So I think that's a good thing for this group to discuss.

Avri Doria: This is Avri again. I think on something that's talking about multilingual support, there's just sort of a rhyme and reason that says maybe translating it is inappropriate -- just my two cents. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: That's a good. Thank you, Avri. Others? What do others think?

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. I agree with Avri. But how long are we talking about for the translation? I mean, it just - my concern in the timeframe is that we're going to put it out for a public comment period, but work is going to move on, and we're going to continue to progress.

                Is - I mean, is there an issue with an open comment period in us moving along? I'm just curious if people, you know, think that that's - that could be a problem, and also, if we wait, for the translations, how long would that be and how long would that set us back?

Julie Hedlund: So Jim, this is Julie. I don't know how long the translations would take, but my sense is that probably I would guess at least a few weeks.

                I mean, given that there - part of the difficulty is that there is a deadline of the 15th of November for items to be made available for - so anything to be posted for - that's going to be under consideration for Cartagena, which is the deadline we're working with here, some of those items will need to be translated.

And so there's, I think, probably a rush right now to translate some items for Cartagena. We'd be adding that to this. And I - you know, it's probably going to be a couple weeks, I would think, depending on how many languages we wanted.

What we could conceivably do, since we want this to - you know, we'll be talking about this in Cartagena, is at least try to see if we could get a relatively quick translation into Spanish. And, you know, of course, request the other translations as well, but they may take longer.

And like I said, I'd - I would be hesitant to take a guess as to exactly how much time this would take.

And I don't...

Jim Galvin: So for...

Julie Hedlund: ...answer your second question, I don't think there's any reason we can't continue with our work in the meantime. But, you know, given also the consideration that we'll, hopefully, get comments that we can then consider as well.

Jim Galvin: So, it sounds like what we would need to do is we could release the English version right away. We could open, I would think, a 60-day comment period, try to get Spanish as quickly as possible with other languages to follow and let people know that other languages will follow, and in the meantime, we continue to progress work. And our presentation in Cartagena might actually be a little different than whatever is released because we will have marched on. Would that be fair to say how this will work out?

Julie Hedlund: Comments from the...

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, go ahead, Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Hi, this is Edmon. I actually quite agree to that as much as I agreed to Avri's point. I - and the general - I guess the general idea of having things translated and I'm personally comfortable with that.

But I'm also thinking it's probably at that point in this topic and everything, it really doesn't hurt to try to put out the English version first and try to use a longer comment period. And then once we do have the translations, we could, at that point, also decide to extend the public comment period as well if the translation would have taken us longer than we wanted it to be.

The - generally, though, I know there is this general concept about got to have everything ready together, but I think, personally, I feel it's okay to, you know, have things posted as they become ready. So if you think that Spanish would become ready earlier, I think that should be posted as soon as possible. And that goes along with the English version -- you know, sort of same report with the English version.

What we do want to get a sense of is, you know, what the field feels like in terms of the (unintelligible) of languages for - that's to be translated and who wants the - for the final fees of translation that's in place, we would probably have to make a state - make a decision on how much longer the public comments is going. That's sort of my take on it.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Edmon. Comments from others?

Steve Shang: Hi, this is Steve.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you...

Steve Shang: I have a question. How about to - sorry, I'm thinking aloud. How can we get a faster response, given that maybe translation would be a bottleneck? How about we translate the slides for Cartagena into, like, the five U.N. languages?

Do those first and then, you know, we post those slides, you know, with the presentations at the Cartagena meeting, while we do the translation -- you know, the full translation.

So I'm thinking, you know, we have, like, a shorter version so that, you know, people can immediately see and get a sense of what it's about and what we have discussed.

Andre Kolesnikov : Well, I can translate the thing to Russian myself.

Steve Shang: Okay, Andre.

Andre Kolesnikov: It's not a big deal. I mean, it's easy.

Steve Shang: Okay. I mean, I can translate to Chinese. That's - I can.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Steve.

What do others think? I mean, we don't have the slides as yet, but Steve, were you going to try to draft a slide?

Steve Shang: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: Based on the report?

Steve Shang: Yes, probably.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I think if we have slides already, I think that that would be an interesting idea. I mean, it is an interesting idea.

