

**GNSO/SSAC
International Registration Data Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 30 August 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 30 August 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-20100830.mp3>

<http://gnsso.icann.org/calendar/#aug>

Present for the teleconference:

Andrei Kolesnikov -- Nominating Committee Appointee

Rafik Damak -- GNSO Non-Commercial Users Stakeholder Group

Avri Doria - NCSG

Bob Hutchinson, GNSO Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG)

Yao Jiankang, GNSO Registry Stakeholder Group, CNNIC

Steven Metalitz -- GNSO Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, CSG

Jim Galvin -- SSAC -Afilias

Edmon Chung -- Co-chair - GNSO Registry Stakeholder Group

ICANN Staff

Julie Hedlund

Steve Sheng

David Piscitello

Glen de Saint Géry

Absent apologies:

Jeremy Hitchcock - DYN-DNS

Coordinator: Excuse me everyone, it's the operator. I just need to inform you that this conference call is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. And you may begin.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much (Lori). This is Julie Hedlund and I'll go ahead and do a roll call for this meeting of the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group.

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. On the call we have our Chair, the Co-Chair, Edmon Chung. We also have Andrei Kolesnikov, Rafik Dammak, Bob Hutchinson, Jim Galvin.

And from staff we have Steve Shang, Dave Piscitello, Glen Desaintgery and Julie Hedlund. Have I missed anyone?

Wonderful, well thank you very much. And I'll turn it over to Edmon and then also to Steve Shang. Perhaps Steve could catch us up on where we were at the last call.

I think we've been making some progress through this staff summary through Page 3. But perhaps you'd like to lead us into that Steve?

Steve Sheng If that's okay with Edmon.

Julie Hedlund: Well actually, I'm sorry, this is Julie. Let me just start with one other thing so we don't save it for the end of the meeting.

We've had a request to have this call be switched to a later time. It is a relatively early time for people on the West Coast. But it's also a late time for folks in Asia.

Edmon, if we were to start an hour later, would you be able to accommodate that?

Edmon Chung: For me it's fine.

Julie Hedlund: For you it's okay?

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: Others on the call, would one hour later work for you?

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: I'm sorry, who was that?

Andrei Kolesnikov: It's Andre.

Julie Hedlund: Would that work for you?

Andrei Kolesnikov: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: Rafik, I know you're in Asia. Would one hour later still be okay for you?

Rafik Dammak: It will be midnight.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, quite late. So I hesitate to do that. Would you be able to do that or should we stay at this time? I mean we picked this time because it's sort of an in between time for everyone.

It's hard to find a time that works perfectly for everyone. So I'm hesitate - I'm hesitant to change it. But the request was made by (Owen Smigalski) who's on the West Coast.

And I see Steve Metalitz has just joined us. Welcome Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you, good morning.

Julie Hedlund: Steve, I just want to let you know, this is Julie. We've had a request to perhaps change the call time to one hour later. That does make it challenging for folks in Asia.

Edmon has said he could make it. But I know it's also a difficult time for Rafik as well. So I was polling the members to see if folks could start an hour later or if we should keep it at this time.

Steve Metalitz: I could do either.

Julie Hedlund: Rafik, what do you think? Midnight is awfully late for you. I hate to do that to you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Are you sure? We're not going to let you get much sleep. Okay.

Rafik Dammak: I think I'll call it at a half always late at night so.

Julie Hedlund: Okay well very good and thanks for being so accommodating everyone. Glen if you could please note that we will start the call one hour later at our next scheduled call which will be two weeks from now.

Glen Desaintgery: Thank you Julie. I'll do that.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Glen. I'm sorry to take some time with that, but I thought rather than saving it for the end, we could check that off here at the beginning.

Steve let me go ahead and turn it over to you.

Steve Sheng Okay so I want to first give a summary of where we discussed last time. So the last time we spent about 30 minutes talking continue our discussion of variance. Hello?

And I think that the discussion was that it's very difficult to have an accurate definition of variance and because different organizations or different countries may define it differently.

So I think that the working group members saw that it's not up to us to define what it is. But we can simply take the definition that's given. Usually they are in, you know, two forms, the activated variance and also the reserved variance.

And we - and to think about how to display those two types of variance in who is. So I think we have agreement on the call last time with a few members that will activate variance.

Basically that the variance that exists in the DMS to a who is query of the variance to the return the who is result of the original domain as well as in note that this is a variant of the original domain.

