

**GNSO/SSAC
International Registration Data Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 19 September at 15:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO/SSAC International Registration Data Working Group on 19 September 2011 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-20110919-en.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#sep>

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

Present for the teleconference:

Edmon Chung - ALAC
Avri Doria – NCSG
Jim Galvin – SSAC -Afilias
Bob Hutchinson -- GNSO Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG)
Scott Austin - IPC

ICANN Staff

Gisella Gruber
Steve Sheng
Dave Piscitello

Absent apologies:

Steven Metalitz -- GNSO Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial
Owen Smigelski - Sunrider International, Intellectual Property Interests Constituency,
Commercial Stakeholder Group
Rafik Dammak -- GNSO Non-Commercial Users Stakeholder Group
Julie Hedlund
Sarmad Hussain - CLE-KICS, UET

Coordinator: The call is now recorded. Please go ahead.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon to everyone. On today's IRD call on Monday the 19th of September we have Jim Galvin and Avri Doria.

From staff we have Steve Sheng, Dave Piscitello and myself, Gisella Gruber. Apologies today noted from Rafik Dammak, Steve Metalitz, Owen Smigelski, Julie Hedlund. And Sarmad Hussein and Edmon Chung have said that if they are late and unable to join the call then they do send their apologies.

If I could just remind you to please state your names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you, Jim and Steve.

Jim Galvin: Thank you. So we only have Avri. Did I catch that right? As the working group members - the only other working group member on the call?

Avri Doria: Yeah, we're outnumbered this time.

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes.

Jim Galvin: Yes.

Avri Doria: We lose.

Jim Galvin: Well we'll just press on here. Avri, you provided some comments so why don't we just press right into your comments and go along with them? I have a question for you, Avri, with respect to your comment about ASCII transcription in particular.

I guess we're not calling out translation and transcription, you know, by language at all in particular. So...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Galvin: ...it wasn't immediately obvious to me why we would want to talk about ASCII in particular. Could you say a little more about that?

Avri Doria: Well, yeah, and as I admitted I think when I wrote this was just something that while I was sort of thinking about the definitions of, you know, translation and transliteration and such what I think we've been saying is that, I mean, when we are doing a transliteration my assumption was that we're doing a transliteration to (unintelligible) characters. Now that may be fallacious thinking but that was sort of the assumption I had.

In other words we're doing it to something that we assume that is - if not the first language is the second language, is the at least online computer reading language that we expect to find most prevalent. And is a - is the - as the backwards compatibility.

Now I may be wrong about that. But that is perhaps the question. It was an assumption I was making. But now that I say it, you know, my assumption that transliteration was going to ASCII as opposed to something else may be erroneous.

Jim Galvin: Well the only thing - so this is Jim again. I mean, I guess the only thing I would say is I was trying not to express - speaking personally - trying not to express a particular preference for one language or another in either direction, either as a starting point or an ending point.

I mean, at least for me I felt like the issues are applicable, you know, more generally and we wouldn't have to do that. You know, it's just you and I talking here at the moment. I don't know if you want to, you know, say more and try to just support what you're saying in a different way.

But I guess we probably need more people in the discussion unless you want to...

Avri Doria: I think the major point is the backward compatibility. My assumption has always been - not backward compatibility from a software perspective but

backward compatibility in terms of whatever we do if we are saying that there is a must-have that is - that is the - what's the right political - diplomatic way to say this - is the - at the moment all that's supported is ASCII and I guess we're removing that.

But - so it's never occurred to me that, A, we were taking out a notion of ASCII for the future for the ASCII writing world. And that this was looking at substituting something for that. If it is I'm not sure how that is said in this.

So - and perhaps I'm missing it and perhaps, you know, someone can point to me where yes we made a decision that we were no longer considering the - that ASCII remains the base of what the ASCII speaking world - or the writing world - no one speaks ASCII - the ASCII writing world was continuing to use.

If that's not a valid assumption then - but I think also there's really two pieces to this; one is that. The other one is in any case that whether it's ASCII or some other encoding there will be, I am assuming, one of the expected encoding would be in English encoding or a Latin in coding or an unextended Latin in coding or perhaps an extended Latin, I don't know.

But even then if you're talking about scripts other than Latin/ASCII there would - if there is transliteration it was kind of an assumption that that transliteration would be into the world's second language and that we wouldn't be transliterating from Arabic to Hebrew necessarily. Or perhaps - or perhaps I'm just under thinking this and that was really one of the possibilities we were leaving open.

I was kind of assuming that when people spoke about transliterating something they would be transliterating it to let's call it the world's second language; the world's second script and certainly the lingua franca of the computer industry to date. And I know lingua franca being English is kind of a tongue-full.

