

**GNSO/SSAC
International Registration Data Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 24 November at 14:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO/SSAC International Registration Data Working Group on 24 November 2009, 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://gns0.icann.org/calendar/index.html#nov>
<http://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-sti-20091124.mp3>

All recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO calendar page:
<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/>

Present for the teleconference:

Edmon Chung -- GNSO Registry Stakeholder Group, .ASIA
Steve Crocker, Chair, SSAC, Shinkuro
Rafik Dammak -- GNSO Non-Commercial Users Stakeholder Group
Avri Doria -- GNSO Non-Commercial Users Stakeholder Group
Bob Hutchinson, GNSO Commercial Stakeholder Group
Yao Jiankang, GNSO Registry Stakeholder Group, CNNIC
Andrei Kolesnikov -- Nominating Committee Appointee, .RU
Mark Koster -- SSAC, ARIN
Steven Metalitz -- GNSO Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial Stakeholder Group
June Seo, GNSO Registry Stakeholder Group, VeriSign

ICANN Staff

Francisco Arias
Glen de Saint- Géry
Liz Gasster
Gisella Gruber-White
Julie Hedlund
Dave Piscitello
Steve Sheng

Absent apologies:

Erick Iriarte Ahon - ALAC, LACTLD

Coordinator: Thank you. We are now recording.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. Gisella, would you be so kind as to do the roll call?

Gisella Gruber-White: Absolutely. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's IRD call Tuesday the 24th of November. We have Yao Jiankang, Rafik Dammak, Robert Hutchinson, June Seo Steve Crocker, Mark Kusters, Avri Doria, Edmund Chung, Steve Metalitz, and from staff we have Julie Hedlund, Liz Gasster, Dave Piscitello, Francisco Arias, Steve Sheng, Glen de Saint Gery and myself Gisella Gruber-White.

And if I could just remind everyone to state their names when speaking, this is for transcript purposes. No apologies for today's call. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Gisella. I really appreciate your help. And thank you everyone who has joined the call today. I do appreciate it. I know it is not an ideal time for some of you. And one of our first orders of business will be to discuss the scheduling of these calls.

I want to welcome everyone to the Kick off Meeting Call of the Internalized Registration Data Working Group. And as you know, this group was created as directed by the ICANN Board in a resolution on June 26th that the Security and Stability Advisory Committee and the Generic Name Supporting Organization would convene an Internationalized Registration Data Working Group to be comprised of individuals with the knowledge, expertise and experience in studying the feasibilities of introducing display specifications to deal with Internationalized Registration Data.

So, that being said, if you are – if it is not the call you want to be on I apologize but we are ready to get this group started and thank you very much for being here.

I would like to just briefly like to go over the draft agenda and see if any of you have any changes or additions that you would like to make to the agenda.

I had thought that we should talk about developing a schedule for these calls. We do have people from a number of time zones and fairly widely scattered across the globe. So I think we will want to talk about how we might be able to come up with a schedule that can accommodate people as best as possible.

And another order of business would be for us to discuss the selection of a Chair or Co-Chairs. And actually the charter talks about the possibility of Co-Chairs but we can discuss that in turn.

I thought we could also speak about the charter in general and perhaps some changes we might want to make to it. It is a draft charter as approved by the SSAC and the GNSO.

And finally if we could speak about a work plan or a timeline for our deliverables. And I should note that this meeting is scheduled for 90 minutes and we will try to end promptly.

Are there any changes or questions about the agenda? Thank you very much. Then perhaps we shall go ahead and get started and talk a little bit about the scheduling. As you know we began by circulating an online Doodle Poll to try to come up with a time that was suitable for most people. But I understand that it is not ideal for some of you.

What we had thought we could do, and I am happy to discuss options and other ideas, is to perhaps see if we could pick a day of the week that might be most suitable and perhaps a range of times or a time if there is a time that people feel that that could work for everyone. Are there any thoughts on this? Don't all speak at...

Edmund Chung: This is Edmund speaking.

Julie Hedlund: I am sorry. Who is this?

Edmund Chung: Yes. This is Edmund.

Julie Hedlund: Oh Edmund. Thank you very much. Hi.

Edmund Chung: Well I think those of you who have been on calls with me know that though I am in Hong Kong I actually generally prefer late at night. So sometime around this time is okay and in fact I am okay with maybe a couple of hours later even. So just want to, you know, let everybody know if you are thinking that late at night is not a good time for me, it is actually a pretty good time for me. So.

Julie Hedlund: (Yau) I think it is also late for you. How does this time suit you?

Yao Jiankang: They were perfect for me. I operate (edimer) and midnight is also okay for me. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. Do we have others? Let's see. I know Rafik you are in Japan. How does this time work for you?

Rafik Dammak: Oh yes. It is okay but just maybe not on Tuesdays.

Julie Hedlund: But maybe not Tuesdays.

Rafik Dammak: Not Tuesday but on other days it is okay.

Julie Hedlund: I know that if we did schedule it this time, it is quite early on the West coast of the United States but it is not a bad time for Europe. And we do have some people who might be participating from Europe as well. Do others have a preference as far as time of day?

So we could say that 9:00 o'clock to 10:30 at least as a starting point. And I am only saying that, you know, we could start with this. And of course we

have the prerogative to change our schedule. It is just a little bit easier to schedule these meetings if we can select a time that stays the same.

But I noted that for Rafik Tuesdays are not good. We could possibly look at, you know, any other day of the week, Wednesday through Thursday. Do people have preferences? And of course we can start with a day we can, you know, try a day. And we can – I can do a Doodle Poll for this next meeting, but what we are trying to avoid is doing a Doodle Poll for every meeting.

For instance, and well this raises the question too is do people have a preference of meeting weekly or every other week? Is weekly too frequent?

Edmund Chung: Oh this is Edmund again.