For reserved variance, that means the variance that are reserved but are not in the zone, there are two options. One option is the query of a reserved variant would only return a message saying that, you know, this domain is a reserved variant of, you know, XYZ domain.

So that's one option. The other option is a query of a reserve variant who will return the same information as a query for the activated variance.

So that's where we are last time. So I guess what does the working group think?

Jim Galvin: This is Jim. One question I have is what does who is do now with reserved names? I didn't think that it responded. But I guess I really don't know. Does anybody know for certain?

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon.

Man: So you mean like an example about (coms)?

Jim Galvin: No, I mean for names which are reserved but not in the zone. And there are such names. What does - does who is actually return anything?

Man: Well give me a name and I'll who is it.

Jim Galvin: Well yes, I was thinking I could do the same thing too. But I frankly don't know a reserved name off the top of my head.

Man: Why don't you try one of the single letter names in .com, a, you know, b.com or g.com that's reserved.

Man: So actually it returned it ownership on the IANA. So it created - so the com registry returns the domain d.com, organization IANA created in 1992 01 01, source IANA. That's all you get.

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon. I think there are usually two ways to deal with reserved names at this point, just generally.

One is that they're essentially registered into the registry with some sort of placeholder data so that it responds in the who is, but it does not - is not included in the zone by way that it, the name servers are not included.

The other way is that the registry would actually have a sort of list of reserve names whereby the who is will also respond. But it's not a regular registration.

The who is would respond just saying that it's a reserved name. Those are usually from GTLDs and in fact there's a lot of CCLDs as well. Those are the two main approaches I think.

Jim Galvin: Well this is Jim again. So based on that, I would think that for reserved names you return a message that says that it's reserved.

Edmon Chung: Right, I think that's a reasonable requirement. So I think...

Jim Galvin: Yes.

Edmon Chung: On top of that I just want to make a couple of observations. I apologize I wasn't able to be on the call last time. But I'm actually glad that from Steve's summary, I think it seems like a good direction.

And in fact, the sort of categorizing as activated variance and reserved variance seems to be a direction that makes a lot of sense for ICANN policy discussions and not only in this context, but also others.

But (before) who is, I think that makes a lot of sense in terms of how to deal with the - what type of data to be respondent to.

Jim Galvin: Right so I interpreted Steve's question to be asking if there was a preference. Or is he just asking if those two choices represent consensus? I mean that's why I just said I would prefer the first.

Edmon Chung: Well generally I think it's probably better to allow either. But I'm sort of open. But I feel that providing - allowing either would provide a better choice for people to decide, registries to decide how they want to present the data.

Jim Galvin: I'm okay with that.

Steve Sheng So Edmon, one of my concerns as I think about, so providing the second option. So for example, you know, treat the reserved variance the same as activated variance.

So when a user, so when a computer user using query a reserved variance and he or she sees the who is record there, would that give them kind of a wrong impression that the name, he can actually resolve their names so...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: I think I sort of read it, I guess I'm re-reading it. Sort of when I read it, I thought the first option was would only return a message saying and the second one would return the same information.

I, somehow I had interpreted it that it would still provide that message saying that, you know, it's a reserve. But it will also provide the information of the activated variance.

So I think, you know, you just asked the question. And I think it's more corrective, you know, that there is the message that says this is the reserve variance for XYZ domains because on your second point you didn't say only be the same information.

But I think your observation is correct.

Steve Sheng Okay so you think that by providing a message saying that this is a reserved variant, the user will not be confused?

Edmon Chung: I think if we really want to add to it then for all, really for all IDNs where there is a variant issue, there should probably be sort of a link to the policy so that people can read the policy of how the variance is generated - variance are generated.

Steve Sheng Okay. Okay that's, I'm fine with that. So what you're saying is providing two alternatives for the, you know, registrars or registries. But, you know, requiring them to at least implement Option A. Is that right?

Edmon Chung: That seems to make sense for me. And the other thing is it might be useful actually to return a URL that has information about where the

policy, you know, where the policy is posted. I'm just making a suggestion here.

Steve Sheng Okay, what do others think?

Man: I'm a little confused with now we've got two different kinds of variance that we're, or two different kinds of reserved names that has kind of crept into the discussion.

One is the style of g.com where ICANN has by policy reserved those names. And the other one is the registrars naming policy is reserving the name okay.

And I'm, I guess I don't mix the two. Is that, am I wrong to think that they are separate? Or they should be handled separately.

Steve Sheng I think they are separate. In the context of our discussion, the reserved variant is the reserved variant of a particular domain name that is activated.