So those were assumptions I'm making. If I'm wrong then it's good to know that. But those were assumptions I had. And I don't know if other people had them too. I might have been the only one that assumed that transliteration would come to, as I say for want of a better word, the world's second script.

Jim Galvin:

Well I guess from my point of view, speaking personally, and this is Jim. I think that the phrase in that second recommendation about, you know, the issues report that we're asking for should consider whether it's desirable to translate to a single common language or not or a single common script.

And we in fact were leaving out a recommendation for any particular one and thinking, at least from my point of view, I was thinking that the issues report would in fact look at that issue.

Now saying a little bit more as chair one of my concerns was that, you're right, we - one of our models was that, you know, US ASCII in particular should be the default and everything should sort of migrate towards that. And I think that's, you know, what you're - I believe that what you're reacting to is the fact that that discussion or that issue had existed and we never really came to closure on it.

And I think that that's the point of this Recommendation 2, at least from my point of view speaking as chair, you know, the point of Recommendation 2 is the fact that we had these four models and four possibilities and we really couldn't come to closure. And even putting it out for public comment a year ago did not draw out any comments that allowed us to find closure, you know, not from my point of view.

And the response to that in my point of view, you know, speaking as chair was this Recommendation 2 where, you know what, I think that is really the critical issue in this space of scope of things that we were supposed to look at.

Yes it's possible to display internationalized contact information but there are deeper issues involved in deciding who should do that and, you know, how it should be done in terms of, you know, which language to transliterate or translate to or from.

And so the purpose of Recommendation 2 is to focus on that particular question and have that question revisited with a different set of people because I also think we don't have the right set of people in this group to really address that question. So that's two answers.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Jim Galvin: I don't know if that's helpful to you or not.

Avri Doria: No that - I mean, I think from one perspective I think, sure, from a chair's perspective put things totally neutrally out like that is quite reasonable. I think from a common sense perspective if there is to be any translation or transliteration I can't imagine it going anywhere else.

And I know that can get me pegged as a linguistic imperialist but given the argument of the world's second script I just can't imagine that if people say transliteration or translation is a good idea where it would go.

But as I said at the second level if there is translation or transliteration to some yet to be defined script/language and leaving it that way that's cool. But then that's where my next question comes in and should it also be transcription?

And so what ever we translate/transliterate to do we also want to transcribe to is the question we haven't asked and so that's why I was saying - but you're right, I made a presumption about what we would translate or transliterate to and I understand being totally neutral and avoiding linguistic imperialism

about the world's second script and I'm not going to try and make that change.

I just think - I can't imagine that we would all decide that Hebrew was the new lingua franca that we would transliterate everything to. Or actually Korean would be really good too; they got a cool syllabic structure that if we all learned it it would be really great.

Jim Galvin: Okay. So...

Avri Doria: I just love the way Korean works. If you've ever watched it on a keyboard it's just really, really cool. But anyway...

Jim Galvin: All right so do I understand then that your - so we've answered your question or at least I've tried to answer your question and you're okay for now. You're not asking for any change or proposing any change for Recommendation 2 then?

Avri Doria: Well the only thing I'm questioning there is it an issues report on translation, transliteration and transcription? That's the second question. Whatever it's being translated and transcribed into while they're doing an issues report even though we've never really talked about it here do we also want to be complete in this issue and get transcription where it - the sound as represented in this yet to be determined script/language?

((Crosstalk))

Jim Galvin: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...linguistics right.

Jim Galvin: Then I think my reaction to that then is, speaking as chair, then we need to get other people in this conversation and hear some other opinions. I

understand that, you know, Bob Hutchinson is on the call. I don't know if he wants to say anything about this. But we need to press on the mailing list to see if we can get other people to say something about it too.

I'm more inclined at the moment so - to make one last statement as chair and then see if Bob wants to say anything - as you did say in your note I consider that particular change or suggestion for a change more on the substantive side than not.

Avri Doria: Oh yeah.

Jim Galvin: And at this point in the development of the document I'd be looking for some strong working group support in order to make that change, you know, before we would do that.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Galvin: So let's see where we can go from there. So let me ask if Bob wants to add anything to the discussion or not?

Bob Hutchinson: No, this is Bob Hutchinson. I came in late. I was wondering whether Avri could explain what she means by transcription...

Avri Doria: Right.

Bob Hutchinson: ...in this context?

Avri Doria: Transcription basically is when you take the sound of something and you're representing that in some other script. So for example if we were using an English-based script - a Latin script - we would - and this is actually very similar to the way some of the keyboards at one point worked in Chinese where people would type in the phonetics of the word as opposed to, you know, character-based stuff and the character would appear.

