

**GNSO/SSAC  
International Registration Data Working Group  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Monday 12 July 2010 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 12 July 2010 at 14:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ird-20100712.mp3>

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

**Present for the teleconference:**

Avri Doria - NCSG  
Jeremy Hitchcock - DYN-DNS  
Rafik Dammak -- GNSO Non-Commercial Users Stakeholder Group  
Bob Hutchinson, GNSO Commercial Stakeholder Group  
Yao Jiankang, GNSO Registry Stakeholder Group, CNNIC

**ICANN Staff**

Dave Piscitello  
Steve Sheng  
Gisella Gruber-White  
Glen de Saint Gery

**Absent apologies:**

Ram Mohan - Afiliias – SSAC Board liaison  
James Galvin - SSAC, Afiliias  
Steven Metalitz -- GNSO Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial  
Julie Hedlund

Man: Please go ahead, the recordings have started.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening to everyone.  
On today's IRD call on Monday the 12th of July, we have Jeremy Hitchcock, Rafik Dammak, Robert Hutchinson, Avri Doria, Jiankang Yao.

From staff we have Glen de Saint G ery, Steve Sheng, Dave Piscitello, myself Gisella Gruber-White and we have apologies from James Galvin, Steve Metalitz, Ram Mohan.

If I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you (Steve).

(Steve): Thank you Gisella. Hello everyone and welcome to today's IRD call. (Julie) has a doctor appointment, so she asked me to facilitate the call.

Jeremy, since you're the co-chair, would you be able to lead this call?

Jeremy Hitchcock: Sure.

(Steve): Yeah. If I may suggest, (Julie) sent out a draft agenda. That has essentially four items. The first point is discussion points from Brussels' meeting presentation. She also attached her slides.

The second point is issues remaining to be addressed. The third point is the next steps in preparing recommendations like the internal report. And the last one, she also wants to discuss about the meeting's schedule, whether we still want to rotate by-weekly to tailor different time zones.

So those are the four items on the draft report. Feel free to use any of those Jeremy, if you have other items.

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. I don't think so. I think that'll be a good agenda. So we'll - so we're sort of light on attendance, but I'll guess we'll dive in and start with discussion points from just - two on the call attended the either session for the IRD update.

Has anyone?

Avri Doria: Avri. I couldn't, I had opposing, - competing meetings.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Okay. So, just for - this is Jeremy. Just for the update from the group, just to bring everyone up to the speed. There were two presentations that were given that prompted a community effort to speed on where we are.

One of them was a quick 10, 15 minute updates on the GNSO on Monday and then there was an actual commentary on Thursday morning as a working session that was specifically for the update on - and also was intended for community invite and input on where we are.

Both presentations had - were well received. The commentary came across well in terms of the technical detail and the technical background that was on it, so I think we did a good job in getting it, so that our slides were well understood.

You can bucket up the advice or commentary that happened at both events. The GSO update there was a question, what PDP worked with - would come out as a result of this and they gave the generic answer saying, "Well, we're really just looking at kind of the high level information, fact finding, hyperactive ways doing it."

Not, those specific to anything. I think if they were potentially alluding to the - what requirements like, I don't know, in terms of (unintelligible) or in terms of the existing (TOP)s.

And then in the working session on Thursday, there was some commentary about variance, which was somewhat interesting, in the sense of some items probably we should bring up for discussion.

But aside from that, there wasn't a heck of a lot in terms of commentary, hey this approach is better, this approach is better, or requirements in the sense of we have to have this requirement, we have to have this requirement.

So, I think that that's also a good sign in the sense of we're just kind of presenting the facts and presenting what the lay of the land is.

In the sense of what the presentations were and where we go from here, we talked about a November timeline for having reports completed, including some recommendations and going through the last items that we have in our working group that facilitate, which is they go through the different alternatives and come up with some impacts.