In the ICANN or IANA as an example, those names are reserved, you know, by default. Like nobody else can register them at all.

Am I correct, what you're referring to is, you know, if you are displaying the same message, then you'll get people confused. Is that your concern?

Man: My point is that variant reserve or reserved variance or whatever you want to call them are not the same as IANA or ICANN reserved

names. And I just want, I think that we shouldn't mix the two is what I'm...

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon. I think that is clear. I think what, just to clarify, what we, I think what we are trying to suggest, or the let us trace back to the conversation, we were sort of asking what the current, you know, IANA reserved names, how do they look like in who is.

As a, sort of as a background information for the discussion. Not really that it would be like the IANA one. So in terms of the IDN variant, but what we're saying is that they are reserved for a particular domain.

And the response would indicate which domain that this reserved variant is pertained. And then such that, you know, the user when they're looking for this particular domain, they know why, you know, what, sort of what state it is in. Does that clarify...

Man: Yes that's fine. I just wanted to clarify that, you know, I think the two are different. And we should talk only I guess in this context about variance of domain names at the registry level.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Man: Not at the ICANN reserved names, understand...

((Crosstalk))

Man: And illustration okay.

Jim Galvin: So just to make sure I understand, this is Jim, I - you're making an important, I guess you're suggesting this is an important distinction. A name may be reserved. But it's reserved as a result of two - there are at least two different policies by which it might be reserved.

You know, either by ICANN or by the registry for whatever reason the registry wants to declare it reserved as. Are we going to try to split apart the reasons why a registry might reserve a name too?

I mean the thing that occurs to me is there are reasons why a registry might reserve a name outside of just it being a variant. Are we expecting a registry to create, you know, codes if you will or messages if you will to indicate all the possible reasons why something might be reserved?

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon. I think that might be a little bit out of sort of out of the scope of what we are discussing right now. What we're discussing right now is focused on the IDN variance.

Whether there are, you know, other codes for whatever the registry does, at this point I don't think there is any particular standard or policy for it. And I'm pretty sure that some different CCLDs implement that slightly differently at this point because different registries do have additional reserve names.

But I don't think there is a sort of a standard or specific policy for that. On this particular discussion we're talking about IDN variance. And I think it's useful to mention a generic approach, at least to let people

know that when a domain is taken out of the available pool, this is the reason for which it's reserved. And the who is information will show that.

The other types of reserve names is somewhat not live in this particular discussion. Though I'm sure it's an interesting discussion.

Jim Galvin: Certainly I'm not suggesting that we would, I mean I agree. The actual work is out of scope. I'm trying to understand, you know, the consequences or implications if you will of what we're doing here.

So we're suggesting that we need to say that it's reserved because it's a variant of another name. It's not enough just to say that it's a reserved name. We want to say that it's reserved because it's a variant of this domain name.

I just, I'm simply observing that that's distinct from the way reserve names are handled today. And I think it's important to observe that we're doing something different than the way these things are done today.

Steve Sheng I will put that into the discussion. And we need probably a little bit more in the report as well of (unintelligible).

Jim Galvin: It might be a suggestion for the work to look at, you know, reserved categories and standardizing those. But I agree with Edmon, we should otherwise consider it out of scope.

Steve Sheng Okay any other thoughts on variance? So it seems that we outlined two options that for the reserved variance. And we will suggest that

registries or registrars have the option to implement the second type of treating reserved names as activated variance.

But at least they should implement Option 1 (unintelligible). When someone querying a reserved variant, it should say this is a reserved names, a variant of, you know, the original domain.

Okay so we can wrap up that discussion. Thank you. Do we want to discuss other issues or what do we want to do here now? We can talk about the document.

Julie Hedlund: Steve this is Julie. Maybe, I think in your notes you indicated that you'd gotten through Page 3 of the documents, staff summary document. Perhaps you want to continue that discussion from that point?

Steve Sheng Okay. Yes I think we've reached - seems to have some preliminary recommendations for variance. That's very good. That's a big thing. Let's see.

So we we're going through the IRDs that you - (D) group, the staff summary last time. And the goal is, so the summary was essentially a, if we turn the PowerPoint presentation from Brussels into Word.

And we used this exercise as a way, you know, to identify, you know, what issues we have discussed, what we have consensus on. And what issues that we need more further discussion.

So when we were going through that document, and last time we were on Page 3 of the document. First of all, do you have the document

handy? It would probably be helpful if we can have the document together.

