GNSO/SSAC
International Registration Data Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 25 October 2010 at 15:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO/SSAC International Registration Data Workign Group on 25 October 2010 at 15:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is   incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is   posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not   be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ird-wg-20101011-en.mp3
On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#oct

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

Present for the teleconference:
Edmon Chung – Co-chair - GNSO Registry Stakeholder Group
Rafik Dammak -- GNSO Non-Commercial Users Stakeholder Group
Jim Galvin – SSAC -Afilias
Bob Hutchinson, GNSO Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG)
Avri Doria - NCSG
Owen Smigelski, Sunrider International, Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial Stakeholder Group
Ram Mohan - Afilias – SSAC Board liaison
Steven Metalitz -- GNSO Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial

ICANN Staff
Julie Hedlund
David Piscitello
Gisella Gruber-White

Absent apologies:
Avri Doria - NCSG

Coordinator: Okay. The recordings are all started. Please go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much. Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening. This is

                  the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group call on the 25th of

                  October. Welcome to everyone. From the working group on the call we have

                  Rafik Dammak, Owen Smigelski, Jim Galvin, Steve Metalitz, Jainkang Yao,

and Robert Hutchinson. From staff we have Steve Sheng, Dave Piscitello, and Julie Hedlund.

Thank you and welcome to everyone. Very glad that you could join us. I did send around a agenda. We've accomplished number one, the roll call. And a second item on the agenda is that we did have an SSAC retreat last week, and at the retreat Jim Galvin gave an update on the ongoing discussions in this working group. We had some discussion in the SSAC concerning you know, how the SSAC thought we might proceed in some areas. And Jim, I was wondering - not to put you on the spot, but do you want to share any of your thoughts on you know, what you thought about what the SSAC said? And Steve Sheng collected I think a few action items or comments from the SSAC as well.

Oh, and I see that Jeremy Hitchcock has joined as well. Welcome Jeremy.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Hello.

Julie Hedlund: Hello. I don't know if you - when you joined Jeremy, but we're just giving a little bit of a follow-up from the SSAC Retreat last week, where Jim gave a brief update on the status of the working group's - and Jim, how did - any thoughts that you'd like to share on comments that we received from the SSAC?

And Jim if you're on mute, we're not hearing you.

Okay. Well Steve, maybe I can ask you to run down some of the comments that you had collected from the SSAC in that (unintelligible).

Oh, I see Jim has - I think Jim maybe...

Jim Galvin: Yes. I apologize. I had fumble fingers on hitting the mute button there. I hung up instead of unmuting.

Julie Hedlund: I've done that myself, Jim.

Jim Galvin: It happens from time to time. We do our best.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. I've done that too. I don't know if you wanted to share your impressions of you know, the discussion at the SSAC Retreat, and I know that Steve Sheng tried to capture a few items as well.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Well obviously, I didn't hear what Steve said, so maybe I'll just mention a couple of things.

Julie Hedlund: He hasn't - I thought I'd defer to you first, but if you'd like, he can mention the things he's captured as well. But, I didn't know if you wanted to you know mention anything instead of...

Jim Galvin: I do. What I got from the discussion in terms of specific actions, I believe that there is consensus in the SSAC that you know, we should affirm - it would be good for this group to affirm that the WHOIS protocol is insufficient for needs. I think that that's a point in which we agree even today. In fact, let me back up for one moment and make one other thing - in the discussions, one of the things that we were reminded of is what we need to be careful of here is being careful to distinguish between WHOIS the data model and WHOIS the protocol. And, it's important to make that distinction.

                  You know, I'm sure that we can all appreciate that that distinction is blurred a lot and it leads to confusion, and we should be very precise in whatever comments we ultimately make and any specific suggestions we have about corrections or suggestions - editorial suggestions for even documents that exist today that go along with this.

                  But then, that brings me back to the one specific recommendation. I think there's value in asserting very quickly - and this was what I interpreted to be

consensus within the Committee - within the SSAC. There's value in asserting very quickly that WHOIS is not a sufficient answer, and that additional - I mean a recommendation will be forthcoming from us about more details later. And, I guess we should talk about - we can talk in this committee about how much more we want to say than that and when we might be able to say it.