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Edmund Chung: I guess it really depends on the anticipated workload in terms of whether weekly or, you know, bi-weekly. The up thing is that poll for Thursday we – there is, you know, once in a while there will be the GNSO Council meeting. So...

Julie Hedlund: Yes. This is just – that is a very good point Edmund. Thank you. Yes. Weekly might be a little – we could start with bi-weekly. And I know on some of the other working groups that I have participated in, we have started on a bi-weekly schedule. And then if there is, you know, a rush to complete a deliverable, then we have switched to a weekly schedule. And that seems to work well.

So I would suggest then of course again it is up to you as this is your working group perhaps on a bi-weekly schedule. And since there is a pos – well there will be a possible conflict with GNSO Council meetings on Thursday, I could suggest Wednesdays. Do people have any thoughts on that?

Steve Metalitz: Julie as you know, we have (Set Back) meetings on Wednesdays I think at 10:00. And so if we run from 9:00 to 10:30, that would be a bit of a problem.

Julie Hedlund: That is true. Thank you Steve for reminding me of that. How could I forget that? What about Mondays or Fridays? Sometimes we try to avoid those days for some people, but just anything thoughts there?

Those of you who are on the call, let me put it this way. If we were to have a call in two weeks time, and so we would be looking at – our next call would be in December. And if it were in two weeks time then we would be looking at – if we were looking at a Monday or a Friday we would be looking at the 7th of December at 9:00 o'clock or the 11th of December at 9:00 o'clock.

Mark Kusters: Julie this is (Mark Kusters:I am wondering if I could suggest offering a Doodle Poll. I – we all have varied degrees of schedules around the world. And it may be there would be something that could coalesce because there is better days and better times for me than others. I am sure that is true with everybody else on the call. And it is hard to get all that stuff just calling out. Now, but we – although we do have good guidance from what I have heard from people in Asia.

Julie Hedlund: Right. Thank you for that (Mark). Yes we – I can do a Doodle Poll for this next meeting but what I would like to see happen is that we settle on a time...

((Crosstalk))

Mark Kusters: Well maybe you could use a Doodle Poll to say well okay here is the preference of when would we like to meet.

Julie Hedlund: Right. I could suggest maybe that 9:00 o'clock I think sounds like it could be a good time and I could suggest 9:00 o'clock on the 7th or the 11th and – well and – well for that following week. And if there are other days too that work for people, perhaps accepting...

Mark Kusters: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: I will try that and perhaps then we can settle on a time. It is – (Mark) I – you may not – many of the people on this call may not be aware of this, especially those coming in from the ASFAC side. The GNSO currently has I think more than 16 of these working groups running.

Mark Kusters: Wow.

Julie Hedlund: And so that is why we try to avoid doing a Doodle Poll every time we are setting up a call because we are actually trying to fit these calls in amongst the other GNSO calls for those people who are GNSO people on this call who will be on other GNSO calls. So it makes it a bit complicated.

In any case, I will go ahead and do that so that we can move on because I do not want to take more time with this. So why don't I do that and then we will see if we can from that settle on a time.

But I must say thank you very much for this discussion because I think maybe we have settled a few of the issues concerning the schedule. Did anybody have anything else they wanted to add on the schedule before we move on?

Thank you very much. So our next item of business is to talk about possible Co-Chairs for this group. The draft charter that was approved by the SSAC and the GNSO suggests electing Co-Chairs from the GNSO and SSAC.

We do have several people on the work team who are from GNSO and some also from SSAC. And so I would like to ask here if there is any interest among those of you who are on this call to be a Co-Chair on this work team or to suggest the people that you think might be interested.

Edmund Sheng: Hi this is Edmund. I just want to – I just have a question actually. So – oh hello?

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Edmund Sheng: Oh okay. I was wondering...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Excuse me. I am sorry.

Edmund Sheng: ...if anybody heard me. The question is is the GNSO Council supposed to pick a Co-Chair or we will just give them your – take somebody from, you know, and then be SSAC.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Edmund that is the quest – this is Julie. That is a good question. No. The working group chooses its own Chairs. So the Council, GNSO Council does not have to approve the Chair and the SSAC does not have to approve the Chair.

And so...

Edmund Sheng: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: ...that is entirely up to this work team to pick the chairs. Other questions?

Yao Jiankang This is (Yau Yun Kong) and my question...

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Yao Jiankang ...is how many Co-Chairs will we need, you know, one, two, three?

Julie Hedlund: The charter says will elect Co-Chairs. And it is – and also it says I am sorry, I forget the place. I believe it is one from each. One from GNSO and one from SSAC.

Yao Jiankang Oh I see because that means we, you know, two Chairs, two Co-Chairs.

Julie Hedlund: Right. Two Co-Chairs. You are absolutely right. Sorry not be do more.

Yao Jiankang Okay.

Julie Hedlund: We – in working through the draft charter with the SSAC and the GNSO, the idea the Co-Chairs was that while we could have a Chair and a Vice-Chair, because this is a joint GNSO SSAC effort, we felt that it was more appropriate to have Co-Chair positions, one from each.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: I am...excuse me. I am looking – this is Julie – I am looking at the charter again. It does not say how many but I think it is something this team can determine or not whether it would be two Co-Chairs.

Liz Gasster: Julie it is Liz.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Thank you.

Liz Gasster: One thing that might be helpful is just to talk a little bit about the responsibilities of the Chair because I would not want people to feel too daunted by volunteering in terms of the responsibilities of the Chair.

I mean obviously there are responsibilities in terms of leading the group and managing the meetings, but we do try very hard in terms of the staff to

support the Chair and the group. There is quite a few staff people on this call just as an example.

And I would not want anyone to be deterred from throwing their name in or a colleague's name in because of concerns about what is really being asked of them. Not to say that there isn't work involved but just that we would do everything we can to facilitate and support the Chair.