Jim Galvin: This is the document from July 30, correct?

Julie Hedlund: Yes Jim, this is Julie. That's correct.

Steve Sheng Yes.

Jim Galvin: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: But Steve, this is Julie. You might also just want to read through a little bit just in case, you know, some folks don't have it handy. I can send it around to people.

Steve Sheng Okay.

Julie Hedlund: But you might want to describe what the next issue is that we're discussing.

Steve Sheng Okay, okay.

Man: Is this document on the Wiki's page?

Julie Hedlund: I think it is. I think it is, but I think it's probably perhaps linked to an earlier note. Let me just send it quickly around to everyone.

Steve Sheng Okay. But let me summarize what we discussed last time. What we discussed last time going through the first couple of pages, there was no problem.

However, we stopped at this particular point. The point was that the existing GUI's protocol has no mechanism for indicating a preferred character set to use, either for query input or for the display of the results of the query.

So this is essentially a limitation of the Port 43 who is. And what we have in the document is a recommendation that the working group recommend interested parties to submit a proposal to resolve this IETF for consideration as a standard track RFC.

So that's what I think the working group discussed. Basically we'll call out this issue that the who is lacks this capability. But we will not address it here.

So discussions last week, we had a couple of discussions essentially saying, you know, if you go to IETF, you know, the IETF will simply refer us to IRIS. Or, you know, so that's one option.

The second is, you know, ICANN can do some work or pay someone to do the work and develop an informal RFC. Whether that will become standardized is open to question.

And another suggestion is, by (Jeremy) is that in the interim reports, we want to have a solutions section. So we want to look at who is. And we'll look at like other solutions like IRIS and (restful) who is that others currently gave me a lot of head winds.

Like why they worked and, you know, why no one is adopting them, you know, sort of issues on that. Go ahead, I just want to open it up. I think that's an important question.

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon. A couple of things come to mind. The (burnt) who is I think sort of specified ASC, am I correct, is it a seven bit (clean) key?

Steve Sheng Yes, it's an ASC seven bit (clean), yes.

Edmon Chung: In that case then there are really two, well just as a back list compatible, you are thinking there are two ways. You know, and there is the UTS7 and there is also sort of like a mime-type-encoding theme that we could perhaps add in a report as one (unintelligible) of encoding the data.

(Unintelligible) been discussed last time because again, sorry, I haven't...

Steve Sheng I'm sorry, I didn't get you. Could you repeat?

Edmon Chung: Well just off the top of my head there, there are two ways to look into this one. One is perhaps utilizing UTS7. The other is looking into a mime-type sort of how should I say, a mime-type arrangement.

Steve Sheng Yes I think this is one point that Jim raised as a potential solution. Jim go ahead.

Jim Galvin: Yes, I mean I was going to say the important thing here is whether or not backwards compatibility with who is was a goal. You know, I mean IRIS is not backwards compatible.

And so, you know, I just, I think the question that we have to ask ourselves is are we somehow, do we want to try to force that something new be done that's backwards compatible?

Or shouldn't we simply adopt what is there? And, you know, a lot of people got together and proposed something which, you know, solves an awful lot of problems.

I observe - I mean on the issue of whether the ITF would even consider standardizing something else. It's hard to say. I suspect that the odds are not very good.

The ITF has been getting more and more formal over the years in spite of itself and its best wishes not to end protocols that compete with something that exists.

Face quite a high bar and a big hurdle to even get published. I have no idea how that would be likely to turn out if we were to try to propose something or if ICANN were to pay for something to happen.

I think the question that we have to ask ourselves is why is IRIS or a (restful) who is inappropriate? And that's what we need to document. Or we need to provide a recommendation that this is the path we need to head towards.

People need to begin looking at IRIS and getting serious about it.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can I get in the queue?

Steve Sheng Go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Hi and sorry I missed the beginning of this meeting I thought I was dialing in on time but I seem to have jumped in the middle. I think that - and what was just said, there's really two things I think when we were talking about backward compatibility we were talking about the data requirements and were the data requirements compatible.

And indeed we may find that there's a split in the data requirements, that there's a minimal set that would be backward compatible and that there's a full set that might not be and that might be one way to look at it. So that we're not trying to do some sort of (Flag Day) notion on, you know, WHOIS is the old and never will work and something new for example IRIS is the new and everyone must switch over. So I think when we're looking at backward compatibility it's not is IRIS backward compatible with WHOIS it's are the requirements for the data which is what we've been charged with thinking about.