There's also a few lingering issues on how we would present some data, some content. But aside from that, I think that that's essentially where we are. I think we've done a lot of the groundwork and from here it's starting to coalesce the information that we have into a work group - a workable set of recommendations to report.

I'm assuming that the November timeline will actually work out pretty well. It's just - still have a good number of months to go, but we also can't dawdle. So the summer, I want - we'll have to keep up and keep going.

The only other thing that was worth mentioning, was that the - for those people who are in Brussels, the law enforcement community has a certain great presence that was kind of a dog and pony show going around and talking about the recommendation that they made them sold and went around to a lot of the different community groups and talked with concerns that centralized WHOIS something, that they're interested in, because it's a - then the law enforcement ends up as a topic - something that they know is a problem, but they really don't know too much about it.

We've been working with the point person for the law enforcement community and I've traded a couple of emails about the - what was going on, but, I think, aside from that it was good update and there wasn't too much that came out of it, and so we're doing everything wrong and we're going the wrong direction.

So I think that that's a great set of -great outcomes.

So from here, issues that are remaining. Did I highlight that? Is it kind of - let's go around, just 'cause there's a smaller group. Does that sound like a - all the issues that need to get addressed in a working forward plan?

(Steve): Thank you Jeremy. What do others call - on the call think? Do you have something to add?

No. There doesn't seem to be.

Man: Jeremy are - I guess that's a good approach working forward.

Robert Hutchinson: This is (Bob Hutchinson). I would add a couple of observations from things I saw in Brussels. There was also a paper that was released on WHOIS performance, which might be of interest to people on this call.

It was done by a group back east, I think probably can dig up the reference to it. It was a fascinating paper from the standpoint of attempting to validate the WHOIS system from the standpoint of how often WHOIS servers are alive and how often they're failing.

And basically they built some scripts to ping WHOIS servers. And it showed the - it was with some graphic data the unreliability of the trunk WHOIS system, in terms of the server network associated with itself.

So, that was kind of interesting. And the other piece of data that I think is sort of relevant has to do with the servicing of privacy reveal requests. I was in the registrar's meeting and there was quite a heated discussion about an enforcement by VISA demo that went out essentially said that within five days, if you're doing privacy protection on a WHOIS registrant, you have to reveal contact data.

And that, along with a law enforcement issues, might be relevant. Not so much for the data part that we're concentrating on, but for the mechanics part that data diligence.

And maybe you can comment about that.

Dave Piscitello: Hi this Dave. Are you talking about the new John report?

Robert Hutchinson: Yes.

Dave Piscitello: Okay. So that answers one of two questions. And then when you say mechanics, can you just be a little bit more specific. So you're talking about - well, I'm certain- I'm not quite certain what you mean by mechanics. So, I just want to understand how to answer the question.

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

Jeremy Hitchcock: Yeah, go ahead.

Avri Doria: ...we ask Dave to go too far. I think that a lot of people have gotten really interested in the contents of No John, but I do think that we need to be really careful what degree of truth and scientific validity we attach to it.

And sure, while if 10 to 20% of it is indeed scientifically sustainable, we do have some concerns. But A, I'm not sure how pertinent they are for a group that's trying to figure out how to store and save information, and B, I just would not want to quickly start taking action that presume that it is a - as I say, scientifically valid study. Thanks.

Robert Hutchinson: And what makes you believe that it's not a scientifically valid study?

Avri Doria: Basically the methodology again. This is Avri again. The methodology, the methodology explained. It's very hand wavy. It's very subjective.

As I say, I don't - and I don't think this is necessarily the working group for discussing that validity, and you know, if there's content in it that pertains to you know, IDN representation of data and storage of data, that may be worth talking about.

You know, but basically take any presumptions from that report and to call it valid is just way premature in my opinion, and not necessarily applicable to this effort. Thanks.

Dave Piscitello: This is Dave. To - so let me answer or at least to speak to Avri's point. My understanding is, that the compliance department is going to, you know, review, you know, review exactly the methodology and exactly the results, or thoroughly the results that the new (John People) posted.