And so basically what they were doing was they were typing in a transcription using a Latin keyboard to type Chinese words. Just like also in any language you could take, you know, a Hebrew word and you could write it in Hebrew characters but you could also write it in Latin characters.

And that - the act of doing that is not translation because you're not getting the meaning of the word, it's not transliteration because you're not necessarily having a strict mapping between an (ala) is an A, a (uit) is an I, (lamat) is an L. You're basically taking the sound of the word and reproducing it. So it's a third class of activities.

Bob Hutchinson: Thanks for clarifying that, Avri. I guess I'm okay with the way the recommendation currently reads. I understand what Avri is saying. And I, you know, I'm - I guess I'm concerned that the way Recommendation 2 would read to somebody outside of this conversation is going to be opaque.

And so I guess that's the only thing I would say about it that we've had lots of discussions about, you know, the different models, translation, transliteration but we haven't made any progress as a group on recommendations about that; that's what this recommendation is about. And so I'm supportive of the recommendation but, you know, don't know if I can improve on the wording of it either. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Yeah, as I say the only thing I would have suggested adding was transliteration - I mean, translation, transliteration, and transcription and left it at that. But as I say I can put it in a comment later.

Jim Galvin: Okay so let me also suggest, Avri, that you can raise this again and maybe find a way to push a little harder on this point here on the mailing list and see if we can just get a couple of the people to stand up and have a view about it.

I mean, I would encourage you to do that. I don't want to cut off the opportunity since we're not declaring, you know, absolute finality here so there's still a window here to move this along. So if you wouldn't mind doing that I think that would be fine and we can move onto the next comment that you have here about dates. Is that okay with you?

Avri Doria: Yeah, no that's perfectly fine. As I say I don't have a missionary zeal about it. It's probably the pedant in me that's bringing it up. And basically when I was reading it it was a realization that one class of activity that is possible was not being considered.

And I am, you know, as much - I'm more at fault perhaps than most because why did it take me this long to realize that and to not bring it up earlier. And I realize that bringing it up at the end like this is ludicrous. But just so you know I don't have a missionary zeal on it it's really the pedant in me that sort of says we don't have a complete set of categories here. So, yeah, I'll do that.

But just so you know the kind of issue it is; it's not a, you know, one of my moral human rights whatever issues it's one of my academic pedantry issues.

Jim Galvin: Okay that sounds fine. Thank you. With respect to Avri's comment about dates, you know, I think that's fine. We've identified a solid reference for how to do dates and it's the only one that's popped up. So I, you know, obviously think that we should include a reference to that. And just as we've done with other things, you know, I mean, we've got a solid reference for dates let's put that in there and use it.

I don't know if anyone disagrees. Steve, have you had time to think about that? Did you have any comments about using the date reference?

Steve Sheng: Yeah, I did check the draft applicant guidebook, the WHOIS specification. The date format also conforms to the ISO format that Avri mentioned. So I think, you know, it's a good recommendation.

Jim Galvin: Okay good then I'm glad we finally tracked that down and had something to say there.

Okay we had jumped to Avri's comments early on. I also understand that Edmon is - has joined the call here too. Last time we had left off, after Section 4, right, Steve, correct me if I'm wrong so we had left just to sort of walk through the recommendations. Am I correct in that?

Steve Sheng: Yes.

Jim Galvin: Okay. So I think the appropriate thing to do here then is as we were doing last week let me turn this over to you, Steve, to walk through these recommendations and see if folks have any comments about that or questions.

Scott Austin: Hi, everyone. Sorry to break in. Scott Austin. I'm sorry I'm getting on a little late, I just got off a conference call.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Jim Galvin: Thank you, Scott, for joining us. So, Steve, so we're up to Section 5 here and these three recommendations. And let me turn it over to you to walk through those.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Jim.

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Sorry, Jim, this is Edmon. Thank you for, you know, (unintelligible) and I'm sorry for joining, as I mentioned. In terms of Section 4 actually, again I apologize for missing that meeting, but Steve and I had a discussion while we were talking about these issues at the VIP working groups.

And one of the issues that they came up with was that we, you know, in the whole scheme of editing it seems like we have missed out on a number - a couple of critical items in terms of the IDN part of the, you know, in terms of the domain name description - so in terms of the data.

And we're right now describing it only as domain name and missing both the IDN tag, the language tag element and also the variant element that is quite critical for IDNs. So I thought it might be useful to bring that up as well.

Jim Galvin: Can you say more? I mean, we obviously do talk about the need for signaling. Did you - can you be more specific about what you think we're missing and needs to be added?