Now the second question comes up. Okay let's say that we do decide that a basic set is backwardly compatible but we are recommending a fuller set be sort of an option that people should be headed towards across a five-year period what have you - I mean I'm just hand waving very much at the moment. But then in that more advanced that we can look at what is a decent vehicle.

Now one question is have about what was just said was aren't both WHOIS and IRIS IETF protocol? And so a recommended change to WHOIS would not be doing something that was some other protocol but it would be taking something - and I do not remember at what level of standard either (it) or IRIS is at.

But wouldn't it be doing something to something that is already an IETF protocol? So that coming in with something outside would only pertain if somebody were to go off and blue sky a completely new protocol not if someone were to say, "Listen how can we fix up WHOIS?" And again hand waving as to whether it is possible to fix up WHOIS. Thanks.

Jim Galvin: I agree. I mean I think Avri asks some really good questions. And I really, you know, don't want to speak to the IETF or it's processes I mean she's been around it as long as I have. So, you know, it's hard to say what's likely to happen.

You know, IRIS was at some level intended to be a replacement for WHOIS but WHOIS was never made historic or deprecated. Could you make changes to it? Perhaps. I think if the changes got to be too extensive somebody might step back and say, "Whoa, you know, we already did this once let's not do it again." But, you know, I don't think we're going to resolve the question of what the IETF will or will not do here.

Actually I like what direction Avri was going in focusing on the data and, you know, I think that we should do that. And I think that that's a way to make an observation that WHOIS is insufficient and IRIS is a better choice.

And with (Jeremy's) suggestion of making a solution section we could expand on that a bit and maybe that would provide a basis for going forward with IRIS as opposed to trying to revisit WHOIS. Which I think, you know, we could make a recommendation that it might be possible

to do that but actually proposing anything that one might change would really be outside our scope here I think.

Avri Doria: But - this is Avri again. By the way I wasn't recommending that we do the WHOIS I was just saying that that wasn't an outside protocol. Sorry.

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon. I just want to add I pretty much agree with (Tim) in terms - or I think a lot of people have a general inclination or sentiment toward moving beyond WHOIS.

But I guess what I was bringing up is really, you know, in a solution mindset I don't think we should completely, you know, in the context of having IDN's and existing WHOIS services I'm not sure I'm - we're at the point of abandoning it just yet.

And in terms of suggesting a let's say (UTF-7) over WHOIS really does not change WHOIS as far as I understand. I haven't opened the WHOIS RFC for ages but I think it is really just 7 byte ASCII data, it doesn't even have a format.

So pushing IDN data in sort of what we have discussed so far via WHOIS and a (UTF-7) encoding really does not change WHOIS and does not require a WHOIS change. Which allows most of the things to be for end users to - or existing applications and all those kind of things to continue to work. But if you really want to see the WHOIS data perhaps, you know, even in the solutions session we can point towards more modern tools.

But I guess, you know, I still think there is value in the existing infrastructure that's already out there and we really should not sort of make it really so discriminatory against IDN data and hence, you know, if that is completely not available to existing WHOIS sort of infrastructure. That's my point.

Man: So.

Dave Piscitello: Hey this is Dave can I...

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) I'm sorry. but Dave go ahead. You go first.

Dave Piscitello: So I pulled up RFC 3912 and it's very interesting - this is the WHOIS, you know, protocol specification 2004. And it's very interesting that the only time that it mentions ASCII is when it discussing the encoding of the character turn and line fees. It does not expressly forbid the, you know, any other text encoding.

And in it there's a section now it's call Internationalization that we should probably all read and just, you know, just appreciate because it does say that, "In practice some WHOIS servers particularly those outside the USA might be using some other character set either for requests, replies or both."

And what they point out is - they take a completely agnostic approach in the RFC and all they say is, "This inability to predict or express text encoding has adversely impacted our interoperability." So if you read

that, you know, to the sort of letter of the standard there is nothing that precludes the use of any encoding.

The only requirement in WHOIS which has been, you know, historically the only requirement is that whatever you send, you know, whatever encoding you must conclude the transmission with - at the ASCII character turn and ASCII line feeds.

Man: Right.

Man: Yes.

Dave Piscitello: So if you read that that way and you're looking at identifying possible solutions it seems to me that there - that one thing we could do as staff is enumerate the solutions and include the variations that, you know, we would imagine people might want to choose to use, you know, using the current port 43 WHOIS, using RWF and using IRIS.