And there are, Avri is expressing, I think, a concern that was expressed by a number of people, not simply, you know, registrars who were unhappy. That it wasn't clear, you know, it wasn't clear from the report exactly how, you know, you know, how they established availability and lack of availability and it's also known in the community, that a lot of the methodologies are not that are used to determine is uptime, you know, have some degree of error.

So, I think it's worthwhile, you know, letting compliance you know, use what the new (John People) published as, you know, as sort of a notice that, you know, perhaps there's more to be done in the - from compliance's perspective in understanding, not only, you know, how accurate those results are, but what would be a better methodology and a reliable methodology to produce and reproduce statistics that demonstrate either they're compliant or they're not compliant.

That sort of information is probably going to be extremely helpful in understanding how to build enforcement mechanisms, you know, for the 2009 RAA, as an example.

So I think that, you know, that understanding repeated offenders, if there are such things as repeated offenders in this context, is probably valuable, but I also agree with Avri that it's only from tangentially an issue for what we're trying to accomplish here.

So, I think we've answered the first question. I asked (Rod) - I'm happy to answer the second question, but again, I'm just trying to understand which aspects of mechanisms you were looking to me for an answer for?

Robert Hutchinson: Oh well, I was just saying that the new RAA requirement to reveal privacy is not enforced or tracked in WHOIS at all today. But, in a future system, it may be one of the requirements of what you're doing. In other words, your presentation Dave, I don't believe covers that.

So...

Dave Piscitello: Oh, you mean on the privacy protection - the abuse of privacy protection services?

Robert Hutchinson: Yes.

Dave Piscitello: Well, I think, you know, so - maybe we can wrap this up fairly quickly. The abuse studies that we've been doing, you know, are trying - you know, trying to answer some specific questions, you know, how prevalent abuse is on - and you know, who is doing it and are there any noteworthy socking points, in you know, among the privacy protection providers?



You know, in a more general - and we're going - and (Steve) and I are going to continue to do that and hopefully, we'll have more data, you know, shortly, you know, we're going to run another batch and study again.

But, I think, generally what we need to do in order to have better measurements, is to have better tools.

And you know, there's considerable discussion in ICANN on how to get those and you know, (Steve) and I have certainly, you know, talked about, you know, what they might look like and how we might put them together with some of the, you know, some of the IT folks and some of the compliance folks.

So yes, we do need better mechanisms to actually say, you know, - actually there's two questions we need to answer at this point. I think, one is, how do we know, you know, are - is there a metric, you know, that we can measure that will allow to say, whether or not, a legitimate privacy protection service provider or someone who's operating the business, you know, either as a registrar or as a contractor to a registrar, and you know is operating in good faith.

Versus, deception entries in the registration data. You know, I've been receiving, you know, lots of those recently, where somebody is just typing in, you know, WHOIS Privacy Protected as their registrant information. And that's, you know, that's not you know, not very helpful because, unless the registrars are actually some sort of verification, all that does is help, you know, help spammers evade a filter, you know, or a marker that we used to identify spam or, you know, it's probably even better than putting down Mickey Mouse, you know, as the registrar.

So, I think we have a lot of work ahead of us in that whole area.

(Steve): Thank you Dave. These all are very good and important discussions. I'd like to come back to the outline that (Julie) had. Jeremy - so in the Brussels presentation, there's an issue - there's something on the variant.

So I did have a few exchange - email exchanges on this issue. And the issue is, so in the IDN names, the IDN Domain Names, they're usually variants, particularly in the Indian language and the Chinese language.

The Chinese - and sometimes what Greg Aaron from (Afilius) told me is that there are so many variants in the Indian language. This could be in the hundreds.

I don't know whether that's - that the Chinese language will have as much variance as possible, but I'd like to see how the Chinese manage its variant?

Is Jiankang on the line?

Jiankang Yao: Yes.

(Steve): Jiankang could you help us with this?