Edmon Chung: Well we had a, you know, (unintelligible) suggestions sessions previously - previous conference calls talking about IDN elements, the language tag and the variant. And right now in terms of for example Section 4.2 it really just says domain names - domain name.

And it should, you know, identify (unintelligible) IDN and, you know, be the various elements that is required.

Steve Sheng: So, Edmon, this is Steve.

Jim Galvin: I apologize. I guess I'm not quite understanding what you're asking for, Edmon. I don't know if anyone else can add and say something?

Steve Sheng: Edmon...

Edmon Chung: Perhaps Steve can add.

Steve Sheng: So for the language tag it is included in the report. I think that's included in Section 4. - let's say 4.4. And I think also 4.3 talks about the language tags.

So for example IDN (unintelligible) 4.3 the working group would like to recommend an issues report on the subject.

In the interim the working group recommend that the directory service outputs should at least include tags to identify language and scripts as described in (RSV) 5646. Thus - those will need translated or transliterated information would at least know what language and script the contact information is in. So we do - we do mention about the language tag.

There was a...

Edmon Chung: Okay sorry for missing that. I think that would suffice.

Steve Sheng: There was a section...

Edmon Chung: For the language tag part.

Steve Sheng: Yeah, there was a section in the interim report about IDN variants that was not included here. For me it was mostly - I don't know where to find the right place for it rather than, you know, intentionally omitting it. So - and Edmon, are you suggesting that should be - that under Section 4.2 under domain names that we are suggesting?

Edmon Chung: That is probably a good, you know, place to put it because we spent considerable time (unintelligible) issue so I think it would, you know, we really should include it in the report.

Steve Sheng: Okay. What do others think?

Jim Galvin: So, I'm sorry, this is Jim. Just a clarifying point here. So you want it included in two places in the report, Edmon, or are you comfortable with the fact that it's included here?

Edmon Chung: For the language tag I think it's probably fine. I think we need to add back the variant section into 4.2.

Jim Galvin: Okay so I guess I'm going to need some help here about what exactly that means.

Steve Sheng: So there are some - there was an email I sent earlier about the - there are like a chunk of text from the interim report that were not used in the final report. Let me pull up that maybe...

Jim Galvin: Okay so look for a message from Steve Sheng.

Steve Sheng: First version...

Jim Galvin: Oh and this - okay it also has - okay so from August 25. And there's a document here that has the text from the interim report in it.

Steve Sheng: Yes, yes.

Jim Galvin: Okay. And there is a discussion of variants in here you're saying?

Steve Sheng: Yes.

Jim Galvin: Oh query and display of variants.

Steve Sheng: The email is from - when was the email from? August - something - August 24 - 25. Yeah, so there was a section on query and display of variants in internationalized registration data.

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. I think - let me ask if you, Edmon, could say a bit about why you think it's important to include this text? I mean, from my point of view we have gotten down to where our recommendations are. And I'm more inclined

to include in the document, you know, those - that information which is supportive of the recommendations that we have.

So what I want to understand is how this variant text, you know, would improve our support or documentation for the findings and recommendations that we get to in this document.

Edmon Chung: Well first of all it's a - it's a fairly intricate discussion. And, you know, while I'll be happy to go over it all over again I think we've spent at least three or four meetings on this to clarify everything such that we reach a point where we can actually make some recommendations that I think make sense.

So I really think to use that work entirely and I think it fits very well into, you know, the - what we need to recommend.

Jim Galvin: Okay so - this is Jim again. I guess while I appreciate the significance of variants and I know that there is a lot of work going on in, you know, variant working groups here, case studies in ICANN, it's not clear to me how a discussion of variants, you know, changes or adds anything that we've come to a conclusion about here even though we did have a discussion about it.

You know, I mean, it's common working groups to have discussions about issues and, you know, you have that discussion for completeness but it's not a part of your final work product. I mean, I guess I'm interested in what others think, Avri or Bob, have opinions about this text and what we should do with it?

Avri Doria: I actually don't. I think that within the number of things that are going to get covered in terms of looking at other languages variants however it gets solved elsewhere should just follow. And so I'm not sure - I mean, I understand and totally support the importance of it but I'm not sure that it is an additional problem that needs to be solved here too and I'm thinking that it

can just piggyback on (unintelligible) that are decided elsewhere about how ICANN is going to deal with it.

But a mention that, you know, that is an issue can't hurt but I don't know how necessary it is. So I find myself sort of ambivalent and that's why I was kind of being quiet (unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: Now this is Edmon again. I think the sort of recommendation that we came up with is, you know, I guess the beauty of which is that regardless of what variants look like in terms of policy or whatever the IP comes up with it still (fit) and that's why, you know, that's why I think it's a gem that this group came up with especially I remember during those discussions there were members from the Asian community participating much more in the discussions.