But we just need – we do someone or two people in this case ideally to, you know, act as conveners and be focal points for communicating back to each of the respective communities.

And I think the ideas of Co-Chairs is to share the load and ensure that there is good perspective from broad communities, the technical community and the (G tail D) community.

So I just want to put a little advertisement in not to be hesitate if you are in, you know, really what we are looking for is someone that, you know, understands the issue and cares about it and think that they can lead the group or jointly lead the group through a work plan that – to a successful outcome in terms of examining what the Board is asking this group to do.

So, you know, I would view it very much as a, you know, that substantive kind of perspective and the staff will do everything they can to minimize, you know, any other work that comes up in terms of organizing and taking notes and those kinds of things.

Julie Hedlund: Hello. This is Julie. Thank you so much. That is a very, very good point. And I am looking at the charter here which does state that the Co-Chair shall have the primary leadership responsibility for the work group and that the Co-Chairs are encouraged to collaborate with one another and with staff support personnel in leading the work group.

And as Liz said, and very, you know, very important point that there is staff (who work) for Chairs and we are here to help and it is really more of a sort of a leadership and communications function and coordinating with your respective organizations, GNSO or SSAC on the issues that the...

Liz Gasster: And it is Liz. Just one more comment I want to make that I am being reminded of which is that this is also a topic that is important to the other NSOs and ACs. And the charter does look to this group to interact with and pursue input from the ALAC and the GAC and the CCNSO. So I think that would be another role that the Chair would want to make sure to be inclusive in that respect and think in terms of a work plan that involves those participants. So another facet of the function.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Liz. This is Julie. Thank you. With that being said, do others have questions or comments or ideas concerning the Co-Chairs?

Edmund Chung: Hi. This is Edmund again. I am happy to, you know, try to liaise to GNSO what is happening here and, you know, try to get participation from different people. I mean that is true.

The only thing, you know, in terms the Co-Chair role, I guess one of the things that is in the back of my mind is that there are a few (IDN) related issues that – items that are being, you know, that are being tried to be progressed.

If they do become something, then it is just their timing arrangement issue that would make it more tough than what it is right now than I can handle.

Liz Gasster: So Edmund, it is Liz. You would be okay with the liaison rule which is another...

((Crosstalk))

Edmund Chung: Yes. I am happy to...

Liz Gasster: ...position that is called for in the charter which would be wonderful to have that liaison back to the Council as well.

Edmund Chung: But...

Julie Hedlund: Yes. This is Julie. Edmund were you suggesting you would like the liaison role or were you suggesting that you would be interested in being a Co-Chair but we would need to recognize the fact that I know you are involved in other groups and that there could be some difficulty with your time and participation in these other groups?

Edmund Chung: So basically what I am suggesting that I am – I think at this point in time, I am happy to do either or both. But if things change later, you know, maybe liaising back to the GNSO is one of the areas that I can definitely do.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Edmund. This is Julie. Thank you. Are there any others from the GNSO side who might be interested in Co-Chairing or do others feel that it would be fine for Edmund to be the Co-Chair at this point from the GNSO?

Edmund I think it sounds like the job is yours if you would like it. Recognize that...

Edmund Chung: Thank you. I appreciate that and I am happy to sort of in the role. As I mentioned, you know, I will definitely let people know if time becomes an issue and I will leave it to the group. And at that time I think others from GNSO if they have the time and are willing to serve will – it will be great to step up.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. That – this is Julie. Thank you Edmund. That is very helpful. Well why don't we then go ahead and start with you in the role as Co-Chair from

the GNSO and thank you very, very much. And we understand that your ability to commit to this might change depending on the workload for you and that we may need others to step up and assist.

And keeping in mind that our charter does not restrict us to two Co-Chairs, conceivably we could have somebody who is also working with you in this close to the role from the GNSO. Thank you.

Do we have someone who is an SSAC member who would be interested in being a Co-Chair who is on this call? And I need to remind myself who we have on the call from SSAC.

Steve Metalitz: I think it is only me. It is Steve.

Julie Hedlund: Yes I think it is actually. Unfortunately no, I know that (Jeremy) had hopes to be able to join.

Man: I think (Mark) is also.

Julie Hedlund: Oh yes (Mark) I am sorry. I did not mean to overlook you.

Steve Metalitz: I think (Mark) has distinguished himself here with active work in this area. He is clearly the obvious choice.

Julie Hedlund: Well thank you Steve. That is a resounding nomination. (Mark)?

Mark Kusters: Yes. I am hearing that. I do not think I could do justice though unfortunately given my current workload. And actually, I – all right, I do not think it would be a good idea. I would be happy to be a liaison, but I do not think I could be a Co-Chair.

Dave Piscitello: Julie there are probably others who are not on this meeting who, from SSAC, who might be willing to join and participate. And there is certainly

considerable interest in the committee. You know, perhaps if it is appropriate to move forward with Edmund at this time and see if there was somebody from SSAC or perhaps one of the other (FOs) or (ACs) that might be interested.

I know that this topic is important to the GAC and the CCNSO as well. And so it is not just to, you know, the GNSO and SSAC that that will contribute here.

Julie Hedlund: Dave thank you very much. I agree that we have several other SSAC members who I know had wanted to be on this call. And I think we should give them the chance to see whether or not they might be interested in this role as well.

So let's defer this question and it also can be a matter that we can discuss on the list if we wish. And Dave I suggest too that we could, in the meantime prior to next call, talk to some of the other SSAC members and other SONAC people who had indicated an interest in this group to see who might be interested in that Co-Chair position.

Any other thoughts on Co-Chairs before we move ahead? And thank you very much Edmund Chung.

All right. Thank you everyone. Then moving ahead, the next item of business was to take a look at our charter, our draft charter. And I wanted to point out a few things for discussion, and also to note some areas where we could possibly make changes if the working group would like.