Jiankang Yao: For manager of Chinese words, according to IDN ROC, 37, 43. And so, for example, in (Ching Hall) Universities there are four Chinese words for - four Chinese curator (unintelligible).

So maybe they will have more than 16 words for the same idea you tell me. Commonly we have - the registrar explanation of the (simplified) Chinese and the traditional Chinese character.

But people will use them free. All centralized - simplified the Chinese further (unintelligible), and the old traditional Chinese character (unintelligible).

So, (unintelligible), there will have a total - at most three domain names, but other words we will not be using the (unintelligible) rule, but will be corrected for the registrant.

Otherwise, another registrar warrants it. So, it is kindly our purgative is at most three words they will be put in the DS tools. Others will be protected.

So, only those three words. So the words which we are putting in IDN rules will display against the equiv, other you will not be displayed. Thank you.

(Steve): Thank you. That's very helpful. So what I'm hearing is, although there could be, you know, various, you know, over ten's and maybe 20's of variants for given IDN in Chinese, you would - so the (silic) would put at most, three variants in the DNS zone and reserve the rest for registration. Is that correct?

Jiankang Yao: Yes correct.

(Steve): So, the other question is, what if I query a user, for example, I query a variant that is not in the DNS zone. What will the WHOIS? What's the behavior for WHOIS?

Jiankang Yao: For...

(Steve): So if they query...Go ahead.

Jiankang Yao: For whomever, there's only - four simplified Chinese and four cities are Chinese where you'll putting in the DNS rule, other.

So it's reserved while we'll not be equivalent. It's only the ones in (unintelligible) will be displayed in the WHOIS.

(Steve): And can be queried? So only the ones in the zone, displayed in the zone can be displaced and queried in WHOIS, right?

Jiankang Yao: Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah.

(Steve): Query the reserved ones, 'cause you wouldn't have anything.

Jiankang Yao: Ah, yeah, yeah, yeah.

(Steve): Okay. That's sound good. Go ahead. What do others think.

Dave Piscitello: Yeah, this is Dave. I have a question, because the variants - I mean, variants, I think, have to do with or that you've talked about so far, have to do with the IDN label, not the registration data.

So I think - I'd like to understand the relevance to - the relevance or the correlation to registration data?

So as an example, if I am - if I have a domain that I've registered using a variance in, you know, in an IDN label, what does that - what constraints does that imply on the registration data? You know, should I - can I use the same variant in the registration data? Can I use other variants in the registration data?

You know, I'm sort of concerned that talking about variants pulls us away from focusing on, you know, on things other than domain labels. And...

Jiankang Yao: Dave, I think I'm only referring to the variant in a domain label, not in other variants. That's...

Dave Piscitello: So, okay, that's good. That's helpful. What does that mean -so if they're already extended conventions for, you know, for the variants in the IDN guidelines...

Jiankang Yao: Right.

Dave Piscitello: ...yeah, then is this an issue that we have to be concerned about with, you know, with registration data?

Jiankang Yao: So the first part, is not quite solved, is - so when they use a query, a WHOIS, for example, when they use a query to order simplify it, simplify Chinese script, do we display the variant that, the domain variant in WHOIS?

So I think that's kind of a service requirement detail. And second, can use query the variance, one variant and get, you know, what it represents?

So I think that's what I'm trying to get at. Because in the presentation, in the Brussels meeting, we do have this bundled representation, so a single AOU label query should be returned. I think that's talking about the variant.

Personally, I don't know much enough to say we should go beyond like domain variants, because that will be just a state explosion for WHOIS. So that's my intent.

Dave Piscitello: Yes, I guess - I see that as important. I'm not certain that it's something doesn't end up falling, you know, falling in the -under the responsibility of the registry, you know, or the registrar.

Because, I don't think we - I don't think our group can actually answer that right now. I think what our group can, you know, can do is, is try to identify how we're going to represent the data other than the label and that the more that we spend time looking at A&U label issues, the more we're going to cross into someone off its turf, so to speak.