The reason for saying now that WHOIS as a protocol is insufficient is because the next version of the Draft Applicant Guidebook is coming out. And of course as part of that, a new registry agreement is going to be proposed. And as part of that, WHOIS is the service that's recommended - WHOIS the protocol. And so, we should get to a place quickly that we can state that that's not the right answer, so that perhaps they can begin now to call out in their agreement and in the Applicant Guide Book that there should be an expectation that WHOIS is - the WHOIS requirement is going to change.

So, that's the one specific action to put on the table that should happen very quickly, is to assert that WHOIS as a protocol is insufficient.

Other things that I got from it were the distinction between protocol and service, and also a suggestion to switch to using the phrase directory service instead of WHOIS at all. And so when we make our recommendations and our suggestions about where to go, we should speak in terms of a directory service and the functionality that it needs, thus to set the stage for drawing attention away from WHOIS so that we really can begin to look at other options that solve this problem.

That's my take away from the Retreat last week. I don't know if Steve wants to add anything or clarify anything, that would be fine with me.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Jim. Steve, do you have anything you want to add?

Steve Sheng: I have two points noted. I think Jim discussed the four models in the working group, and one of the question is why translation? How is the translation different from transliteration, just in terms of the address? And, which specific field is uses for translation, right? Which field is intended for translation, to the affect - you know, (related to) that question.

Another question is - affect raised is the IRT working group discussed about standardizing the data - the WHOIS data. It raised the question should we also discuss about standardizing the labels of those output - different (handle) (unintelligible) mean. You know, the contact, the address, phone number, you know. Right now, different registrars and registries, those labels are different. So you know, to have easy - and anticipate for internationalization, you know there's maybe more demand for localization than in - on the results of those can be localized. And so you know, that's one of the question asset raised, but I think that's it. (Unintelligible). Thanks.

Jim Galvin: Yes. Let me - thank you Steve for that, and add one thing to the comment that you made. You were asking about the distinction between transliteration and translation, and what should be translated. To put that in context, one of the specific things that was raised was for example addresses or names are the kind of thing that it may not make sense to translate or transliterate, and that was the specific context for that comment about choosing what things are translated and what are not, and you know, suggesting that this group consider that issue in particular. So, thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Thank you very much, Jim and Steve. From the working group members, are there any questions concerning these issues that were raised by the SSAC or discussion on them?

Steve Metalitz: Yes. This is Steve Metalitz. I had a couple of questions.

Julie Hedlund: Please go ahead, Steve. Thank you.

Steve Metalitz: In terms of the timing on this, and Jim's remarks about the Applicant Guide Book, I'm not really sure whether it's too late to effect what's in the Applicant Guide Book anyway. I guess, maybe we'll know more after Thursday when the Board considers the time table. But, you're - what you were commenting on Jim was with regard to the WHOIS protocol and not the directory service or the WHOIS data model, I think is what you said. So, are you suggesting that we make a recommendation as to what will be in the registry - new registry agreement as far as which protocol would be used, or as far as what kind of service would have to be provided?

Jim Galvin: I think the minimum thing that we can do is simply to state, if we can achieve consensus within this group, that the WHOIS protocol is insufficient for the needs of presenting internationalized registration data. And, we would ask that the staff take that point and incorporate the idea that the WHOIS protocol will be changed at some point in the future. They should keep that in mind as they draft other policies and procedures while this working group continues its work, and maybe it will have a specific recommendation in the future.

And, that really only speaks to the timing issue. I mean, I think the minimum we can say is WHOIS is not sufficient and please take that into account in everything that you do, without telling them exactly how to deal with that, and we need to make that particular comment public. I - my assumption in saying that is it's not clear to me that we can come to consensus about what we would recommend to replace it in a timely enough fashion to effect anything.

The other thing I'll comment on is as far as timing of the DAG 5 is concerned, it's my understanding and my expectation at this point that DAG 5 is going to come out relatively soon, within the next couple of weeks, and the timing of this will be such that a public comment period is going to open, and the public comment period, one should expect to close at the end of the Cartagena meeting or shortly thereafter, depending on when it's released. So, now is the time for us to be able to make a specific comment because we can submit it as part of the public comments, you know officially from the working group.

Steve Metalitz: All right. Thank you. That's helpful, and I think I would be in agreement that - with that comment that it should be borne in mind that the WHOIS protocol is not forever, and that should be borne in mind in drafting these documents for the new gTLDs.