And we were able to come up with this, you know, this recommendation. And I think (unintelligible), you know, because the whole point of that discussion was that the issue of variant itself is out of scope but how it should be, you know, how it could be incorporated into WHOIS in terms of the spirit of the WHOIS and, you know, how the function of the WHOIS, the recommendation is it's quite, you know, straightforward and on the point and I think is relevant for this group.

Jim Galvin: I think, Edmon, let me ask the question in a different way. Do you think we need to make changes to our recommendations with respect to variants? I mean, if we add this text in would that change, you know, any of our findings or recommendations in some way?

Edmon Chung: If you - if you put it that way. Perhaps one of the things is that we should ask staff to build on the discussions of this group rather than start from scratch. I mean, that's probably the only change necessary in terms of the actual recommendation because, you know, the actual recommendation itself is to ask staff to do more work.

But the - what could be added is that, you know, this is - this is, you know, this is already a result from the working group and something that works for this specific issue. Or we can just generally say that, you know, the findings from the working group should be part of what staff should build on.

Bob Hutchinson: This is Bob Hutchinson. I guess I would agree with what I think Edmon is saying. We should make some mention of variants. Where we have the enumeration in 4.2 of the data elements, where domain names come back and it's referencing both the A-label and a U-label it implies there that there's only one variant that's returned I would say.

And I don't know where to put the concern that Edmon has which was that variants be properly handled. But I think it's somewhere in the - in the 4-series. There should be notice of the fact that the system should return variants.

Steve Sheng: So, Bob, you're suggesting to add something around Section 4.2 under domain name?

Bob Hutchinson: Well unless somebody has a better place to put it, you know, that's - I mean, I don't know how you actually are anticipating returning the variants of a domain name. But that's where, you know, if I were looking for a combination for variants I'd be looking at in the domain name so, you know, the comment of what Edmon is referring to minimally we should put a sentence in here that says variants should be dealt with according to whatever policy for variants is adopted by ICANN or something.

Jim Galvin: So, this is Jim. I guess this is where - and, you know, sort of following on the side that Avri was describing, I mean, while I appreciate the importance of variants and part of the problem in my view, just speaking personally about, you know, variants and these studies within ICANN is there have been a number of different discussions about variants and how they are dealt with.

I think that, as Avri described, they are important. But I think that whatever we say here, you know, variants will simply be incorporated and be a part of that as a natural evolution forward.

The variant case study groups and that huge activity which is currently going on in ICANN that's where, you know, variants are going to be addressed and dealt with and what's going to become the policy, the overarching policy for how to deal with variants.

And I would expect as an ordinary course of things that, you know, that will carry forward into whatever this work gets carried forward into. I'm really just not inclined to want to add something to this text that doesn't actually contribute to our actual work product. It adds at least in my view it's adding more of a distraction to this work than it is contributing to this work.

Even though I understand the huge importance and significance of dealing with variants in general I don't think it's important for us to pull that particular detail into this discussion and into this work product. So that's my immediate reaction to that.

We've all four had a chance here to speak so maybe now let me step and speak as - speaking as chair - and I realize that Edmon is also a co-chair of this group - and speak about process and how to deal with this issue.

I think, Edmon, prior to when you joined when we were talking about transcription with Avri I think that because of the lateness in the process of where we are with this document and the limited number of us on this call - and this seems like a substantive change in my view in terms of what we want to do to the document.

The right thing to do here is to press on this on the working group mailing list. And we need to seek to get more opinions and hopefully consensus among those opinions about what to do about this particular text.

I mean, I really don't want to word smith here. And I think that if you bring up this issue there and then have a specific proposal about where to put this text and how we could use it and incorporate it I think that's the right thing to do in terms of how to deal with this document.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Galvin: Anyone want to comment on the process I'm proposing?

Edmon Chung: Hi, this is Edmon. Sure, I think that works. And I can propose some text. But I was wondering if Steve has any thoughts on that because we had a - we had a chat basically about this. And the other thing is that I actually quite strongly disagree that this is the work that the IP would be doing because this is very specific on WHOIS issues and not IDN variant issues.

If you look more deeply into the results of the previous discussion you would realize why that is the case and that's why (unintelligible) and why it's, you know, regardless of whatever that happens at the IP. This is still something that is useful for this (IOD) discussion.

But anyway I can certainly draft something. And I wonder if Steve wanted to add.