Jiankang Yao: Yes, I agree.

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. I'm sorry I dropped off a bit and it sounds like we're talking about the variants.

Dave Piscitello: Yes, one of the things that I couldn't quite get a firm grasp on, was I guess, it's a fuzzy match or a fuzzy logic where you would do a query for something with a particular family, scripted family, and then you'd get back all the variants.

I'm trying to figure out the use case where that's actually useful where you would request something in one particular - one specific variant and then you get all of the other variants back? Is there a use case where that's helpful?

Jiankang Yao: For Chinese there is - if you query one (unintelligible), there are other word for me in IDN would be returned at the same time. Only - all the IDN words that are used on (Azul) will be returned.

You'll acquire any of the (Azul)s, and of those ideas in the IDNs rule. But other IDN names will not appear would be - would not have been returned, that is a result of - that is for reservations only.

If you return IDNs there may be hundreds. It is impossible to display all those IDN names.

Another way, not every word, IDN word is - yields greatly. The same frequency.

And for example, in Chinese we only fully simply by the Chinese traditional and Chinese ideas are free to use it. Some combination is another URL user.

Only in some special case, the word says used. So, in my opinion, so we should report, record the frequency of IDN words. Some are frequently used. They should be displayed in WHOIS and that should be put in the IDN rules.

Other, there will seldom use the IDN names through their novelties, for the ETS rules or not be WHOIS. Thank you.

Dave Piscitello: I think that's a reasonable policy for us to assume, yeah, as we look further at the registration data.

(Steve): Okay.

Discussion.

Jiankang Yao: Also from (Jung Yell) is the WHOIS through the - so the registrars or registries should return the most frequently used IDN variants in the WHOIS? Is that right, instead of all the variants?

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. That would seem to make sense, although in a more generic - I could understand where - how that works for a ccTLD, because you have a pretty well defined user constituency or you know who the user community, in terms of their language set, but global - it'd be difficult to mandate what a global sense or what a global TLD would want to return or for different variants.

And so I - I'm not sure that that - it's certainly helpful in the sense that it's not returning all the variants. It's returning the variants that make the most sense, but in the GTLD space, I'm not sure we have the context to make an assumption of what specific variants there are, and I guess, not knowing what variants you should return, maybe you should only do one or kind of the most specific that you could think of.

Jiankang Yao: That's a valid point. Is what you're saying, is not make it mandatory, but make it optional? Is that...

Dave Piscitello: Well, I think, - this is Dave again. I think we can - what it - there's a subtle difference between dot CN understanding and appreciating what's the most commonly used variant are, for you know, the ccTLD and trying to understand what the most common variants of, you know, of Chinese are for,

you know, a GTLD where hundreds of countries employ, you know, or have users who registrar Chinese names.

And you know, so I think it becomes significantly more idiosyncratic, you know, as you localize this, but it becomes exactly the opposite as you go global.

(Steve): Good point.

Jiankang Yao: This Jiankang Yao. And for my opinion, in other words, the WHOIS should only display IDN words that are put in DS rules that are put in DS rules.

So, although IDN words will be one package, should it be displayed to the user? At the same time, if you display the words that are not in the IDN rules, so that...

(Steve): Jian Yao?

Dave Piscitello: I see. So if - I think we're all saying the same thing.

(Steve): Yes.

Dave Piscitello: Your description is based on, you know, on sort of two criteria. It's a variant that you recognize and it's also a variant that's used in a label that's been substantiated in its own file.

(Steve): Yes.

Dave Piscitello: Yeah, okay.

(Steve): So we have an agreement on that. I see (unintelligible) what's the use case for displaying variant?



Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. Was that a question?

(Steve): Yes. I mean, am I rephrasing your question correctly? Are you - you're essentially questioning whether we want - whether there's a space globally for variant right?