I will just say on the transliteration - you know first of all, the localization point of the labels makes a lot of sense to me, and I guess - I'm not sure we have discussed that, so maybe we should. But on the transliteration versus translation, I think there is a little bit of confusion about this in the draft report that was - draft interim report that was circulated. So when we get to that, perhaps we can discuss that point. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Steve. Other comments?

Robert Hutchinson: Julie, this is Bob Hutchinson. Could we get a little more definition on the comments that were made about the inadequacies of the protocol - the WHOIS protocol? We've heard from a number of members on this team that the WHOIS protocol could be completely gotten away from, could be tweaked in a small way, or could be tweaked in a major way. You know, I don't understand. Is the SSAC - were they basically saying let's you know, place a stake in the ground here that we're going to in essence not do a small tweak to the protocol as it currently sits? Or, can you give us a better feeling about where that conversation went?

Jim Galvin: I think that there is a lot of evidence, not just from SSAC, but I think it's been you know, visible in the community for a long time that the WHOIS protocol is simply not going to meet the needs of internationalization. It was in its day US ASCII only. It is today - it is in theory intended to be 8 bit clean. In technical terms that's what you call it. But for example, there's no defining coding mechanism and there's no way to signal an encoding mechanism. There is no way to signal character sets or scripts that are used. And you know, there

actually is - there've been a number of things that have - it's not extensible in any standardized way.

So you can make a query which you can only give it a domain name, but you can only give it a domain name in a US ASCII form. And in fact even today for WHOIS services that different registrars or registries offer, if they allow you to enter the Punycode representation, the (XN--), it's just because on the server side, they're looking for that magic four character sequence in the front. And if they get it, then they know to decode that and look it up, and then they'll use that in the reply and that's what they'll give back to you in the response. So - I mean from a technical point of view, it's quite straight forward to state that WHOIS is insufficient.

Now on the issue of where to go with it, that's part of the problem we've been having for years, is people - you know a lack of consensus on where to go with WHOIS. I mean, the obvious candidate is IRIS. I mean, the IETF created that vertical. It's been around for years. It's ready to go. There are implementations of it that are ready to go. You know, even - I believe there's even - well, I guess I'm not certain now, but I know for example that VeriSign, and I know that a number of others did implementations of IRIS.

But you know, whether we want to recommend that and go in that direction or not, I don't know. We should probably explore ourselves in this group the advantages of IRIS and then consider other alternatives. That's my response. Does that answer your question?

Julie Hedlund: Bob, was that helpful to you?

Robert Hutchinson: Yes. I guess that I'm not clear as to whether that's your opinion or that's the opinion of the SSAC, or is it an amalgam of everything?

Jim Galvin: I would say that it's an opinion of SSAC, and I think that even in our document - well, I guess we're stuck on the four models. We've been talking

about data models. See, this is where this distinction between WHOIS protocol and WHOIS data model is kind of important, and we probably need to have that discussion in this group. I think personally that a large part of our discussion has been focused on the data model, not on the protocol, except for part of the response to the first issue, so maybe we should go back and visit that in this group and make sure that there's clarity on that point.

But, I do believe that there's clarity in the SSAC that the WHOIS protocol is insufficient. And so, I'm comfortable representing that position here and asserting that in our discussions in this working group too, to see what consensus we can get in this group on that point.

Dave Piscitello: This is Dave Piscitello. There are two SSAC documents that are actually from 2008. One is SAC 27, and it was comments to the GNSO regarding WHOIS studies. And SAC 33, which was domain name registration records and directory services. And, both of those talk about the need for features that are absent from - you know, from the exiting WHOIS protocol and services that are necessary to provide greater accuracy, greater integrity, and greater accountability.

So Steve, I'll post the links to those, and those are sort of some of the background material that I think Jim is basing his opinion on.

I think that since 2008, there have been a number of discussions about other alternatives to IRIS, because IRIS - the uptake for IRIS has been rather negligent - negligible rather -- sorry about that -- and it is perceived to a rather client footprint. It's a fairly heavy forklift implementation. But there are some other people who are - have been experimenting with what's called (repsal), or representative of you know, RWS - representative - date - what is the acronym. I got - it's a word - it's a mouthful.

Jim Galvin: Yes. I get that it's restful, but I actually could not expand it here in real time. Sorry.

Steve Metalitz: I think its date transfer, its representative of it.