But not having the slides yet and knowing that it would take us a bit to - just looking at when past slides have been done, it takes a couple iterations before we have slides, because when you make things shorter and you're doing certain abstractions, then you - people say, "Well, that needs to be adjusted. This work needs to be adjusted."

So I'm not sure that we would have those quickly. While I tend to argue for - and this just comes out of, you know, working in the U.N., where there's just a tendency where you start and end with all the languages at the same time. I think as long as you have a common ending date, you can start earlier if you really need the comments as soon as possible and you think that the most relevant comments will come in in English, which may or may not be the case.

I don't know to what extent the work we're going to continue doing depends on the comments, but I would think that we couldn't really - I mean, if there's other work that we should be doing that's sort separate track or more detail on particular things, but isn't really totally dependent on the comment we received and the comment we received goes back to the sort of principle work we've done, I don't see how we can do that much with them before we've seen most of them.

To sort of say, "Well, we'll make all the changes based on the English comments, and then if we get a Spanish or Russian comment, well, we'll deal with that later," again is somewhat problematic in the multilingual context. And I know it's something that's difficult and it does make things take longer.

So I just sort of advise caution, but I'm really trying to understand, what is the work that we're plunging into next and how dependent is that work on the comments or can we just let a comment period run its course while we - in

parallel to the other work, and then when all the comments are in, we go back. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Avri. That's a very good question. I'm interested in the Working Group members to comment on that.

What is the sense of the Working Group as far as the next steps to continue the work? And I'm reminded of the fact that there was a discussion -- a meeting -- before this last one about all also providing a comment with respect to the DAG -- the next iteration of the DAG -- and I don't believe that's out yet. So - and, you know, talking about not recommending WHOIS in that next iteration.

So anyway, question out there for the Working Group is, what are the next steps? How does the group want to proceed? Any thoughts?

Jim Galvin: This is Jim. I guess my only comment, I mean, I don't really object to making the documents and stuff available.

My only hesitation was when you used, Julie, the word "official" or "formal comment period" because I think that Avri is right. Avri is right. It's - it just feels awkward to me that we are working and the - you know, to put out a comment period and then we're going to have to take in these comments and yet we're moving along. I mean, we haven't hit a place where we're ready to pause and then wait for comments that we can deal with them and I am.

So the formality of it is what concerns me. I mean if we could put the stuff out there and let it be known to people that the documents are there and they can comment if they want, that's one thing, but, you know, obligating ourselves when we're trying to move along just seems awkward to me.

Julie Hedlund: And that's a good point, Jim, and I think that it's one that we should discuss.

Typically, when you put something out for a public comment, it's - you're specifically asking for a comment. I mean, you're formally saying, "Here's something we did," and there's a preamble that we, as staff, will have to write to this. I mean, it'll have a little background and so on, but it does have a, you know - these are - we may have, you know, to say, "Well, we're asking for comments on this report." We can also ask for specific areas that we want comments on within the report.

And then, typically, there's a piece that says what we'll do when we receive those comments and what we'll do with those comments. So it's a fairly formal process -- sort of giving people notice that, "Hey, we've come to a point in our work that we have a product that we'd like you to know about and we'd like you to comment on. Please send us your comments and here's what we plan to do with them."

So it is fairly formal, but I'd be curious for those working within the GNSO, because I've only been initiated - been working with a certain number of documents within the comment period, so I'd be curious as to how others see the process and whether they feel it's that formal.

Avri, I know you've got a lot of experience with this, if you'd like to comment?

Avri Doria: Sorry, don't have a comment this moment.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. Thank you.

(Dave):   Julie, this is (Dave).

Julie Hedlund: Hey, (Dave).

(Dave):   Hi. What - I'm trying to recall what we did with the Interim Report from Fast Flux and what was done with the RAP Working Group's Interim Report. Did they actually go out for a formal comment?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, I don't know, (Dave), because I wasn't involved in that.

(Dave):   Sure. So I think that there's actually, you know, precedent to be set here.
                  Maybe if we talk to Marika, she's handled so many more of these than - you
                  know, than we've had to. I'm sure that she - you know, she has the process
                  pretty clear.

Avri Doria: The issue - this is Avri. The issue that makes it complicated that made me
                  pause is, in all those cases, yes, they went out -- Interim Reports did go out
                  for comment. They only went out in English. And - but we hadn't yet entered
                  the age of consent on the multilingual aspects.