The first point I would like to make is that this is a draft charter. It has not been approved by this working group. It has been – the draft charter has been by the GNSO and SSAC, but that does not preclude this group from making changes.

And if you have looked at the charter, you have seen that there are a number of TBDs in it, things to be determined, that we need to discuss as a working group. And so that is another reason why it is a draft.

So I thought we could go through the charter and answer any questions you may have with it, note some areas that need to be updated and then work – and then we could move on a work plan. And that actually – the work plan and timeline and deliverables is actually a part of the charter. So we could walk through this and get to that section and then talk about some things that we would like to do as a working group.

First of all, are there any overall questions concerning the charter – just any general questions? All right, thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Um, nothing).

Julie Hedlund: The charter has – begins with some background information on the working group. None of that – it is all just basic information, nothing that we need to change. It simply states why the working group was created, how it was created and what its purpose is. I think – so that is Section 1.0.

If we move on to Section 2.0, Working Group Identification, then we come to some of the areas where we as a working group can make some changes to the charter. And these are points that we are already in the – we have already had some discussion on.

As you note in this section, there are Co-Chairs from the SSAC and GNSO that is – in the draft is indicated as TBD but now we can happily add Edmund Chung as our Co-Chair from the GNSO.

We also in this working group can have liaisons to the various (SOs) and (ACs) in ICANN. And so there is someone who doesn't feel that they necessarily have time to, you know, be a Co-Chair, they certainly can be a liaison.

And the third point is that if we feel that there are people with a particular expertise who might assist the work of this group, we can have advisors to this working group. Right now we do not have any advisors but – and if anyone knows of anyone who might be able to assist in the work, and this might come later on as we identify the work plan and the deliverables, we certainly can have advisors to work with us. Any questions on this – on that section?

Following on in Section 2, and this information is something we can update now and that is that we do now have a URL for the IRD-WG Wiki workspace. And I understand that some people have had difficulty getting on the workspace so we are getting that technical issue is taken care of.

We do have the email list established. And we do have a repository of the mail, of the archive established as well. So as staff we can update those aspects of the charter easily. Any questions?

So the next section is 3.0 which is the mission, purpose and deliverables. And this is obviously a very important part of the charter and of the working group. The scope, mission and focus areas are to study the feasibility and suitability of introducing display specifications to deal with the internationalization registration data.

And I note here that this working group can and shall solicit input from all interested constituencies including CCTLD operators, the CCNSO, ASO, ALAC and GAC. In other words, the working group should and can reach out to all interested organizations within ICANN to assist in the work of this. Any questions on that?

Mark Kusters: This is (Mark Costericks) Julie. I am looking at this and this really has really two components of it. I mean it needs to be tussled out a little bit more. And the first part is one that is really thorny. And that is what is the mandatory elements that you need to display?

Julie Hedlund: Um-hmm.

Mark Kusters: And that is really the social data and how that is actually – and what are the mandatory requirements, optional and that sort of that. Does each domain registration have to have an organization or user associated with it for example.

The second part of it is okay, what is the protocol that you need to use to actually – to facilitate the display of international character sets? And that is sort of a separate issue. And it is really two separate parties that are – that need to make that decision up.

Julie Hedlund: Two separate parties for these two elements?

Mark Kusters: Yes. Well the first part is really – you have the registrars who collect some information. You have law enforcement agencies who want various types of information. And then you have those individual users who may not want to share that information as well as organizations.

So that is – those are sort of – the social information is not, to me, is not of interest. What is interest is the protocols that – in which all this stuff can actually sit on top of, and making sure that all happens because we actually have multiple issues that are kind of like tied up in this study.

Julie Hedlund: (Mark) thank you very much for that. So, if – this is Julie. So it is really the second...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...the protocol to facilitate the display of character sets that is the primary focus of this team?

Mark Kusters: Well that is a question because there is things like postal codes and that sort of thing in terms of standards that I know that Dave has brought up before. But I am just wondering if – how wide is the scope and whether or not that is too wide.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. That is a very, very good question since we are on the issue of scope. And as I do not have the technical expertise in this area, Dave might I call on you to see if you have some ideas, and also others who – anyone else on the working group of course. But from a staffing – a staff point of view when we were developing the charter, I am just wondering Dave if you have something you would like to add.

Dave Piscitello: I am thinking. I think part of the objective here as (Mark) says is, you know, is to tease up two separate issues. One is understanding what data we want to collect and display and the other is understanding the message of delivery.

The standards that we – that we mentioned in the presentations that staff gave both in a Webinar and in Seoul were more or less, you know, you know, outreach to look to see if there were other paradigms. They were not necessarily, you know, indicative of, you know, of the direction. But just try and understand how communities try to solve the multi-language problem.

I think certainly having, you know, having spent some time following, you know, following (Mark's), you know, mention of the way (Erin) does their RWS, you know, WHOIS service and then taking a look at some of the other, you know, other alternatives to (Iris) and (Chris) than listening to the communities, you know, our reservations about those protocols, I think that they would be in play.

And in fact, one of the reasons why I was having a side conversation with (Mark) was to, you know, just to learn a little bit more about some of the implementation experience.

I also think it is very valuable to, you know, to take a look at more carefully the way many of the CCTLD operators are already managing, you know, managing this issue. And in fact you do see some people who are doing some of the things that are similar to what (Erin) is doing or what the other (RARs) are doing.

Lastly I think it is valuable to consider the optimality that might exist if we were to have a single convert standard that would allow people to have a common (duit) platform for both (immeneck) number registries and domain names.

Mark Kusters: Okay. So this is...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Dave. I appreciate that. I am sorry, (Mark) is that you?

Mark Kusters: Yes. And so let me rephrase this. Is this something that we want to actually have – try to attempt to have a uniform schema or is this something that we want to actually say okay here is a various sort of platforms that we have looked at in which that we can – that can actually solve the internationalized WHOIS sort of issue. And here is one that we think is best that the community ought to use.