Jeremy Hitchcock: Yeah, that's - essentially I'm asking what's the - in a global - in a more global context, why would you - I could understand for localized within country applications, 'cause you want to render text slightly more readable. But I'm guessing with the various use cases, you're not looking for - you're not going to have somebody who is using a variant or a dialect and trying to communicate with that person, it's probably for more official purpose.

So that the reasoning for a variant or for displaying multiple variants, is probably less likely, but no - I'm not an expert in the area, so I'm just kind of making...

But yeah, I think that the general question of why displaying variants is important, especially in the GTLD context, where you're probably interested in all the other way. It could be you're interested in the most specific case.

(Steve): Okay. That's a valid question. I will write it up and post this to the working group.

We have about 15 minutes left.

Dave Piscitello: Someone has mail.

(Steve): Yes. That's correct. (Julie)'s second point was issues remaining to be addressed. Can we have a quick discussion on that? What are some of the issues...

Woman: I can help you out with that

(Steve): ...for this working group that remains - needs to be addressed.

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. So I guess a couple of quick ones, that we have at least, that I've been keeping track of that we really need to have some agreement on, is which of the approaches in the sense of ASCII requirements exist?

And I think the past president, pretty much all of contact elements. I think that there's a question of what display, whether or not, we're just talking about Port 43 WHOIS or Web based and how those two are impacted?

And I'm...

(Steve): I'm sorry. Would you repeat the second part - the second question? I didn't get it, a part from Port 43 WHOIS.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Port 43 WHOIS and a Web based WHOIS, because I think that the two of them have come up as potentially separate sets of requirements or separate sub based.

(Steve): And what was the question? The question is...

Jeremy Hitchcock: Whether we treat them separately or whether they have different requirements, because I don't think - I think we've always been talking about Port 43 as the system, but as what brought up, I think, a couple weeks before Brussels, they actually look a little bit different in the sense of how they might respond.

And I think the Web based query tool is a little bit more robust and potentially able to have more language support.

(Steve): Okay. Any other questions, issue?

Dave Piscitello: Jeremy can I ask you why include that? Is it an order of complexity or is it...?

Jeremy Hitchcock: No, actually, I think that a Web based - I think Web based protocols have a lot more - they have a great understanding of what language and what scripts and how text is rendered back.

Because they're HTML and HTTP have a great framework for handling language translations and it's not just- we've been kind of talking about Port 43 WHOIS trying to key off of what the query string is and trying to look at what characters are in that query string in order to determine language and family.

And you don't need to do that in a Web context. So I'm saying that the Web context is actually a little bit easier to provide alternatives - it makes it easier to do the display.

Dave Piscitello: Well I'm - the only reason I'm asking is, because I guess my sort of intuition said that, if the thought's not present on the - you know, in the operating system, it doesn't matter.

So, maybe I'm, you know, I'm too immersed in how we used to get, you know, terminal settings for, you know, for Telnet. But, you know, I guess I...

Jeremy Hitchcock: Yeah, it could be. I mean, if you download Fire Fox or offer a Safari or Internet Explorer, they typically have a pretty wide range of language support and the fonts are actually loaded in there.

So the display makes it a lot easier and also in the actual transmission of requesting and displaying documents there's a lot more language support.

Dave Piscitello: Okay, so actually what I think what you're saying, is that the existence of client applications that are - that have the proper character sets bundled is more prevalent among browsers than it is among client command lines?

Jeremy Hitchcock: Yeah, that'd be a fair way of saying it.

Dave Piscitello: Okay.

Jeremy Hitchcock: The other one would be, is that your data transport in HTP is also very well encapsulated, so it's - you don't have the same type of problems in - like when we were talking about extending the 43 WHOIS and trying to figure out that port's capability, was a lot more complicated to think about how - whether they were going to be some sort of XMLs or something like that. And you don't have - those problems have already been solved, I think, for - in the HTP world.