Dave Piscitello: Yes, it is. Yes, representable - representative of date transfer. In any event, there have been some experimentation by (Aaron). (Ianna) is actually done some tinkering, and some ICANN staff you know have also done some tinkering with it, and I believe (Wright) has an implementation. So, (Westful) uses XML over uses XML over HTTP, and so that's another possibility. You know - but, it think that's the - if I could offer an opinion. One of the things that we originally tried to do at the outset was focus on you know, the data that - as opposed to the protocol, but I think it's perfectly appropriate for us to say that you know while we are focusing on the data, we don't think that the protocol is going to be able to carry the mustard.

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. So, I think there's two points, and one is probably the more - there's probably a greater chance of consensus on them than the other. And, I'm looking at the (unintelligible) to make sure that we're kind of in line on this. I mean, I wouldn't read that - or it would seem like the discussion that we've had has centered around the data models, what we're specifically looking for, what's lacking from the WHOIS protocol in the sense of the requirements of registered data in the international contacts.

And, I think that the - I mean, that might be something that we want to do even on this call is to find out whether or not that that day - that's a statement that this working group is comfortable making. And, I think it's been something that we've been hanging around since probably the end of July. So, I think that there's a pretty good chance that there's pretty universal consensus on it. Not sure, but that's just kind of the feeling is that there's things that are lacking in the current framework.

The second is I think the deliverable that we're looking for - we're looking to present is the types, kind, and coding of registration data to collect, and I'm not sure that we want to identify a system that is a successor. We could say

pros and cons of a particular one, but I think that that's really outside the scope is that we're looking at what are the requirements in certain (unintelligible) we can kind of look at IRIS and say, "Oh, well these are the things we want to make sure are in that system, so this is what we say these are the requirements." I would think that that might be a little bit out of scope, or at least pretty forward of us. But, that's what kind of just my opinion on it.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, Jeremy. Other comments from the working group members on the call concerning sort of the two questions here. And perhaps, we can even get a - maybe we can even try to see if we can get a sense today from all of you on the first question. And, that is can we go ahead and write up a very brief statement that the current WHOIS protocol is insufficient for internationalized registration data, and perhaps listing a few reasons why we think that, some which Jim has enumerated.

So first of all, let me ask all of you on the call, does anybody - okay, this is probably a simple question. Does anyone from the working - on the call disagree that we should make such a statement as part of the public comment process in the public forum on DAG 5?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I don't object to it, but I would want to see the language that's being proposed.

Julie Hedlund: Of course.

Others?

Then perhaps, what we can do -- and Steve, Dave, please chime in -- is perhaps staff cold draft a brief statement for the working group to consider. This would be separate from the interim report. That's something we could consider submitting in the public comment period that would be forth coming. And, we could send that around to the working group to get your comments on that.

Steve and Dave, do you think that that is something that we would be able to do? Do we have enough information to do a draft, or do we need some more information?

Dave Piscitello: I'm sure we can come up with - I mean, we're not looking for a full report, just...

Julie Hedlund: No. No. It's not a report.

Dave Piscitello: (Unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: I think just for comments. You know, just a very brief document with maybe a little bit of preamble, but I think referencing the - you know, the SSAC - previous SSAC Report 33 and 27 could be useful. Referencing the - you know, some brief reasons why the protocol is insufficient for internationalized registration data, and then saying you know, that we - you know, that this working group thinks that its insufficient and just something very brief for the group to consider.

Dave Piscitello: No problem.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. So, we'll take that on as an action item from this discussion, and then I think in this group we need to decide, I think as Jeremy had pointed out, just how much is in scope with respect to what this working group can say on you know, recommendations for alternate protocols, IRIS or (unintelligible), or whatever, or perhaps, just maybe commenting on pros and cons of some of these protocols. B

But, I'd like to get a better sense I think from the working group members on the call, whether or not that's an area to pursue. It hasn't really been something we've been looking at. And we also do have - I'll remind you the - you know, the issue of trying to get an interim report out in time to be

considered for Cartagena. So, I don't know whether or not - I don't - since we've not discussed this all, then I don't know that we have anything that we could include in that interim report. But perhaps, that might be an area that we could consider to include for additional work.

What are your thoughts?

Steve Metalitz: Well, this is Steve Metalitz. The interim report now has a paragraph on Page 5 that - it discusses some of the shortcomings of the WHOIS protocol. It doesn't use that word, but - and then it concludes that the group's objective is how to support the submission, display, and transport of the data in the existing WHOIS protocol, or whether there is a need to migrate to new protocols. And I assume from what Jim was saying, that his view is there's a need to migrate to new protocols, and maybe this is a place where that could be stated.