And they are really two different – there are two different sort of questions. The first one is mandatory – mandating some sort of schema. The second one is okay schema aside, you guys figure that out in the political process.

Here is a bunch of different technologies that actually can solve this and this is what we will recommend.

Dave Piscitello: So I do not want an...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Yes and then – please let me introduce yourself to the scribe. Thanks.

Dave Piscitello: This is Dave Piscitello again. And I do not want to monopolize the conversation. I do want to make an observation that one of the important, you know, one of the important motivations here was to, you know, to make certain that there was a commondative data if not a schema that would be – that would continue to be automatable in the manner that people have attempted to automate for WHOIS on – in domain names thus far to do things like detection of abuse and other, you know, other data lining applications that are appropriate for WHOIS.

So to answer your question (Mark), I think that having a data schema as a, you know, as a goal would be a good thing. I don't know if it is a necessary thing. I do think that it may be well be the case that if we do not have a data schema, what we might want in the (RAA) or in some other policy document is an enumeration of the data elements just as we have today. And that doesn't necessarily mean it is going to be an XML, you know, XML schema or other schema but at least it would be an enumeration of the data that we want captured.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. Thank you Dave. Others I am – we invite others to comment here. I think this is a very important point. We do really need to tie down the scope and the questions that we want this working group to address. Please others...

((Crosstalk))

Edmund Chung: This is Edmund. I still have a couple of how should I say more process oriented question. I do not know whether I want to interject here or (Mark) and Dave have further comments on.

Julie Hedlund: Please go ahead with your questions.

Edmund Chung: Okay. So, just looking at the sort of the scope and timelines, from the charter there are certain things like a – like a work (shop) and stuff. Do we consider that already done in Seoul or are we supposed to – is that doesn't count or how does the timeframe and deliverables work right now?

The other question is we are talking about the scope. The group itself is a set in GNSO. We do talk a little bit about getting CCNSO involved as well. But is this something that would have implications to CCTLDs as well? Is this something that ICANN is interested to recommend to CCTLDs to use as well? So.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. I can answer your first question easily. The workshop in Seoul was a deliverable for this working group. It is a little confusing because the charter as I think you have noted was approved back in September. And some of the deliverables were then approved, including the Webinar and the workshop in Seoul both of which have been completed and, you know, will be indicated as such here in the charter...

Edmund Chung: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: ...really looking at the following on from that.

With respect to your second question and the impact on CCTLD, I am wondering if someone else on the staff or in the working group would like to address that because I do not quite know the answer to that.

Andrei Kolesnikov: (Andre).

Julie Hedlund: I am sorry. Was – that was (Andre)?

Andrei Kolesnikov It is (Andre) yes.

Julie Hedlund: Oh thanks – thank you for joining. I am sorry. I did not realize you were here.
Thank you.

Andrei Kolesnikov No. I am just listening. Regarding the particular – the practical implication, it might not be CCNSO related, but just to let you know that we in the practical implementation of the WHOIS data and the WHOIS outputs and the protocols and the Web interfaces and the data fields. So all I can say that all the group can utilize our practical experience since we gain some data on, you know, how good it is, how back it is within a few months starting tomorrow because tomorrow we start the priority registration and it will be practical. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: (Andre) thank you very much. This is Julie. Thank you.

Andre Kolesnikov Um-hmm.

Julie Hedlund: Are there others who would like to comment on the question concerning the impact and the scope of this as far as engaging other (SOs) and (ACs)?

Oh this is Julie. I think we have got then a couple of things on the table. I think (Andre) has made the good point that this group can look at the practical experience in the CCTLDs now. And Dave and (Mark) have noted some questions about the scope of this group.

And that – the question being whether or not there should be a mandatory schema and perhaps that is a goal of this group if not a requirement. But I think as Dave had noted, it would be useful to have an enumeration of data elements.

What does this working group think as far as flushing out a little bit more in the charter perhaps these two items and whether or not we want to go as far as saying that this group would try to come up with a mandatory schema or whether or not we want to back off on that a little bit.

I would say that is an important point that we should try to nail down, but others can correct me.

Edmund Chung: This is Edmund. I am wondering whether, you know, how we should really go about this is, you know, whether we should jump right into the data elements and schema or do we want to go to take a look at the parameters that we are working with.

We are talking about WHOIS, but I guess there are other potential delivery protocols. Do we look at that all or we are focusing on whatever is the WHOIS protocol right now?

Julie Hedlund: Edmund that is a very good question.

Steve Crocker: This is Steve Crocker. I would recommend at least briefly a fresh start approach of laying out what the requirements ought to be. And in – for my taste, I would like to see something that is extensible and can handle both current and future needs across different scripts and cultures, contact information of both the existing kinds of physical address and phone number, fax and so forth and any future contact points.

I mean, just to stimulate discussion suppose there comes a day when everybody has some sort of instant messaging handle that is different and distinct from an email address. Would we want to have a way of putting that into the schema? And I think the answer is yes. I am not suggesting that seriously, just as a way of stimulating discussion.

I think that we also need to be able to handle various forms of tiered or selective access with appropriate controls. Ultimately this is not the right group to do a technical design that goes through the whole standardization process. That has to go through the ITF. But I think this could be a group that sets, stacks and either does a design or (stins) up a design team that does some sort of prototype design or puts together the appropriate ideas.

I do not want to just wander around the problem or grab at existing solutions or ask how we are going to tweak WHOIS. The transition problem of how to get from wherever we are now to wherever we want to go is not a trivial problem. And I think we all have to agree to that.

But I do not want to be burdened by saying well it is going to be too hard to make any changes, therefore we are going to live with what we have. I think the first thing to do is figure out where we would like – ideally like to go and then also keep enough energy in reserve to plot out the transition process from here to there.