                  And also we had a much (unintelligible) notion of how we ended comment
                  periods, whereas sort of the public participation changes that has been
                  coming down now has gotten much stricter about needing to have a date. So
                  Marika has done really excellent in sort of, you know, maneuvering that in
                  various groups where sort of we kept comment periods going until such time
                  that we had gotten all the comments we hoped to get because people were
                  just slow delivering.

                  But yes, the comments does seem to get longer, and with this new
                  multilingual push, which I might not have brought up if this group hadn't been
                  about multilingual WHOIS -- I know that's not specifically what the group's
                  about -- but, you know, it does complicate the issue. So that's -- but certainly,
                  interim things that - this is not a Final Report.

                  This is an Interim Report, but once you do a comment period, one of the
                  comments that people who are following the ATRT have heard is that, you
                  know, comments are not adequately dealt with. And so going out the
                  comment, incurs -- what is it, formal or informal or whatever -- incurs the
                  obligation to review each comment and sort of say, "Yes, we considered that
                  for - you know, and this is what we did about it. No, we hadn't considered

that. Thank you very much. We will consider it now and here's what we're going to do. Or this is out of scope and, you know. Or whatever."

But, basically, taking each comment as a group and treating it like it's something that's important to us. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Avri.

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon. Just to, I guess, adding to what Avri said. I think it really depends on the volume of comments we get.

From what I understand, there's - in (unintelligible) I think it's (unintelligible) itself as formally created by GNSO and (unintelligible). So I think it's somewhat formal. Whatever report we put out would be formal.

And I think at the end of the year public comment period, I would sort of - sorry to put work on you, Julie, and staff, but I think that would be getting a report on the - on - a sort of a summary on the comments received. And I guess, depending on how much comments received, it would need to be summarized in terms of lumped into different types of comments. Or in fact, there's even, well, the, you know, comment by comment summary. And that - if that summary would somewhat end up in not only our conversation, but potentially in the Final Report in some paper form.

So and just to add one more point, I think - I generally think it's good to try to get a document--- you know, even if it's not translated or even if it's not, you know, in its best form. So (unintelligible) not talk about this here.

(Unintelligible) meeting so that people have a chance to fix (unintelligible). And usually, during an ICANN meeting, anything that is in a comment period gets slightly little more attention and that is something that we probably should take advantage of. So that sort of adds to what I was suggesting earlier.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Edmon. This is Julie.

I do want to confirm what you're saying with respect to how the comments are handled. Regardless of how many comments are received, even if it's just a couple or one, if they're relevant comments, the staff does provide a detailed summary of the comments. If there's many, then typically, we'll group them according to type or topic.

And what we are tasked with is providing the summary and it'd probably be myself and Steve providing the summary within a matter of a day or two depending on how many comments are received -- it could take longer -- of the closing of the public comment period.

And that part of the - part of what we're committed to is to move quickly to address the comments. And I think that you're right -- that they also then would become part of the dialogue in this group and, you know, as to how the group wishes to address them.

So the summary is just sort of a, you know, summary and description of what the comments were and categorizing them. But then the follow-up work for the Working Group would be specifically how to address those comments and where and when and what not, and that's part of what, I think, Avri was speaking to as well.

The other thing that I would agree with is that if we do put out even just an English and -- perhaps if we can get the Spanish quickly -- the Spanish translation and, you know, get the public comment period started before Cartagena, then when we - we will have a scheduled presentation of Interim Report probably on that Thursday during the week -- that Thursday, the 9th, I believe it is -- and we will be able to then say, "This is out there for public comment," encourage people to comment and so on, and possibly we may

have comments that we can, you know, even refer to, you know, that are already up there.

But I agree with you, Edmond, that it could get more attention if we've got something out there prior to Cartagena.

Any other comments?

Jim, you were raising a concern about sort of the formality of this. It is a fairly formal process, you know, and then whether or not the - you know, the work of this group would continue during the comment period.

Now that we've had a little bit more explanation how - does this raise more concerns for you or what do you think?

Jim Galvin: No, I think my comment still stands. I think, in general, I have a preference for a comment period occurring during a more, you know, quiescent time in the work of the Working Group so that we give people the opportunity to really look at the work. And then we - you know, we take on the action of dealing with the comments.