Steve Sheng: Yes. And, I agree. Another place I could be - the way in the report is we call out two questions. The first question is how to internationalize the WHOIS data. And you know, what (unintelligible) element to internationalize and what are the models to internationalize them?

And the second question is how to support that internationalization - you know, that the submission would play in transport of the data with WHOIS. So, those are the two questions we separated in the interim report. If the working group wants - if the rest of the discussion - unfortunately right now in the report, it only calls out those two questions. Pretty much the rest of the report focus on the first question. If the working group wants, we can write something on the second question - or actually, are we going to write something for the DAG 5 public comment? Can we include that simply in the report?

Julie Hedlund: (Unintelligible). I - yes, I - I'll let others comment too...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...but I would think that since it looks like we'd have to prepare the comment pretty quickly we certainly could include - I think the comment and the interim report should be (consistent). I think I heard someone else commenting. Was that Steve Metalitz that I heard?

Steve Metalitz: No, it was not me.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. So we do have - we have called out the question in the report but we haven't gone into great detail in the report on it. We've stuck more to the discussion of the day tomorrow. But, you know, anything that we could use as far as (unintelligible) I think needs to be also treated consistently in the report. What do others think?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. If I could - I certainly agree we should be consistent but let me just note, I think we have a deadline of November 15th to complete our interim report if we want it to be discussed in Cartagena.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, that's right.

Steve Metalitz: And that will certainly - the comment deadline for the next version of the applicant guidebook is unknown at this point but it will certainly be later then November 15th. So I guess I would suggest that we focus on the interim report and then assuming we're successful in getting that draft posted by November 15th, it might be possible to adapt something that's in there into a comment - a public comment I mean after the...

Julie Hedlund: Yes, (unintelligible) for that. That's actually a really good point and I'm sorry I was being obtuse on that. I mean, given that we do have an interim report draft from the staff to consider and then, you know, we can include in there what we want to say on the protocol and then that could also be, you know, could drive the public comments. But you're right, the 15th is the deadline.

That's our driving date right now and we don't know yet the date for the comment on (dag) 5. Thank you for that.

So I'd like to suggest then that we switch the discussion now to the interim - the draft interim report that Steve Shank sent around. I think that we now have some new edits that we need to make to that and in particular relating to the inadequacies of the who-is protocol and then also making it very, very clear that we have a distinction between protocols - anything referring to that relates to the protocol versus data or the directory service and perhaps making sure that our recommendations with respect to directory services (do) as such as opposed to who-is.

But I was wondering if the working group would like to make any general comments about the interim report before we dive down into it.

(Steve):   Julie, I have a process question.

Julie Hedlund: (Steve), go ahead.

(Steve):   So how does the process work for editing this report? Does the working group members suggest individual edits and we merge them or, you know, we do the edits and what is the (stat) for doing that? I can imagine a lot of people want to edit so I don't know how it - how to manage the process.

Julie Hedlund: That's a very good question (Steve) and I'd like to get a sense from the working group on how we can proceed. I mean, we certainly, you know, number one we can discuss the report on this call and gather some changes that staff then can make to the interim report.

But I'd also very much like to encourage I think working group members to actually edit the report if they desire and then we can incorporate those changes. That's been a process that I've used - that we've used for some of the GNSO working groups as well as some of the (S act) documents where,

you know, the members actually edit the document using tracked changes and then staff can go ahead and incorporate those changes into a single document.

But I'd like to get some guidance from Jeremy as the co-chair and also from the other working group members and how you would prefer us to proceed.

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. I'm still kind of listening to find out what people would think on this but I - you know, I looked at it and the big question I had was, where do we put in for some finding the next step, even as an interim report, just where are we going to give at least some guidance in the sense of where we're thinking? And I mean, that might be a great place to talk about some of the alternatives that exist and try to really break it down into a - change is difficult for something like the current who-is implementation and protocol and there's one of two or one of three options that exist on the (wild) that should be adopted.

And I think that that might be a good - if everyone agrees that who-is is broken then we should say, "Hey, somebody has to make that decision," and finally make a call of who that is and put a little bit more momentum behind him. And that would be one thing that I would probably want to see in terms of recommendations or findings or a draft finding, is rec- is some statement to that effect that a success would be determined.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Jeremy. Other - thoughts from other working group members? Okay. All right, well why don't we - we've only got about 20 minutes left on this call. Let's go ahead and perhaps get started going through the documents.