And there are obviously all sorts of permutations and we get back to I think what Avri is pointing out is the most important aspect of what this group is, is that we want to understand what the data are that ought to be, you know, that people ought to be able to submit and that people ought to be able to expect when they get a response and these standardization of how you transport it is a separate issue.

Jim Galvin: So - thanks Dave for pointing out 3912. I had missed this update to WHOIS and as you say all it really does is remove the U.S. ASCII requirement. WHOIS still has the problem that you have no idea - there's no way to indicate what character set is in use.

Dave Piscitello: Right.

Jim Galvin: So, you know, it just provides means - in essence all this really does is say that one should regard or could regard WHOIS as 8 byte clean but that's really all you get from it.

Dave Piscitello: So Jim this is Dave again. I see the possibility of WHOIS being very much in parallel with DNS security extensions. And it - yeah, I mean I could imagine an RF - if you wanted to go this path an RFT that talks about, you know, WHOIS extensions to support internationalized registration data.

And it would be - it would seem to me to be very hard for the IETF to say that that would be inappropriate because it already has said it wasn't inappropriate for DNS, it wasn't inappropriate for SMTP. So I mean if we wanted to go the WHOIS route you could do it that way.

Jim Galvin: Yeah. I guess - not sure I want to get into a technical discussion right here and now. It's not immediately obvious to me how WHOIS could use DNS to get past the problem that it has here. Or did I misunderstand what you were suggesting?

Dave Piscitello: Yeah. You misunderstood me. Again this is Dave. We had DNS which could only support 7 byte ASCII it's letter, digit, hyphen. And we wrote at least two sets of, you know, two sets of extensions to DNS, one for internationalized domain names and one for DNS security extensions.

We had mail - SMTP and we wrote extensions for that to support multipurpose Internet mail extensions. Right? So why couldn't you do that for WHOIS in the IETF.

Earlier people said that it would be very hard to get the IETF to accept new standards because IRIS was in place. I'm just responding to that saying I think that that would be a very hard line to draw.

Jim Galvin: Oh okay. So the response is the hard because it's a process question and there's really just no way of knowing how that's likely to turn out because it depends in part on, you know, who the area directors are at the time.

You know, the way the process is supposed to work you can even make an independent submission but it still passes back - when it overlaps with an existing protocol it passes back to the IESG to say something about it.

And actually I think what's supposed to happen is the IESG get to put a statement in front about - I mean, you know, we're getting into sort of detailed IETF process things.

But it would not be something which came out of the IETF and it would be flagged as such and it would have a preamble that stated that this conflicts with an IETF, you know, standard protocol, that kind of thing. So it's not that it's hard to do technically. It's a process question. That's really the only issue that we're raising here.

Avri Doria: If I can - this is Avri again. If I can add to that. It's not necessarily that it would be in contravention. I mean yes the IESG does have to do it, yes the IESG puts a statement saying this was independent work. But that could still be something that was seen as part of WHOIS that was acceptable on, you know, the standards track and such. There is no

preclusion that just because it comes from an external source it will not be.

And yes if it's an end run around the processes or protocols then the IESG probably wouldn't even let it through and if it did it would put that negative imprimatur on it. But often times it would just put a, "This was not produced as the product of a working group. However, you know, it has been through the reviews and it is approved," et cetera type of thing.

So I think you're right (Jeff) there is no way to predict what will happen. But of course understanding how the IETF works and what gets through them as an RFC and what doesn't and what changes can be allowed is something - is a process that someone would have to work.

And again I'm not saying I'm in favor of it or not I'm really just saying that a solution shouldn't be precluded based upon the, you know, the process of IETF because it is possible to make a change to a standing protocol and get it approved.

Steve Sheng Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much Avri.

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: I'm sorry this is Edmon again. You've just - I wanted to sort of ask as we were talking about this particular point I just sort of want to ask and thank you for pointing out the 3912. And actually looking at the other WHOIS just refreshing my mind of the RFC's. But so far it doesn't occur to me that anything that we need to - that we have discussed in terms of the data to be carried utilizing the WHOIS protocol really I

don't see any change required there. It seems to me that, you know, what we want for WHOIS to carry there - the type of data for WHOIS to carry is really a policy matter.

And ICANN saying if there is an IDN registration or if there is a registration with internationalized data like contact data but with an ASCII domain there are, you know, these are the things that you should do and that's actually in the, you know, for details at least like these that's like in the agreement. The ICANN contract has a WHOIS section specifying what type of data and how it should be presented for each registration.