Dave Piscitello: Right. And those are the issues that (Jim Galvin) had raised a couple, you know, a couple of times, where you know, are we going to use some sort of mime, you know, mime encapsulation or XML or you know, 'cause he had mentioned that.

I think it's valuable for us to make both those observations in our report.

Avri Doria: Right. This is Avri. Can I add. I think it is good to make those observations, but at some point, that then will enter sort of a policy area, of if we're not saying it's impossible, then one has to decide whether contractually and everything else, those bits of backward compatibility need to be there or not.

Dave Piscitello: Yeah, I agree.

Avri Doria: And so that's where we're really on a cusp. And so we probably should say, it's possible, but it's really hard, or it's not possible. I think it's probably possible, but really hard, as opposed to not possible.

But you know, I haven't delved deeply enough into them to say that for sure.  
Thanks.

Dave Piscitello: Right.

(Steve): Okay. I've taken them down. Any other open issues that need to be addressed?

Robert Hutchison: Yeah, this is Bob Hutchinson again. That comment period in Brussels failed to sort out about Iris and I didn't hear a response from this group or maybe it's not part of the scope of this group as to how that work relates to what's going on, I guess, on the second part of the report Dave did?

(Steve): I'm sorry. What - what's the - how is Iris related to this working group?

Robert Hutchinson: Yes, it's a - it was noted, but I don't know if it is something that this working group needs to take a look at or whether it's just not of interest at all?

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. I don't think that - it's certainly of interest, but I think it's the wrong answer. Iris is a technical implementation of registry and data. It very - if I could speak, it may very well be a great implementation for a set of requirements, but I think we wanted to find about our environment and then think about what other technical things might exist out in the world.

And so that was - somebody asked that during the working group, but I think that was essentially the answer I gave, which is, no Iris might be great for the things that it's designed for and what standard says that it's designed for, but I think we're still trying to figure out what the business rules and the policies are.

Robert Hutchinson: Right.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. If I could add to that. I think something that would be useful to encourage the proponents of Iris is after this comes out for them or someone else to basically look at the requirements, look at Iris and say, yeah, yeah, no,

but easy, you know, and go through it and do an analysis. But I wouldn't see it as being part of this group, but certainly a great response to the work of this group.

Dave Piscitello: So Avri, this is Dave. If you run into someone who's a proponent for Iris, would you please point them in my direction, because - they're about as rare as diamonds.

Jeremy Hitchcock:...or a minority.

Dave Piscitello: And it would really be interesting to actually have somebody who's a proponent of Iris to ask questions of and get perspectives from, because all we hear is nay saying against Iris.

Now, and just for completeness sake, if no other - if nothing else, I'd like to understand who still likes it.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yeah, I'll have to - I mean, I've heard people, you know, during the past couple of years bring it up, but now I have to remember who it was, that would say, "You know, we should", and so I'll try and remember to volunteer.

Dave Piscitello: Sounds good.

Avri Doria: Have we looked at the talk to, you know, the people that did the original work on it, the...you know, and see if they're still proponents of their product and want to take a stab at answering anything?

(Steve): Well there's no - really no working implementation of who Iris and our original architects of Iris has moved onto rest for WHOIS.

Dave Piscitello: Yeah, I was just about say, hear the same thing.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Which some people might say is the way forward. This is Jeremy. But it's restful WHOIS, that's the new thing that we should be chasing after.

Avri Doria: So, this is Avri again. So if we can't find such proponents, it may fall on either this group or someone from, you know, the naysayers group to do a proper analysis, so that it can permanently put to bed.

Like I say, I haven't studied Iris. I you know, you know, don't know the answer to it, but if there are several proposals, someone's going to have to take Iris and put it to bed, because I know, while I was, you know, playing chair of GNSO, people would constantly bring it up as, "Oh, we should", and if only I could remember who was saying the we should.

But it was constantly there as a refrain.

Dave Piscitello: I think that probably falls on (Steve) and I to, you know, to consider as we wrap up the service requirements work for the GNSO, but I...