Avri Doria: Hi this is Avri.

Julie Hedlund: Please go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes. I would definitely like to endorse that. I think to limit this group to any existing pool and sort of that would be to sort of negate the work that it really needs to do. I think we have to take a full and careful look at what needs to be captured and how it needs to be, you know, stored, processed, whatever and then find is there, you know, an existing solution or does one need to be developed.

But I think creating the specifications or at least the recommended specification of what needs to be there is something that should be a scope. And as I kind of thought it was in defining the charter, but that was ages ago so I am not sure I remember correctly. Oh this is Avri Doria.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Avri. I think both Steve and Avri – this is Julie – have – Steve and Avri have made some very important points with respect to the scope of work for the team. I would like to hear others on this call if you could respond to that?

Steve Metalitz: Julie this is Steve Metalitz.

Julie Hedlund: Hello Steve. Thank you. Go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: I just wanted to say that I do not think that determining what would be the content of WHOIS really was – is within the scope of this group. As I read the charter it is dealing with the feasibility and suitability of introducing display specifications. And it talks about achieving consensus on the typed kinds and encodings of registration data.

So, I do not think that necessarily means that this group would – I do not think it means this group would get into exactly what is collected, how that is different from what is collected today and what is displayed and how that is different from what is displayed today.

Julie Hedlund: Steve.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: But it is more of a technical mandate.

Julie Hedlund: Steve thank you very much for that. That is a very good point. Others have comments?

Yao Jiankang This is (Yau Yun Kong) from (Sing). My comment is since this was our working group, work that we are in (unintelligible) who is protocol in ITF and the willingness (unintelligible) ITF or some (unintelligible) ITF as publish our

research result. And in future we pursue to publish as (unintelligible). Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: (Yau) that is a very good question. This is Julie. Thank you very much. I think that is a good question because – and it gets to the point of what our expected deliverable would be. As described in the draft charter, there would be a deliverable of an initial study from this working group which would go out for a public comment period within the ICANN public comment forum and then a final study that would be submitted to the GNSO and SSAC for consideration.

But I think your question was do we also then need to coordinate or publish our research in the IETF.

Yao Jiankang Yes I...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: And I do not know the answer to that. Do others have comments on this?

Edmund Chung: Julie this is Edmund. Hello?

Julie Hedlund: Hello Edmund. Yes. Please go ahead.

Edmund Chung: Yes. I actually have a comment on Steve's earlier comment. So I didn't want to interrupt your question about the IETF saying that.

Julie Hedlund: That is okay. Please Edmund go ahead.

Edmund Chung: Okay. I agree with Steve in general. There is one point though. In terms of data elements, there might be – I am just thinking out loud right now actually, sorry about that – that there are possibilities where we might want additional data for internationalized versions.

For example, you know, we might ask for an ASCII only version and then a national insertion for whatever purpose. So I do not think that would be out of scope of what we might discuss. So it is not entirely just display or technically displaying at least as far as I am – I, you know, I am looking at it. I do not know whether that makes sense to others.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can I add something?

Julie Hedlund: Yes please Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: On – this is Avri Doria. On both of those issues I think and perhaps I do (unintelligible). I do not think that this group needs to decide exactly what needs to be there. I do think this group needs to look at what kind of things needs to be there because it is impossible to specify the rest of it without knowing that you need certain kinds of data and they will be cover the exact listing of content is yes that is a different entirely recognized issue.

But the kind of content that may need to be specified and contained within a database and retrieve from a database I think is necessary. I think if we do not know what kinds of things we are talking about, then there is really very little we can do. We do not know what we want – what kinds of things we may want to do with those things. Again it becomes difficult to specify anything.

I think in terms of the IETF and publishing something, I think that is a question that can wait later. I think if we have something at the end that says, you know, we need some work done in the following and here is kind of our first take at the kinds of things that that work would involve in terms of protocol or what have you.

I think that certainly we can and should put something forward there. But I think that the size that we got that at the beginning in and I don't know that we need to do that.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. Thank you very much Avri. That was a helpful – very helpful comment. Do others have comments concerning this discussion now with respect to scope?

Steve Sheng: Hi Julie this is Steve Sheng.

Julie Hedlund: Yes Steve, please go ahead.

Steve Sheng: Just kind of two backgrounds points. So, the context is the GNSO is doing five WHOIS studies. And the fourth one is with regard to the hypothesis originally submitted at – the use of (IBM) characters in TLDs will impair the accuracy and with ability of WHOIS records displaying the domain name, email address and name server address.

And that was one of the hypothesis that GNSO asked for a study. And I think that is one of the reasons for this working group so there is some information.

With regard to Dr. (Parker's) point of starting a fresh, you know, think about the kind of requirements that we need. So that is the last in the set of five WHOIS studies, the last one the Council asked the staff to compile a list of kind of technical requirements for improving WHOIS.

So in that requirement, you know, we will, you know, I am primary responsible for that. So in that requirement we will talk about, you know, tiered access. So just to want to bring up those two points.

Julie Hedlund: Steve that is extremely helpful and I think a very important point to note that there is ongoing work with respect to the – to that particular requirement. Do we have other comments with respect to scope and how we want to maybe what we want to focus on first?

I am hearing that we might want to take a fresh look at this, perhaps not in defining content, but perhaps in looking at the kinds of things that need to be there, if not the exact things that need to be there. And waiting until later on the question of whether or not we would have something that we would need to use to engage with IETF depending on the outcome of our studies. Any other thoughts in this area?

So, my next question is then, how do we want to proceed as a working group? We are committed in the draft charter to a study. And the timeline for that study is to be released sometime in December which I think would be now rather difficult.