The difficulty is that we're - in order to have a final draft approved by the working group, you know, to be able to talk about in Cartagena both at a presentation and for the GNSO council and at a public session, then we really do have to have it up on the meetings Web site (unintelligible).

And so I think that just as far as how to proceed here, we can talk about this on this call, I guess I would ask, though, whether or not it might be useful for us to accelerate our calls a little bit. If we had a call, for instance, in two weeks that would be on the 8th and that might be difficult for (unintelligible) then by the 15th.

I was wondering whether or not the working group members would be able to have a call on next Monday.

(Steve McCallus): This is (Steve McCallus). Could I suggest that I think we could have a call next Monday if need be but I think what's probably most useful would be for people who have suggested edi- I mean, obviously we're awaiting some more material from the staff as we discussed but for the existing draft maybe we could encourage people circulate their edits or proposed edits, you know, within the next few days and then that would perhaps provide the basis for discussion on the 1st if we need a meeting then.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you (Steve). What do others (think)? I'm only mentioning having a call really becau- sooner rather then later because we have tended not to get a lot of comments on the list when we've asked for comments on documents although we certainly can, you know, give it a shot and try, you know, to really encourage people to go ahead and submit their edits to their report.

And that, you know, I think would be very, very helpful to actually get comments on the list and, you know, be able to try to incorporate them relatively quickly.

And if that was the case, if we get comments then maybe we could prepare another, you know, sort of a more final draft call in two weeks rather then doing a call in one week. What do others think?

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. I seem to have developed a little bit of confusion here. We have - Jeremy was also commenting about, saying something about the who-is protocol and then we also started the discussion of this interim report. And my confusion is are we going to have and publish two things or did we just say we're going to incorporate the who-is comment in this interim report?

Julie Hedlund: Thanks Jim. This is Julie. I think what I heard was that because of the timing on the (Netalus) noted we have to have the interim report done and out by the 15th. But we don't know when the public comment will be. What I think I heard was that we were going to incorporate what we wanted to say about the protocol in the interim report, in particular, the statement that we think that it's inadequate - the who-is protocol is in adequate and why.

But then I thought I heard Jeremy say that in the next step (section) of the interim report which doesn't have anything in it yet, that we could talk about perhaps working on (recommendations) for a new protocol, you know, as part of next step. So I don't think we'd have time to agree on what those recommendations would be for this interim report. But others can correct me if I'm wrong. Does that help Jim?

Jim Galvin: Yes, thank you. So with that, we're just talking about one thing - the interim report - and so I'll just say that I agree with you and Steve having said up to this point.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks Jim. Any other questions or comments?

Bob Hutchinson: Yes, this is Bob Hutchinson. I also agree with Steve. I'm curious as to the timeline you think we have to operate to. And it seems like there's not a lot of members, or there're a lot of missing members on today's call. Is that true? And also I would like to see us get our comments in by, like, Wednesday of this week so that we could have a call next Monday and kind of wrap up what our interim reports, the bulk of it, needs to change from where it is right now. I

think that's doable. I may be wrong, but (I) defer to the group but I think that's a (doable) goal.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, thank you Bob. This is Julie. We actually have a fair number of working group members on the call. We have - today we have Rafik, Owen, Steve Metalitz, Jainkang, yourself, Jeremy and Jim Galvin. So (I said), Edmon Chung sent his apologies as did Avri but that's a pretty good core group of those because then (evolved) steadily I think throughout the process.

But I personally agree that I think it would be extremely helpful to have comments quickly from everyone, say, by Wednesday and then I think that in order to preserve the momentum, I think it would be helpful to have a call both on the 1st as well as perhaps on the 8th. (I see) by the 8th and prepare a final draft for people to see. Was that feasible for those on the call to do both a call on the 1st and on the 8th? And I'll poll to ask for comments by this Wednesday?

Owen Smigelski: Hey Julie. This is Owen. That certainly works for me and I think we should also make sure to put something out to the email list as soon as possible so that the other members are aware of what's going on as well.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Owen, yes. And actually I'm - I'll send out some notes later today from this call and also with the suggestion of doing call both on the 1st and the - scheduling calls both on the 1st and on the 8th. Comments from anyone else?