So I'm not sure why we would have to, you know, even if we need to carry internationalized data why we would need to change the WHOIS for - in a technical protocol level such that it can carry that kind of data.

Man: Thank you Edmon.

((Crosstalk))

Dave Piscitello: Well I...

Man: Dave...

Dave Piscitello: Edmon this is Dave again.

Steve Sheng Dave I have to stop you. I want to give a change to our colleagues from Asia Andre, Rafik and (Jan Kung). I think that your own organization deal with IDN's. How do you handle WHOIS and what do

you think of our discussion? Sorry to cut you short Dave I want to give people an opportunity to speak out.

Dave Piscitello: (Unintelligible).

Steve Sheng Andre?

Andrei Kolesnikov: Yes. I'm here. We handle this data very simply. We do not - well yes, we do not allow the IDN characters in the WHOIS outlook, it's on a (legend) strip and there's a couple of reasons why we do this. First of all it's regular and daily work was different internationalization requiring the WHOIS output, you know, to find out, you know, the different (unintelligible) of the copyrights the, you know, the legal content.

Also our agencies in Russia working with, you know, with the (unintelligible) script without problems and also other (unintelligible) enforcement agencies in Russia, you know, spend a few years, you know, trying to educate and find out how to use it.

However with the new IDN we've got (unintelligible) we do allow the IDN characters in the WHOIS output but it's a matter of the registrar on how they deal with that. They set the rules and they don't and basically they don't - they didn't change the ASCII to allow the IDN characters in the data fields.

So for Russia this problem doesn't exist yet and we are pretty much comfortable with ASCII in our data fields when somebody registers a domain. That's basically how we deal with that.

Steve Sheng Okay. Thank you Andre. (Jan Kung)?

(Jan Kung): Hello. The (unintelligible) for the encoding for the current (unintelligible) our national coding for example (JB 2312) there are elements mentioned UTF-8 or UTF-7 for the (unintelligible) encoding. Actually I support the UTF-8 encoding because UTF-7 is not really - is not a (unintelligible) user for encoding. Also the UTF-7, the RFC for defining the UTF-7 is (unintelligible).

So the current (unintelligible) version five only the UTF-8 or (unintelligible) UTF-1332 so no UTF-7. So - which kind of encoding support UTF-8 is okay but UTF-7 is not commonly used. Thank you.

Steve Sheng Thank you. Rafik? Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Yes. I'm not (unintelligible) organization which is handling the IDN. So but I'm just wondering about what Edmon (unintelligible) that we may not need to change WHOIS protocol. But are we (unintelligible) the WHOIS can handle other how you say, other characters in the ASCII because I'm (unintelligible) check the RFC (unintelligible). We can check this point.

And also I am wondering about IRIS because I know that some issue (unintelligible) is that (unintelligible) that using IRIS. Maybe we can check and see the (unintelligible) and communicate about that.

Steve Sheng Okay. Thank you Rafik. So what I'm hearing for the RU IDN is not an issue. Currently it's requiring ASCII but RU is comfortable with ASCII but they allow IDN and it's a matter of registrar policy. So Andre if a registrar in Russia does allow IDN what encoding is it in?

Andrei Kolesnikov: Excuse me, can you repeat one more time?

Steve Sheng If a registrar in Russia does allow internationalized registration data what encoding data are in? Is it in the Russian encoding or...

Andrei Kolesnikov: No, no, no. We use ASCII transcripts.

Steve Sheng Okay.

Andrei Kolesnikov: Whatever language it is it's all written in the ASCII. It's not a translation of something, it's a transcript.

Steve Sheng Transcript, right. So - but do you allow like native internationalized registration data?

Andrei Kolesnikov: Well we, you know, when you - let me say this in our new regulation documents regarding our national IDN domain yes it is possible to answer the, you know, to answer the IDN characters in the data fields.

Steve Sheng Okay.

Andrei Kolesnikov: But the registrars who is accredited by our coordination center didn't (implemented) it yet.

Steve Sheng Oh. I see.

Andrei Kolesnikov: But also there will be certain limitations. For example the content data will be in ASCII for a long period of time for the reasons everybody knows why. I mean...

Steve Sheng Okay. Thank you.

Andrei Kolesnikov: And also we have like 15 years of (dot RU) behind us and, you know, three new (unintelligible) domains. And the market and the users pretty much - pretty free at the rate of, you know, traditional licensed (rate).