And so we need to adjust the dates. But I think we need to frame the problem and how to address it first. Of course others can correct me if I am wrong. I think that as a, you know, as an outside goal, we have a next ICANN meeting in Nyrobi in March. And so we may want to, once we have framed our – the questions we want to address in the study, we could look at a timeline for perhaps achieving a deliverable that might be able to be presented before Nyrobi or at Nyrobi.

But I think from my personal opinion, we need to tie down exactly what we want this group to look at. And I am hearing some very good ideas here. What do you think? Other comments on scope? Do we feel that we have some good – some places to start here as far as rewriting the scope of this group and making it a little bit more specific in the charter with respect to exactly what we are addressing?

We want to narrow – make sure that we are specific about the scope and that we are not dealing with determining the content. We are looking at the feasibility display of specification types and kinds and display data but not the content but perhaps looking at the kinds of things that we want to be there. Does that seem to be an accurate statement?

I think we have tried to capture that to a certain extent in the charter but did we need to make that language a little more specific or do people feel that this charter is acceptable as written as far as the scope?

Andrei Kolesnikov Yes. I would need the more clear specification. It is (Andre).

Julie Hedlund: (Andre)? A little more clear specification.

Andrei Kolesnikov Yes. I would like to have more clear statements and more clear areas of the work group scope...

Julie Hedlund: Um-hmm. Okay.

Andrei Kolesnikov ...defining what we are dealing with technical specifications or content. So important.

Julie Hedlund: Right. Okay. So both the technical specifications and saying something...

((Crosstalk))

Andrei Kolesnikov And/or content.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. And/or content.

Andrei Kolesnikov Um-hmm.

Julie Hedlund: Other thoughts? Thank you (Andre).

Edmund Chung: This is Edmund. I guess – I apologize. I haven't seen enough attention or focus on this development. But I was just wondering the fact study on some of the display standards and, you know, how CCTLDs are doing some of the things today. Has that been compiled and where can we find that information?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. Dave did you want to speak to that?

Dave Piscitello: I did not hear the question. I am sorry. I cannot, you know, could you...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead Edmund. Sorry.

Edmund Chung: Yes. Just quickly. But in the sort of scope (pondit) it says staff would study some existing sort of models like the international mail, like some of what other – what current – what CCTLDs are doing currently. I was just wondering whether that report is – has been compiled or, you know, where to find it.

Dave Piscitello: Oh okay. Well there was a – we did not actually do a report so much as reported through a Webinar and at Seoul.

Edmund Chung: Okay.

Dave Piscitello: We haven't actually done a formal poll of – or survey of all the CCTLDs to understand how they are dealing with this today. And my sense is that, you know, that a significant number of TLD operators are not yet addressing, you know, addressing the issue but are only collecting, you know, standard ASCII or local language.

So I – if committee wants, I think that we could certainly reach out to the CCNSO support staff and get some assistance in getting a more formal, you know, formal collection than the anecdotal collection that Steve Sheng and I obtained in August in September.

With respect to looking at farther alternatives, you know, there isn't much more to look at from what the UPU does. And the only other – not only but the other element that we have been exploring considering was mentioned in

Seoul by (Mark Costericks) and that was using an XML, you know, you know, data structure or schema over HTTP as one alternative. And that same – the same schema could be delivered over Port 33 and the Part 543 – 43 application.

If you are interested in having staff compile a brief statement of those alternatives, I am sure that we can do that.

Edmund Chung: No no. I was just wondering. I now recall the Webinar that I selected to. And I think that that presentation might be useful. I do not know whether it could be found somewhere. Is – because I think that is – those are the stuff that I – you mentioned in the Webinar.

((Crosstalk))

Dave Piscitello: And, you know, Edmund, it will not be very hard for me to put together a very short, you know, very short paper that discusses the alternatives and identifies other resources. And I am happy to do that. So...

((Crosstalk))

Edmund Chung: ...might be useful because then we can fuse that into the, you know, put that into the initial study anywhere.

Dave Piscitello: Okay. Then I will take that as an action and I will try to have it available at least 72 hours before the next meeting, provided the next meeting is not next Tuesday.

Edmund Chung: What do other people think just similarly, I mean if people do not think it is of value.

Man: No no. I think it is a great value and I am glad that you proposed that. And I was looking for a way to say the same thing. I think we ought to bring all that stuff up and put it on the table here.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. I will go ahead and send that presentation that was provided at the Webinar. It is available. It is actually linked on the (SX) site. But I will send it around to this working group as well.

And Dave thank you very much for taking the action item to do a short paper. I think that would be quite useful.

This is Julie again. I think that these things would help us to frame the work as we move ahead and ensure that we can clarify these – the scope of this team so we know exactly what we are working on. Other comments?

And Edmund thank you very much also for raising the issue of harnessing the existing information that ICANN staff has pulled together. I think that is an excellent way to start.

(Andre) I think – this is Julie. I think you talked about making sure that we have clear statements in the charter – technical specifications and/or content. Do others agree with that suggestion?

Andrei Kolesnikov Maybe this question will come way once we have the actual presentation of the what, you know, the previous topic you discussed.

Julie Hedlund: (Andre) thank you. That is a good suggestion.

Edmund since you have so graciously agreed to be a Co-Chair of this team, do you have some suggestions for how we might proceed? I don't mean to pick on you but I do want to give you that opportunity.

Edmund Chung: I guess I am still trying to wrap my head around, you know, how to go about this. I don't at this point have a clear preference anyway or special thought about it. So, I defer to listening to others.

And perhaps I think, you know, in general, the stud – the study from staff would definitely be a good point of departure.

Julie Hedlund: Edmund this is Julie. Thank you so much. I think that is a very good way to start. And I didn't mean to put you on the spot, but I wanted to give you the opportunity if there was anything that you wanted to add.

Do others have a sense of what we should be looking at as a working group to help us refine our scope and mission and goals?