It just - I am concerned about us continuing to progress work while comments are coming in and then we have to merge those two things. I mean, I'll work with it if that's what people want to do. I guess I'm just calling it out as it just strikes me as awkward, but I'm not going to stand in the way of the overall process here.

I mean I also understand and appreciate the value of getting public comments. I suspect this work in particular is going to draw some public discussion -- at least I would hope so.

You know, WHOIS has certainly been an interesting topic in - at ICANN for a long time. So, you know, we can choose to just deal with it, and I'm okay with

that or I'm just raising a question to see if there's anyone else who really thinks that it's a big issue and maybe we shouldn't do a comment period because we don't want to deal with that.

Avri Doria: Okay...

Jim Galvin: Thanks.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I think saying we don't want to do comments period -- we don't want to deal with - have to deal with the comments -- would be a - sort of a bad way to say it.

And that's why I'm still trying to get clear as to what work - oh, no. Is the work we're doing dependent on the comments? If it is, I think we should take the time to hear the comments. If it's not, then we should proceed working.

I had felt that - and perhaps it was only because we were aiming for a document, that we were no longer making great strides of progress, and that we really were at a point where we needed something beyond this small regular crew to sort of weigh in on some of the issues.

So, I thought actually that you know, the comment from the community was something that we actually needed, but that there could be some specific work items that we could pick that were less dependent on the comments. So you know, I can't say that I've paid close enough attention to know exactly what those work items would be.

But otherwise you know, there's also not a harm if we do decide that no, all of the work really needs more input, and therefore this group should go on (furlough) until we get the comments. It's not like any of us doesn't have oodles of other things to do. So, I think we are at a point - I mean, I said it at the beginning when I agreed yes; going out for comments is a good thing.

I've had the feeling for awhile that we're sort of in that wheels turning motion - I mean, wheels turning moment where we're not making that much progress and that having community buy in, or non-buy in to what we're doing, is important. So, I guess I think we need to hear from them.

Jim Galvin: So, this is Jim again. I have a question. Avri made me think of something. Is it possible to focus what we want comments on? I mean, I know to agree rather strongly with what Avri said, the four models that we have laid out is an area where I think we really could use some public comment. We really would like to see where the support is and what the community thinks about those four models. At least for me, I would very much like to see that.

So, it would be interesting if we could - and obviously, we would release the whole document as far as where we are, but to call out that particular section and say you know, we're especially interested in people's you know, preferences with respect to those four models, is that something we can do in this formal process?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Jim. Yes. And in fact, it's very helpful in - you know, for us as staff in writing the announcements that goes along with this document if we do include specific questions that we would like people to address in the comments, rather than simply you know saying, "Here's a report. Please comment."

I think if we do want to direct attention to specific areas in the report, we really should do that, and I think that will likely get better or maybe I should say maybe more targeted or specific comments if we do that.

Jim Galvin: So, let me say then that I'm actually in favor of a comment period, with particular focus on getting comments on the four models.

Julie Hedlund: What do others think? Thanks, Jim.

And - then, that leads me to the other question. Is there - in the meantime, is there - and this is a question that Avri raised as well, is there other work that this group wants to do? Any tasks that are not dependent on the comments? And, I guess one thing that came to mind that I mentioned earlier was do we want to write up a very brief comment that once the comment period is open on the DAG, Version - whatever it is, then that we would say that - you know, some kind of statement to the effect that the - this iteration of the DAG should not include a recommendation for being (unintelligible) of WHOIS.

Jim Galvin: Well, we still have the other two questions that we haven't finished looking at, right?

Julie Hedlund: That's right. We do have further work there as well. Now, do we want to - and, that is - and that's a good question Jim. Do we want to call out comments on those two questions?

Are they in the...

Jim Galvin: For me, I don't think so. I mean, I like this interim report because it's a statement of where we are. I mean if anything, we might say in the next steps that there are other issues we are still looking at. Should we tell them the issues? My preference would be not to because I'd like to focus you know, people's attention on what we've actually done and what we have some consensus around. And you know, this way we could continue to progress work, and to me that really speaks to all of the issues that I was trying to raise. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Excellent point. Thank you Jim.