Steve Sheng: This is Steve. Maybe a quick note, Jim, the VIP is only a issues project and they will not solve, you know, how variants and WHOIS issues. What will likely to happen is they will identify that issue and ICANN will ask, you know, whatever working group, probably this one, to solve that.

So in that sense the - the VIP only identifies issues and ICANN is going to look for community to solve that. So that's just a clarification on the different works related.

Perhaps I think for the time left let's set aside the two issues. One is the transcription issue, one is the variant issue. And let's work through the recommendations. And then, you know, once we finish the recommendation and then we can - if we have time we can come back. Is that okay with people?

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. And thank you, Steve, for that clarification. I think all I really meant - and I sort of spoke a little overstating earlier is that, you know, the variant issue in general - the variant case study work that's going on is the starting point for how variants are going to be dealt with.

Not that there's going to be any - necessarily any final resolution out of that. So, you know, your clarification - I take your point and I sort of overstated exactly what the goal is there and what's going to be come from it.

So yes I agree with you; we should take those two issues to the mailing list, you know, let's look for some consensus on the list and let's see if we can, you know, close on this document here by getting to the recommendations and focusing on those because if we can get through them then this document is done and we can just close these two issues on the mailing list. And I think that that gets us to a closure point for this working group and this activity.

So please, Steve, go ahead.

Steve Sheng: Okay. So the first recommendation is - by the way this recommendation hasn't really changed from the template that we discussed four weeks ago - that ICANN staff should develop in consultation with the community a data model for domain registration data.

The data model should specify the elements of the registration data, the data flow and the formal data schema that incorporates the standards that a working group has agreed on for internationalizing various registration data elements.

This data model should also include tagging information for language and scripts - or scripts; probably language and scripts because sometimes you need both to be (unintelligible) do proper translation and transliteration. So that's Recommendation 1. It has not changed from the previous one.

Any - I guess at this point I want to say any objections or any proposed changes to the recommendation?

Avri Doria: Talking now...

Steve Sheng: Going once.

Avri Doria: Wait.

Steve Sheng: Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: I'm just trying to see if I had - on this but I don't know. This is on 3 correct? My attention wandered for a second. We're talking about 3?

Jim Galvin: Recommendation 1.

Avri Doria: Oh...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Sheng: Recommendation 1.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: No I have no comments on that one.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Going twice. Okay I have not heard any objections. So I think from a process point of view is this recommendation can be considered as almost final except any objections raised on the mailing list.

Recommendation 2, the GNSO Council should develop an issues report on translation and transliteration of contact information. The issues report should consider whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script.

They should also consider who should bear the burden and who is in the best position to address these issues. The report should consider policy questions raised in this document and should also determine whether to start a policy development process.

Now on this I think we have the pending issue of transcription to be closed off on the mailing list. Avri also raised two important points. The first point is an issues report that's not determined issue - recommend. So the last sentence should be phrased, "The report should consider policy questions raised in this document and should recommend whether to start a policy development process."

That wording is very important in terms of - from a process point of view. You know, what the issues report does and not overstepping what it should do. So what do people think of that change, change in determine in the last sentence - last line to recommend.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I also had a comment on the first line.

Steve Sheng: To the Recommendation 1?

Avri Doria: No, no, no, to Recommendation 2, first line.

Steve Sheng: Oh okay, yes, yes, I'm just doing it one by one.

Avri Doria: Oh okay, yeah. I figured since you did the second one and the third one you had missed the first one; sorry.

Steve Sheng: No, I will not. I think this is easier to tackle so - do that first. Okay. All right, any objections? No? Okay so let's reword determine to recommend. So the second point that Avri had raised is the GNSO Council requests an issues report - it is developed by staff. But SSAC can also request an issues report. And in fact since this is a joint working group it might be worth both the SSAC and GNSO requesting a common issues report.

So I take that as a suggestion that - a rewording that the GNSO Council and SSAC should request an issues report. Is that true, Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah, that would be my recommendation. Certainly we have to change the word develop to request just like we changed...

Steve Sheng: Right.

Avri Doria: ...determine to recommend. And then the second...

Steve Sheng: Right.

Avri Doria: ...is more substantive that it should be both chartering organizations of this working group we should make to Recommendation 2. And I think it would be cool for SSAC to have actually request an issues report since they've had the bylaws capability to do so since the beginning of time but, you know, have never actually done so as far as I know.

Steve Sheng: What do others think? This will be important change. Okay, Jim.

Jim Galvin: I agree with Avri. You know, the wording of changing from developed to request is the right thing. And, Steve, you're right it should say GNSO and SSAC; it's a joint working group so that's the right thing to do.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Jim. Any other thoughts on this one? Going once, going twice. Okay. Did I hear someone wants to raise a point? No? Okay so I will reword it as agreed.