Avri Doria: Yeah...

Dave Piscitello: ...but my suspicion, is that what - the underlying - the requirements that we would have for IRD are probably a subset of the requirements that we would overall have for, you know, for WHOIS.

(Steve): So as timing is running short...

Robert Hutchinson: One other point. It was mentioned in the variants discussion that in India you may have hundreds of variants. I don't know if we have anybody from that community on the call or so who understands the root of that. I would like to understand what hundreds of variants in one language or one script means, 'cause I guess I don't believe that's the case, if somebody could illuminate that?

(Steve): Ram Mohan, I think has a great knowledge of Indian variants. And (Afilius) who is also operating the Indian top GTLD, they run into this issue, but when Ram is next on the call and we'll make sure to ask him about that.

Robert Hutchinson: What he expects?

(Steve): Yeah.

Dave Piscitello: Yeah, and this is Dave. I know that in other conversations Ram and (Gregan) have mentioned that India has, I believe, at least 20, maybe the accurate number is like 22 or 23 or 26, official variants in, you know, in the Hindi language.

You know, so you know, whether it's a hundred or whether it's 20, it's an awful lot more than two.

(Steve): What are the next steps in preparing recommendations to implementations plan? What does the working group think on this question?

Dave Piscitello: Well maybe I can - maybe as staff I can ask Jeremy as the chair. What would you like to see staff do next?

Avri Doria: I'm not sure, but I have one thought. Don't we - obviously, it seems to me we're at the point of figuring out what the end game is for this group, to get some final report and put it out and say we're done.

So I'm not quite sure what that set of steps is, but that, I think, outlining those and how we get closure on the group, might be something that was helpful.

But as I say, this is Avri speaking totally out of turn.

Dave Piscitello: So again, this is Dave. Would having (Steve) and I put together a list that says - a list of the issues that we've discussed so far, and what we believe



the working party has concluded, with respect to each of those issues be the first step, so that you know, once again, we actually - we will be able to, you know, put in front of the working party, sort of a status report.

Here's where we believe we are with the issues that were originally, you know, handed to us, you know, to study. We believe we have closure or some sort of working agreement, you know, on these. These are - those that are still outstanding are, you know, are here and in the meantime, we could start to prepare a report describing each of the issues and what the working party recommends.

Robert Hutchinson: This is Bob Hutchinson again. I would take the slide deck from the presentation and roll that backwards into a word document and use that form as a way to put together the recommendations for each one of the issues and get back to the group. And you know, I would basically start with that in terms of form for how we're going to communicate our findings.

(Steve): That's a good suggestion. We could certainly do that. Any other thoughts? Any thoughts on how we can bring closure to some of these topics? I think preparing the report should be less complicated than reaching - to bring, reaching consensus or bring closure.

Robert Hutchinson: And I think there's - in the slide deck itself, there's a number of issues that are still listed as open and perhaps somebody could pull those out for the next conference call and send them out as agenda items for people to be discussing or thinking about.

(Steve): Okay. That's a good step. So pull the open issue out and send out agenda items for people to discuss. Okay. Any other thoughts? Rafik, Jiankang do you have some thoughts on this?

Jiankang Yao: No.

(Steve): Okay. I think these were some very helpful discussions.

Dave Piscitello: Yeah, good call.

(Steve): Yeah. For the meeting schedule, since (Julie)'s not here, I would opt not to change the current status quo for now. That is - we still - we continue to rotate meeting times for geographical purposes.

Is that okay with people on the call for now? Okay. Great. All right.

Well, thank you so much for joining today's RAD call. I think it was a very productive call. We will - the staff will prepare meeting notes and send it to the working group and also on that meeting notes, we'll have some, you know, action items now.

And we'll also identify the open issues that discussed today. So with that, I would like to close today's call.

Thank you so much for your participation.

Dave Piscitello: Thank you (Steve).

Avri Doria: Bye, bye.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Bye all.

END