So, you know, we don't see it as a physical imitation we, you know, the IDN is more goes up the marketing thing because it's hard to write an ASCII in certain Russian, you know, sounds and letters. That's why it's very important for us.

Steve Sheng Yes.

Andrei Kolesnikov: But the WHOIS (output) will remain ASCII for a long time.

Steve Sheng Okay. Thank you. That sounds fine. Dave were you having a point?
Sorry to cut you short.

Dave Piscitello: No. We can just go on.

Steve Sheng Edmon. Thoughts?

Edmon Chung: Yeah. I guess my sort of question remains with Jim and Avri and Dave there. I'm curious what you have in mind to change the protocol to? It seems to me that it is a policy - it seems like based on what we're reading now that it really is a policy decision as to what data elements and how we want it passed through, you know, using the WHOIS.

Of course we can also point towards more modern tools and say, you know, that's probably better. But it seems like if we focus on what the type of data points we - what type of data and what format we want it in the current WHOIS can actually handle it.

Man: So...

((Crosstalk))

Jim Galvin: Well the thing that the WHOIS doesn't handle is it doesn't let you say - I mean if you give it a query of an IDN name, if you give it an IDN name as a query the thing that it doesn't let you say is what language or variant you're using.

Now I suppose a particular registry could decide by policy what it's going to support and if you send it a, you know, "bad" query then, you know, who knows what you might get in response. But as long as you send it a sensible query then you'll get a sensible response and I agree with that.

But I think it's a real shortcoming that you cannot specify, you know, what character set's in use. And I think it - that's an important limitation for us to remind people about.

Man: Sure.

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: I think that limitation is a, you know, it's really important to point it out and I think it's - and that's a clear limitation for the WHOIS protocol and

we can point people to the newer tools as I mentioned -- IRIS or, you know, well mainly IRIS.

But the - you point out two - there are two items that we probably need to discuss. One is - let's use a simpler example, if we query an ASCII domain and it comes back with internationalized data in the contact or whatever form. The other type of discussion that we need to have is how we query an IDN so the query, you know, the domain in question is an IDN whether we would be sending over, you know, how we would be sending over to the server. Those are very different questions perhaps.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. I hate to...

Edmon Chung: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...I hate to interrupt but I should note that we are two minutes past the hour so we probably should wrap up the discussion. Did any of you have anything else that you wanted to continue with at this point or should we postpone the rest of the discussion until the next call?

Steve Sheng I don't have anything. It's up to Edmon.

Edmon Chung: I thought I heard Avri wanting to...

Avri Doria: Yeah I mean I was, I was (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: ...so maybe after Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. What I was trying to say was when you brought up the question isn't it a policy question? I think we actually have two policy questions. One of them is what shape the data should have and then there is another policy question about what do we believe should be done about tools? And I don't mean what should be done in the technical sense of we need to change, you know, this parameter, we need to add these bytes. But what I mean is the community needs to make a decision, this group needs to make a recommendation on should something be done with old protocols? Should something be done to move to new protocol? That itself is a policy decision. Should this be done over a number of years? How should that happen?

And then the thing I brought up at the beginning is if we look at the first decision what is our policy regarding the data and we see some stuff that is mandatory and should be backward compatible and some stuff that isn't. Recognizing that perhaps a small tweak to WHOIS is easier to make for a small basic set than to get everybody in the world to implement and instantiate and deploy IRIS or some new protocol, you know, those are policy type decisions that get based on technical realities.

But I believe we may actually have two policy decisions to make. One regarding the data and one regarding what we believe should be the required tooling since some of that stuff is contractually indicated. Thanks and thanks for giving - and again apologies I thought this started at 10:30 not 10:00 and so I blew it.

Julie Hedlund: Actually Avri this is Julie it did start at 10:30 last time but we switched back to the regular...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Okay. And I just had the old entry continuing through.

Julie Hedlund: You didn't miss that and just for your note one thing we discussed before you got on the call that we're going to schedule the call for one hour later in two weeks.

Avri Doria: Okay. I'll try to make sure I change my calendar as opposed to just leaving my repeat every two weeks entry.

Julie Hedlund: Right. And we'll also send a reminder around as well. Thank you everyone. Is there anything else we want to discuss at this point or shall we adjourn the call until the next call for two weeks time? Then thank you everyone. Thank you Edmon and thank you Working Group members. I hope you all have a good day or evening and we'll talk to you in two weeks.

Man: Thanks Julie.

Man: Thank you Julie.

Woman: Thank you.

Man: Thank you.

END