Edmund Chung: So I – this is Edmund again. Okay. For keep asking questions, but it would be useful if, you know, (Pete) I guess thoroughly on in the discussion as people feel that there are certain areas that we should definitely not venture in to speak up – like the couple that was mentioned. One was in terms of the other, you know, things that other WHOIS studies are already looking into including aspects or those kind of things.

And then I think Steve made a good point about, you know, some of the things that we probably shouldn't look into because that also – as much as I think, you know, it is useful to take a fresh start, which Steve mentioned, but I think it is also useful to get a sense of people would not feel comfortable with this group talking about.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. Edmund that is a very good suggestion. Do others have thoughts?

Edmund Chung: Nothing that right now is for people to speak up but whenever things, you know, come up and bring it up as soon as possible.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. This is Julie. I think sooner would be better. If not on this call, perhaps – and I will do a summary of this call and with action points and some of the main points discussed. I think that is a question we can put out there for people to consider prior to our next call and to alert us to anything that they think is definitely – they do not feel is in the scope of this working group.

And I think Steve Metalitz had already made a good note about not trying to determine the content.

All right. Edmund, this is Julie. You said something that made me think there is something else that might be useful and others can chime in. Steve Sheng had noted the ongoing WHOIS studies that ICANN is engaging in. And on the one in particular that he is working on. Steve Sheng, would it be helpful if we could – if you could provide to the working group just a very brief summary of what are these studies so that we can know what is already happening?

You have mentioned them here, but perhaps that we can have this as information for the working group to consider so that we are ensuring that we are not duplicating work in any way. I mean I think that was our intent in driving this charter was to not duplicate existing work within the WHOIS, but I don't – with the WHOIS studies. But I am not sure that it is clear, and not even to myself exactly what those studies are.

Steve Sheng: Sure Julie. I think the Council asked us to do a – four studies. And the last one was not in the original set of WHOIS studies. But if the goal of that study is to compile a list of servers requirements for the future WHOIS service.

So I think the goal is not only just to, you know, to see what are some of the current features that needs to be improved, but also in light of some of the, you know, policy developments and see and ask ourselves the question if a certain policy, you know, were to go through the consensus process, for example tiered access, what are some of the technical capabilities we need to build in to be able to implement the policies.

So let me just to clarify on that where the studies mostly compiling a set of technical requirements, it is not, you know, it is not – it is nothing – it is not policy requirements. You know, the policy, you know, should come through the multi-stakeholder consensus process.

But we will – we are mainly interested in is from technical point of view, how, you know, how to build in capabilities that will implement some of these proposals.

So we will be looking at past policy proposals and also getting input from various (ASOS) and advisories, for example the (ASAC). So that is ongoing work.

Part of that work that is relevant is this – the – with regards to the display – (not see) not actually characters. But I think for now my sense is we are waiting on the working group to gave us some guidance on that. So I think, you know, that is my current thinking is, you know, the working group can gave us some guidance like, you know, here is the set of, you know, technologies can solve this problem and we are looking to the working group's proposal and probably incorporate some of that.

So that is my understanding. Liz is that correct in faith?

Liz Gasster: Yes. I think so Steve. You know, and part of it is a timing question, right. If this work continues for some reason beyond the completion of the inventory that you do on the WHOIS service requirement, there may be a need to compile at a later point that further thinking. So there may be a timing question there. But I think that that would be the goal is to, you know, incorporate at least into the inventory this – the results of this.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. Steve and Liz that is I think very important information for this working group – the fact that the output of this group is something that is useful to, you know, something else that is happening in ICANN.

Steve I was wondering if perhaps you could just write up very briefly what you just said and send it to the list. And I think perhaps we might consider whether or not we want to note that in the charter, but at least so that people in the working group have the understanding that what – that that would help us – the working group frame the work since part of that output is being considered elsewhere.

Steve Sheng: Sure. I can do that.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. All right. We have now just a few minutes left of this working group kick off meeting session. And I could just very briefly summarize what we have discussed here.

We have talked about the Chairs and Co-Chairs. We have had Edmund Chung agreeing to be a Co-Chair from the GNSO and we will seek interested – other interested individuals from the SSAC who might be willing to be a Co-Chair. And we also have liaison positions that we can fill and we will work on that prior to our next meeting.

Our next meeting we will send out a Doodle and we will look to schedule a meeting in two weeks using perhaps 9:00 o'clock as a time that might be good for people but varying the dates.

We talked about the scope and the need to clarify the scope of this group with respect to the technical specifications and/or content. And also to make available to the working team existing work that ICANN staff have already completed.

And I will send around a presentation from the Webinar and Dave will provide a short paper prior to the next meeting relating to alternatives that staff have looked at. And Steve Sheng will provide a brief statement about other work – related work and how the work of this working group ties into that.

And I think that we – I am hearing that we do need to have a bit more definition in our charter to get a sense of how best to move forward. So between now and the next meeting perhaps the staff can collaborate with Edmund and the working group to adjust some language that could be considered on the list and discussed at the next meeting.

Does anybody have anything they wish to add or to – any questions or clarifications about what I have said? Is there anything anybody else wants to add before we adjourn the meeting?

Edmund Chung: This is Edmund.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Please.

Edmund Chung: Hi. I certainly thank everyone for having at least from the GNSO a bit of stress for me to serve as Co-Chair. But I also hope that the SSAC will quickly find me a Co-Chair to help with the workload.

Julie Hedlund: Edmund this is Julie.

Edmund Chung: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: I heartily agree with you and we will certainly try to help with that to move ahead quickly. Does anybody else have anything?

Then I want to thank everyone who joined today. Thank you very much. And I think that we have got a very, very good start. And thanks so much to Edmund and we will get someone to be a Co-Chair with him very soon.

It is now time to adjourn the meeting. And I will look forward to hearing and done meeting with all of you in two weeks time. Thank you very much everyone. This meeting is adjourned.

Man: Thanks Julie.

Man: Thank you.

END