Okay the third issue is the - this pending issue about transcription. So, Avri, I presume that you take the action item to follow up on the mailing list to gather support to include that?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Steve Sheng: Okay all right. All right so that's the second recommendation. Recommendation 3, "ICANN staff shall work with the community to identify domain name registration data access protocol that meets the needs of internationalization and the requirements enumerated in this report."

So this recommendation primarily speak to the fact that the WHOIS protocol has not been internationalized. In absence of (unintelligible) various parties have implemented different solutions and continual deployment will lead to inconsistent user experience and interoperability issues. So I think that's what this recommendation is speaking about. So any thoughts, comments, objects?

Bob Hutchinson: This is Bob Hutchinson. I would like to have the NRD-AP abbreviation expanded for readability here.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Sure, no problem. My apologies for using too many acronyms. Okay.
Any others?

Scott Austin: Yeah, hi, this is Scott Austin. Do we have any defined term of internationalized? When you say the WHOIS lookup data should be internationalized is that defined anywhere?

Steve Sheng: That's defined in the definition section what internationalized registration data means. Oh you mean the WHOIS protocol has not been internationalized. Yes that's discussed - let me just - that's discussed in Section 3.3, second bullet.

Scott Austin: Okay.

Steve Sheng: Internationalized meaning have the capability to predict or express text encoding out of a US ASCII. Any other comments on this recommendation?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I have one question.

Steve Sheng: Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: Is anything - and I'm not certain - I wouldn't be asking the question if I thought I knew the answer. Sometimes I ask questions where I think I know the answer. But in terms of the issues report and other work we are asking for will there be anything in that that leads into the description of needs and requirements?

And so what I've been looking at is the word this and wondering is that the complete set or is there something that will come out of this - the data model of Recommendation 1 or a PDP and issues report of Recommendation 2 that would affect Recommendation 3? Is there a notion of sequential aspect to this or are we thinking that they could start Recommendation 3 now and come up with a result before we've seen 1 and 2?

Is this an end to end to end project where they can start on it but they need to, at a later time, take into account (unintelligible) 1 and 2? In other words the fact that we say just this has made me look at this as kind of a scheduling event and trying to understand what we mean. And I'm not sure what we mean. Thanks.

Steve Sheng: Avri, I think that's an excellent question. And...

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Steve Sheng: ...I don't know the answer myself. So that's an excellent question. Jim, what do you think? Edmon?

Jim Galvin: Yeah, so this is Jim. I guess maybe I had an assumption and maybe it was an inappropriate assumption but - so we should think of ways to expand. When I see the phrase, you know, meets the needs of internationalization I think the way I interpret your comment, Avri, is you're seeing the phrase in this report and seeing that as a qualifier on both sides of the previous conjunction.

So we have needs of internationalization in this report and the requirements enumerated in this report. I had assumed actually a broader context in the phrase the needs of internationalization to suggest that it's just what Avri said, you know, one could begin this work in parallel but obviously one would want to take into account, you know, all of the broader context that's appropriate and other activities that might be taking place as a result of following on from this work product.

But in the interest of clarity and being specific, you know, perhaps we should find a way to, you know, word smith this and reword this a bit so that we don't overly constrain what's intended to be the input to this work. And I think that's the point that Avri is getting at; we want to make sure that the input to actually

looking to identify a protocol includes everything appropriate and everything relevant whatever that might be at the time that they start this.

Does that - am I agreeing with you, Avri, or do you see that differently?

Avri Doria: No, no, no, I think you're agreeing with me. I was asking as a two-part question; one is what you just said what we mean and, two, yes I agree that if that's what we mean we need to be more explicit about it.

I mean, we can just add a phrase that says, you know, or a comma (unintelligible) internationalization including the outcome of Recommendation 1 and 2, and the requirements enumerated in this report or something like that if we're saying that, you know, and of course we can add the including but not limited to or the Latin inter alia if we wanted to. But, yeah, I mean, if that's what we mean we should say so explicitly. Thanks.

Jim Galvin: Anyone else want to comment?

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon. I think I agree. And it's in line with my sort of earlier comment that development should be, you know, should build on what we have done in this working group. So, you know, I think we should add that in.

Jim Galvin: So, Steve, I think that's a little bit of wordsmithing that you could do. I like what Avri had just said there, you know, the little comma separated phrase there, you know, including any work products and recommendations - including but not limited to, you know, any work products resulting from Recommendations 1 and 2 or something like that. So...

Steve Sheng: So...

((Crosstalk))

Jim Galvin: ...how about if we ask you to develop something and then just call that particular change out on the mailing list?