So leave the report as it stands, ask for specific comments on the four models, but since the comments - we're not asking for comments on those questions we have not yet addressed, we could continue work on this. Does that sound reasonable?

Any thoughts?

Owen Smigelski: Hi. This is Owen. I certainly agree that that sounds reasonable, but you know I'm just curious whether people would want to know - might actually raise these issues on their own if we don't include what the future action items are that we still have yet to consider. I think a brief mention of that might not be harmful necessarily.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Owen. Others?

I mean, I guess Jim you were saying, I think if I understood you correctly, the opposite. Let's not raise the issues that we're still - you know, that we haven't yet considered and just leave the report as is. Because, I assume - and I haven't read the whole report. I apologize. That right now that report does not visit the items - the questions that this group has not yet addressed. Steve, you can correct me on that, please.

Steve Shang: We don't have - we do not list guidance yet to be addressed. We only have what we already addressed, so...

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible)...

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Please. Go ahead.

Avri Doria: So, it seems to me that one of the first things we would start work on, and that would certainly be motivated by the responses we got, but we - with still a lot of initial work is framing the issues that we think need further work. And you know - and what we're going - what we propose doing further. So - and you know, the time of a comment period goes really rapidly, even if we're waiting for a translation. So - and with the meeting coming on and realizing that a week or two before the meeting and a week after the meeting, most working groups are - you know, languish at best.

I think - you know, there's not all that much time to do all that much work if we start the comment period now and we start to look at what we think the next steps are and the next work we have to do, and start getting that framed. I think before we know it, we'll have comments to deal with.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Avri. And, I think you're right too, that - I mean, if this is as we hope, a hot topic, you know, we may be getting comments right away and you know - and - well you know, it depends on of course how long we want the comment period to go, and that depends on how soon I think I can get - we can get translation. So, I can send out an inquiry today and see if I can get a sense of that, and then that could drive the calendar for the comment period.

I think that being said, I mean we can release English as soon as it's ready, but we'd want to have a comment period extended long enough so that once we release - you know, once we post the other translations that there'd be plenty of time for others to comment on this.

I don't - I saw other thoughts on whether or not - Owen has suggested it might be helpful to include the issues not yet addressed, sort of setting them up. But - and, I think Avri has noted that you know, maybe - well, not really just to say exactly what those are because our next step of work could be framing those issues that come and getting a better handling on them. So, we might want to wait.

Owen Smigelski: Well, this is Owen. If we don't do that, then we certainly want to make sure that it's clear in the interim report that this is just you know, just that; an interim report, and there are still other issues and problems to be considered by the working group.

Julie Hedlund: I can do that.

Owen Smigelski: Yes. Because you certainly don't want people thinking that this is some sort of final report and there's no further work to be done, and let them pour in with all sorts of complaints and comments about items not in the report that they perceive should be in there.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I think that that's right, and I think what Jim said earlier is also right, that you know we really are looking for feedback - (unintelligible) looking for feedback on the four models and what people think. And you know, perhaps even leaving the door open to those commenting on you know, whether they have opinions about what other things we should be working on. I mean, the whole notion of the bottom-up community driving our work, this is one of those opportunities.

So you know, they may read our four models and come up with suggestions of something we need to consider, but because we've been so close to it have had it slip our mind you know. And, that could be a good thing. So, I don't think we should take the time to create the list of the future work at this point. We've seen how many iterations we take on wordsmithing, even though it's people who are largely in agreement, but still have different you know intentions on the nuance, and that would just slow things down.

So basically, to perhaps put in an italics section you know, that the future work is currently being discussed and is very dependent on you know, which models are actually adopted et cetera, and leave it at that. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Avri.

Other thoughts?

So, this is all very helpful. What I'm hearing is that we can prepare our public comments - we'll prepare the English version as quickly as we can. I can take a stab at doing an announcement. Typically, there's two pieces. There's the

announcement that gets posted on the main ICANN Web page, also the text, which is largely similar, that gets posted in the forum.

But, I - what I'd like to do is do a draft of that text and send it around to the working group to make sure that I - we frame the - you know, the questions appropriately, and if there's anything that we've forgotten, just so that we can have a sanity check on what we're saying before it gets posted. And certainly, would appreciate your comments and suggestions for improving the announcement.