Well thank you. Do we want to go ahead - and we've got now a little bit more then ten minutes left. We want to go ahead and get started taking a look at the report as it stands right now. And I think that, you know, with respect to getting in our comments now and also by Wednesday, you know, I can indicate today to everyone that there'll be additional text forthcoming from staff with respect to changes forthcoming with respect to clarifying the different - the distinction between protocol and data and also - and I'm putting

in a statement about the inadequacies as the who-is protocol but encouraging everyone to comment on this interim report that we've sent out by this Wednesday.

Maybe I'll go ahead and take this time to just take a look through the report. Looking at it...

Steve Metalitz: Julie, this is Steve Metalitz. Could I raise a question about the report? I think it's relevant to the - one of the points that Jim raised earlier in the call.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, please do.

Steve Metalitz: He mentioned about translation about transliteration and I had a question about that myself. When I look at Pages 14 and 15 of the draft report with Figure 4 and Figure 5 and I think if I'm not missing something, that those two figures are identical. But one has a caption that says model three and regarding transliterating, registrant submission. And one says model four with the registrars translating a (different) submission.

But the two figures seem to be the same and they're both examples of transliteration I think. So I guess I just wanted to raise that question. I wasn't sure what the difference - if these figures are correct, I'm not sure what the difference is between the two models and the - if there is a difference between the two models, then one of the figures is not correct.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. Steve Shang, do you have a comment on that?

Steve Shang: I'm reading through the (quote). It looks like (thing)...

Julie Hedlund: Steve, are you talking about - let's see, I'm looking at Page 14. I'm seeing...

Man: Right, right, right.

Julie Hedlund: (Unintelligible).

Steve Shang: Yes, I'm looking at that myself.

Julie Hedlund: And then Figure 5.

Steven Shang: Figure 4 and 5, yes.

Julie Hedlund: Right. So are these both examples of - yes, I see because Figure 5 says registrars translate registrant submissions. Figure 4 says registrars transliterate...

Steven Shang: Yes. Yes, I think - let me think. Oh.

Julie Hedlund: Because they do look the same.

Steven Shang: I remember. So regarding the (ECO) translation and transliteration, in the - you know, I've been writing draft. In my previous draft there're only three models that we talk about and then, you know, in the last meeting, someone suggested a translation.

                  So I think to respond to Steve, Figure 5 is incorrect I'd say. It has to be - Figure 5 is (on) Figure 4 and that's incorrect. It should be like translation but I have to ask (Andri) (from the question) to do a slight on translation. Thanks.

Jim Galvin: And this is Jim Galvin. So the interesting question that comes up here is this goes to the context for the question raised by SVAC about transliteration versus translation is, is there something in this to be translated? You know, I mean address and name were sort of the two questions that were raised? Are those things which one would ordinarily expect to translate or not?

                  You know, that's the question I raise. It's not even clear to me in looking at this example and thanks for catching the fact that these pictures are not right

or are the same and probably shouldn't be. What would change? Do we even know?

Steve Metalitz: Well, this is Steve Metalitz. I think that if you - that if the first one is transliteration, Figure 4, then Figure 5, if it were to read translation - for example, the last line in address would not say (Rocea). It would probably say Russia if it was translated into English or it would say (Rouce) if it was translated into French.

But it might be - in other words, it would be different then what appears there. But I'm not - I would not be an advocate for requiring a translation into a particular language. And I'm not sure exactly what the motivation was behind that model, but I think that's what the difference would be.

Jim Galvin: Okay thank you. Sure. That makes sense and if we're not voting now then, you know, I tend to agree with you in terms of choosing these models but I don't think we're trying to make a decision at this point as to which one of these we're going to do.

Julie Hedlund: Yes this is Julie. I think that the point of including Model 4, the translation model, was simply to, you know, to show that we have this - (something) - that, you know, that it is an alternative perhaps not one that we're recommending but that if we're discussing it at all we really (should) include it.

I can - I think I can see a few other words too in the address that will probably be translated in this case and I'm sure (Andre) can help us with that. Whether or not that needs to happen, I guess that - you know, that is the question with respect to all of these models is to what extent does this working group - this is something that should be done or is feasible to do.

Man: Well...

Julie Hedlund: Now that - (unintelligible) aside I think at this point.