Steve Sheng: Okay. So currently staff - ICANN staff should work with the community to identify a access protocol that meets the needs of internationalization, including but not limited to the work products resulting from Recommendations 1 and 2, and the requirements enumerated in this report.

But I'll further wordsmith to make this (unintelligible). Any substantive comments and feedback from the recommendations? Going once, twice. Okay. Thank you (unintelligible) recommendations.

I think the two remaining issues is the transcription issue and also the IDN variants. I presume Avri and Edmon if you want to take this to the mailing list and advocate for it, is that right?

Jim Galvin: Yes, that's correct. That's the action in the case of those two items. So in terms of process I think we have two choices here. I realize we're just about at the top of the hour but maybe we can speak to this question here before we run off.

I believe we have two choices. We can have the advocacy for these two issues and a last call on this document proceed in parallel or we can serialize them and allow a period of time for Avri and Edmon to advocate for their issues and then issue a last call on this document within the working group.

Do people feel strongly one way or another? From my point of view just speaking as chair the advantage of doing them in parallel is it may be that we can - I guess correct me, Steve, or check me here, Steve, if we do them in parallel is it possible for us to come to closure and get a publication before Dakar or is that deadline past?

Steve Sheng: The publication for Dakar is September 30. And then so the work - if the working group want to finalize the report then that needs to be published by September 30. So...

((Crosstalk))

Jim Galvin: Okay. Well I don't want to artificially constrain our efforts. You know, we've been going on this long so, I mean, if we can make September 30 that's fine and if we don't I think that's fine too. We can still declare success and announce that in Dakar. And, you know, the publication will just happen as soon after that as process allows.

So I don't think I want to force us to try to be done by the 30th. But in the spirit of trying to achieve being done by the 30th I would like to suggest that we in parallel do a last call on this document as well as allowing for the advocacy of those two issues. So let me put that out there as a specific suggestion and ask does anyone object to doing that?

Okay. So hearing nothing let me suggest, Steve, then that you, you know, turn around this document as quickly as you can and, you know, put it out there as a last call to the working group. And just in terms of process because Edmon is going to advocate for the one issue, you know, you know, both Edmon and I should at least confirm the process and what we're trying to accomplish here.

And then why don't we allow - can we say one week? I think we have to say one week for last call within the working group because otherwise there's no opportunity to even meet the 30th. So whenever you can get the document out in the next couple of days, Steve, we can have a one-week timer.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Jim Galvin: And we'll see what happens with advocacy in the group if working group members, you know, come together and support the group then we'll make those changes that come out of those two issues. And if not then I think the document comes to a closure at the end of the last call and we press forward and declare success.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Jim Galvin: So does anyone object to the one-week last call within the working group?

Avri Doria: The only problem with that, and I don't know if it affects this group much - this is Avri again - is that people are about to head - at least various people are about to head off for (IGF). And I don't know once they do to what extent they'll be paying attention. But other than that - so I don't know if that affects this group greatly. I know I'll be off but I've already reviewed.

You know, if I don't get the thing - for example if I don't get the thing written today, tomorrow, for the list I'm gone for the next week and a half so other than that nope.

Jim Galvin: So thank you for that Avri. We could allow when we send out the last call, you know, for - we could offer the option if anyone wants more time that they should, you know, also speak up and make that known on the mailing list to cover that possibility.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Galvin: So how about if you do that, Steve, when you release the document just say that we're going to, you know, we'll give a one-week last call and if anyone believes that they need more time, you know, have them just ask for it on the mailing list and then we'll see where that conversation takes us.

Steve Sheng: Okay, sounds good. And I'll try to produce...

Jim Galvin: Okay.

Steve Sheng: ...it as fast - as soon as possible to accommodate Avri and others.

Jim Galvin: Sounds good. Let me ask if there's any other business?

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon. Just the matter of I guess process. Are you're anticipating this to go out for public comments and then we would finalize it afterwards or, you know, this is just going to go out?

Steve Sheng: Edmon, I think since they are substantive changes from the interim report so this has to go out for public comment. Thanks.

Edmon Chung: That's what I thought. So I just wanted to make it clear, you know, as we put it out our work is actually not done yet until the public comment period closes. And we probably need to consider the comments and then, you know, make final adjustment before the final report is final.

Jim Galvin: So good point, Edmon, thank you for that. Any other business? And hearing none then I would say that we are adjourned. Let me say thank you to everyone.

Steve Sheng: Thank you.

Avri Doria: Bye.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. Bye.

Jim Galvin: Bye.

Scott Austin: Bye, thanks.

Jim Galvin: Bye.

END