And, I think that - and of course in the meantime, I will contact our translations department and get a sense of how soon they might be able to translate it into the UN languages and give precedence to the Spanish being prepared as soon as possible, since we are leading up to Cartagena.

And then I guess my next question is we do want to you know try to frame the issues for follow-on work. And then with that in mind, I'm wondering do we want to continue with weekly meetings? Do we want to go back to bi-weekly meetings? And if that's the case, then we're - we really only have one - if we go to bi-weekly meetings we have only one more meeting prior to Cartagena, that would be on the 22nd.

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon. I wanted to ask something. I probably should know this, but I really apologize (unintelligible). What is the planning for being a release? Are we doing a public (session) or we're doing a workgroup (session) at this point?

Julie Hedlund: We are doing two things Edmon. This is Julie. We have a timeslot scheduled I think for half an hour -- I don't know exactly when it will occur yet -- to provide a short briefing on the interim report to the GNSO Council during its working sessions on the weekend. That'll be either Saturday or Sunday. I think - and actually, I don't remember - I don't know exactly when that will be scheduled, but hopefully we'll know soon.

And, there's also a public session that we will have to discuss the interim report, probably sometime on Thursday morning. The final schedule has not been determined on that. There's actually a separate - there's also a session on WHOIS issues that Steve Shang is working on, and what we're trying to do is schedule if we can this - the interim report discussion public session back-to-back with the WHOIS session, and maybe give 45 minutes apiece to each of those topics. So, we'll have an opportunity then to engage the public in a public session.

Edmon Chung: So, there are really three sessions that sort of...

Julie Hedlund: That's correct. Because there's - and Steve Shang, can you remind me what is the WHOIS session going to be about that you were working on, I think with Francisco and others?

Steve Shang: Sure. So, what we'll be working on is - as ICANN's technical staff, to think about the evolution of the WHOIS service. One of the things the staff has identified or summarized from previous reports is some of the deficiencies with the current protocol. And then, we also did an analysis of the three alternatives that we have considered.

So, one alternative is extending the WHOIS protocol. So for example, you know one of those issues might be relevant to this working group is how extending the WHOIS protocol can accommodate internationalization, but there are other deficiencies with the protocol that we seek to address.

The other is an analysis of migrating - gradually migrating to IRIS, what are the pros and cons for that? And, the third option is an analysis of gradually migrating to (unintelligible) WHOIS, that's kind of the latest service provided by some (RAR)s.

So, we identified some deficiencies, and then we considered three alternatives and we did a preliminary analysis that we're going to present. And the goal of the session is to gather feedback to see you know, are we - have we correctly identified those issues? You know, are there any other alternatives and models that we have not considered but should be considering? Is our analysis correct - make sense? So, I think that's what the session is roughly going to be about.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Steve. Any questions?

Edmon Chung: Okay. It - generally speaking though, it seems to me that bi-weekly - I mean, one more meeting for us to just prepare for (unintelligible) is probably okay. I don't know that one of - I have a (unintelligible)...

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Edmon.

Edmon Chung: ...in terms of...

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead.

Edmon Chung: No. Just open up to just other people - whether other people feel that we would need (unintelligible) knowing that we have only one more meeting for...

Julie Hedlund: So - thank you Edmon. What do others think? Just have one more meeting on the 22nd to kind of wrap up any final preparations, discuss for instance slides we can get - can try to get done, I guess as a next action item, some slides using the report as a guide. Give the working group a chance to review the slides, and then perhaps have a discussion of any final changes on them on that 22nd. That might be an option. What do people think?

Jim Galvin: This is Jim, and I would be in favor of that. I'd very much like to see the slides a little sooner this time than we did last time for Brussels.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, Jim. We can certainly try to do that. Other thoughts?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. It works for me.

Julie Hedlund: And Edmon, does that sound good to you? Then, we can have one more...

Edmon Chung: Yes. So, I guess it seems like it's - you know, we're comfortable with going forward with (unintelligible).

I have a separate item I'd - I understand - (unintelligible) again. I probably should've recognized that - well before, but with these sort of - the draft schedule out for the new gTLDs and stuff, I've been paying a little more attention to the new drafts (unintelligible). I was just wondering what the relevance there would - there is, and there would be in terms of our work here, and what is in the applicant guidebook? I successfully sort of draw the attention to - I actually see some information about data flow requirements pertaining IDN registration for new gTLDs.