Man: I will get in touch with (Andre) to see if he can help us with a new slide - new screenshot on translation. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: And he might be able to come up with an example that has more obvious opportunities for translation in the address. And just to show, you know, and whether or not it's useful but, you know, a street name that perhaps has a word that, you know, could be, you know, I don't know what (litza) is, (lenana), but, you know, that probably is something that in this case does have an English equivalent that could be, you know, translated as, you know, (Rocea) would be Russia.

                   Thanks for that Steve. Other specific points about the interim report? And thanks Steve Metalitz for raising this particular correction.

Bob Hutchinson: Yes, while we're on the fourth model - this is Bob Hutchinson again - there was comment made earlier about who is labels and I believe that one of the reasons that I asked for this model to be put in here is that I believe that labels will be the one piece that will probably be actually translated so - such that if my language is Hindi, the labels would come back to me in Hindi translated into Hindi, okay, and from English - maybe from a standard set.

                   And if I were in Russian for example, the labels would appear in Cyrillic and translated into the Russian (revila cou) the names, okay. But - and so this is why I asked sort of for this option to be here because I don't see in the overall report a working model that we're proposing without addressing the trans - the - both the transliteration and the translation options of not only the labels for the data but what happens inside the data, okay.

                   And in this Russian example, for example, I don't see that this is being - I see the domain name displayed in Cyrillic but I don't see the other pieces of data displayed in Cyrillic and I don't believe that - if I were a Russian person who

had registered by domain name in Cyrillic that this is what my registration would look like. I'm talking specifically at Figure 5.

Steve Shang: This is Steve Shang. This is a...

Bob Hutchinson: Yes.

Steve Shang: ...a (relative) comment. So let me see if I capture your thoughts. So you are separating the label and the data, first of all, and you are suggesting that the label - oh I'm sorry - that's my baby - and you're suggesting the label to be translated? Is that right?

Bob Hutchinson: Yes. Of the variety that says (unintelligible).

Steve Shang: Okay.

Bob Hutchinson: Well, but the (voice) - with the knowledge that I'm not mixing translation and transliteration.

Steve Shang: Right, right.

Bob Hutchinson: Translation, meaning...

Steve Shang: Okay.

Bob Hutchinson: Yes.

Steve Shang: So there's a technical issue is, I think what you're referring (to) is localization. That means, you know, you go in a different country, the label themselves will appear in their language. So, for example, if an Indian user using who-is, the label would appear in Indian. If, you know, a Chinese user used who-is, the label of data would appear in Chinese.

That's largely I think a client position so that's could be a (work) instead of, you know, the server. The server does that for the client. So to the extent, if you want that to be translated then one way to standardize the label and then let the client determine, you know, how they trans- how they localize that. So that's my point.

Man:　　　　　Yes.

Bob Hutchinson:　Well, you're proposing a particular solution and I'm proposing that this is the problem that needs to be addressed, okay. I mean, I guess philosophically I disagree though I think the who-is service should provide, according to what my query language is, should provide the labels in that language.

Steve Shang:　　Okay.

Bob Hutchinson:　This normally happens in almost all Web based stuff today.

Steve Shang:　　Okay. So could you, in the interest of the deadline, I think what you're proposing (the requirements), I think if you write down those requirements and then, you know, we put it in the report. Does that work for you?

Bob Hutchinson:　Yes, I'll outline some verbiage that I think (might work).

Steve Shang:　　Yes. I'm afraid I can't (unintelligible).

Bob Hutchinson:　Okay thanks.

Steve Shang:　　You're welcome. You provide the language.

Bob Hutchinson:　Okay thanks.

Julie Hedlund:　　And that was Bob Hutchinson. Is that right?

Bob Hutchinson: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: Right. So, yes, I think if you could provide something that would help expand on this model to include the (translation on) labels and your thoughts on that would be extremely helpful.

I (noticed) that it's one minute past the hour. What I'd like to do is go ahead and I'll send around some notes later today from this call and also to - we'll go ahead and schedule a call for this time for next Monday. And in - and we will also ask all of the working group members to provide their comments on this interim report by this Wednesday for staff to incorporate in a new version to be discussed next Monday.

So thank you everyone. Are there any questions before we adjourn? Well thank you all for joining us and we'll look forward to talking to all of you next week.

Man: Thanks Julie.

Man: Thanks.

Man: Bye.

Julie Hedlund: Bye.

Man: Bye-bye.

Man: Thanks. Good bye.

END