And because they sort of touch on the type of data that needs to be selected by registries, I think it seems to me that it has some (implications) to what we're working on. So, I was wondering if - do yourself a favor from the (unintelligible) give an update from that, and - but not actually now, but take a look into it and see if - you know, what if any are the implications or (unintelligible).

Steve Shang: Hi Edmon. This is Steve. I think Francisco work on the data (escrow) program. So, he's also one of the staff supporting this working group I guess, so I guess we can try to ask him to be on the call sometime next call, and then talk about the (escrow).

Edmon Chung: Not necessarily you know - but just get some information maybe yourself, or Julie can get some information.

It's not only that. I may have - I have to say I have not - you know, I guess nobody could probably say they - they're totally familiar with such a long document, but perhaps a - some sort of (unintelligible) different aspects of which to see if there's any relevance on what we're working on with (unintelligible).

Steve Shang: Okay. It would be very helpful if you can...

Edmon Chung: Yes. What I did is...

Steve Shang: ...send an email...

Edmon Chung: ...is the (escrow) part where it defines some IDN parameters and IDN variants and stuff, which it seems to me at the point it's a little bit different from what we have discussed. But otherwise, I - you know, that's really the area I think would be useful to get some updates (from staff) so that we don't duplicate work or you know, we duplicate work that (unintelligible) with things that are moving forward.

Steve Shang: Okay. I will check with Francisco on that. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Steve. Thanks - and thanks for offering to check with Francisco, because this is a topic area I'm not real familiar with. So - and I'm sure he's more knowledgeable in that area.

So just to summarize from today, action items for staff on - I'll work on an announcement and the information for the public forum box and send around something I would say in the next day or two to the working group members to take a look at, and I'll also ask about translation and how quickly we might be able to get that started as well to help inform us as to the length for the public comment period.

And Steve, if you could incorporate the final changes into the report and send it to me, I'll take a look at it as well to get it finalized.

Steve Shang: Sure. I can do that today.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Thanks. And then if you - would you be able to take a first cut at some slides based on the report?

Steve Shang: Sure.

Julie Hedlund: I think...

Steve Shang: How many slides are we - do we want?

Julie Hedlund: Well, I don't think we want too many. I think the period of time, we probably only really want to talk for maybe - on the slides for maybe - I'd say maybe 15 or 20 minutes, and then allow the balance of time - for the GNSO Council, I think we have 30 minutes scheduled. For the public session, we have 45 minutes scheduled. But I think what we really want to do is try to focus on you know, actually the main points and give over much of the time to discussion.

Steve Shang: Okay. That's fine. So probably 10 to 15 slides, (unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: Yes. I'd probably say even closer to ten...

Steve Shang: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: And, you'll have a sense of whether or not the material really lends itself to being that short. We don't want to cut out too many - but...

Steve Shang: Sure.

Julie Hedlund: ...we can always start longer and cut back too.

Steve Shang: Sure. Sure. That's true.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. And, I do have a question for you Edmon. Certainly, staff can give the presentation to the GNSO Council, but I didn't know if you were planning on being in Cartagena, and whether or not you would like to give the presentation for - at the GNSO Council meeting? And, I can find out exactly - very soon I think we'll know exactly when it's scheduled, but it's either Saturday or Sunday.

Edmon Chung: I'm happy to do it. I do plan to be in Cartagena.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. Well, we'll - I'll let you know as soon as we get the schedule finalized, and I'll check with Glen de Saint Gery, because I think she's been tracking that. And of course, both Steve and I will be there to assist you as well.

Edmon Chung: Cool.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. And then, our next meeting, just as a reminder, will be on the 22nd at this same time, and we can do - we'll have the slides out before then, as soon as we can, and give everybody a chance to look at them and comment on them prior to the next meeting. And then, Steve Shang has agreed to check with Francisco on issues relating to the data (escrow) and IDN variants with the new gTLD process.

Is there anything else that I've missed?

Then, I want to thank everyone. It's about a minute after the hour, so thank you for taking the time today. And, I hope you all have a good morning, afternoon, or evening.

Avri Doria: Bye.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Thanks everyone.

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you, (Trey).

END