

**GNSO/SSAC
International Registration Data Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 01 February 2010 at 19:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO/SSAC International Registration Data Working Group on 01 February 2010 at 19:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#feb>

<http://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-ird-20100201.mp3>

All recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO calendar page:

<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/>

Present for the teleconference:

Bob Hutchinson, GNSO Commercial Stakeholder Group

Andrei Kolesnikov -- Nominating Committee Appointee, .RU

Mark Kusters -- SSAC, ARIN

Steven Metalitz -- GNSO Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial Stakeholder Group

Avri Doria -- GNSO Non-Commercial Users Stakeholder Group

Ram Mohan - Afiliias -- SSAC Board liaison

Jay Daley - .NZ

ICANN Staff

Francisco Arias

Glen de Saint- Géry

Gisella Gruber-White

Julie Hedlund

Steve Sheng

Absent apologies:

Rafik Dammak -- GNSO Non-Commercial Users Stakeholder Group

Dave Piscitello

Gisella Gruber-White: Julie, would you like a quick roll call?

Julie Hedlund: That'd be lovely, thank you so much.

Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. On today's IRD call, Monday 1 February we have Jay Daley, Ram Mohan, Mark Kusters, Robert Hutchinson, Andrei Kolesnikov, Steve Metalitz. From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Glen de Saint Gery, (Francisca Arias), Steve Sheng and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. We have apologies from Rafik Dammak and from Dave Piscitello due to the time of the call.

And if I could just please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes, thank you. Over to you Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Great, thank you so much Gisella. And welcome to everyone and thank you for joining us on this call. We haven't had a call in about a month or so but we have had some - I think useful discussion on the list. And I think that what I'll do is use that discussion to sort of spur the discussion here on this call as our agenda.

But if others - if we use these what do we require from IRD questions that Dave sent around and to which (unintelligible) are there any other agenda items that anyone would like to add to the call at this time? Thank you.

So I've sent around to all of you a summary that Steve Sheng had provided that summarized as of last Monday the discussions and responses to the questions that Dave Piscitello had formed and used as a - sort of a framework for our discussion.

And in particular - so anyway I sent that around, I'm not going to go through that document but you can have that as a reference. And then also I'll refer to a message that Dave sent last Thursday in responding to Jay Daley's comments and asking the work team to comment on, you know, Dave's (unintelligible) analysis of the data associated with the registration might be presented.

(Unintelligible) only what data might be localized, what this provision implies to registrants and users (unintelligible) and registrars and registries. And what I was wondering as a starting point is - and I'm, you know, and I don't - I certainly don't want to drive this discussion, I'm not the technical expert here but I do want to try to get things going.

(Unintelligible) wanted to take the discussion from the - where it was (unintelligible) and get some comments from those of you on this call who may have not had a chance to respond and see if we can, you know, maybe, you know, just flush these out a little bit more.

Does anybody have any objection to proceeding that way? Okay. So there were several questions. The first of the questions that David put out there was what do we require from internationalized registration data that a user can submit or have a domain name displayed in the IDN A-label, in parens, XN--format or U-label in parens local language readable format?

And there were several responses from working group members. And in particular - so I'm not going to go through all of them. You know, maybe this will help, Jay, did you want to start? I don't want to target you but since you've been most active on the list do you have any additional remarks that you'd like to add on, you know, as far as addressing that question?

Jay Daley: Well only to say, sorry, Jay Daley here. Only to say that I think this is the easiest to answer of all the questions. I don't think there's any particular disagreement - possibly about the scope but certainly that we believe that somebody should be able to query with either U- or A-label and the display should have both of them.

I don't - I haven't seen anybody disagree with that at all. The scope (unintelligible) extended to WHOIS or whether it went further.

Julie Hedlund: Are there any others who - is there anyone on the call that disagrees with what Jay has just said as far as, you know, is that a point that we can agree with on the scope side of which we can talk a little bit about.

Ram Mohan: This is Ram.

Julie Hedlund: Yes Ram please.

Ram Mohan: Jay, when you say whether the scope is limited to WHOIS or whether it goes further I guess what you're saying - let me tell you how I interpret that. A user comes into the WHOIS service and asks for an internationalized domain name either in the A-label or the U-label format. They get a response back in both the U-label and A-label format for the domain name itself.

And for the contact data if - on a separate query if the users comes in and looks up a contact name they ought to be able to submit in either the A-label or U-label, more likely U-label in that area. And the response ought to come back with a reply with both the A-label and the U-label. That's how I interpret it. Did I get it right? And is there anything more than that that we should be talking about?

Jay Daley: Jay Daley. The bit my point about scope was to say that we shouldn't be looking at (EPP) that we should, you know, the definition given of submit earlier appeared to go slightly wider and I just thought we ought to cut that out, that was all, and be very clear that we're just talking about end user interaction with this which is a by a WHOIS at some point whether it's through a portal and then goes (unintelligible).

Andrei Kolesnikov: Andrei speaking, yes I agree.

Ram Mohan: Ram speaking, I agree. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Ram, thank you Jay. Are there other comments on this particular question? And, Jay, you were mentioning scope, do you want to say anything more about...

Jay Daley: No that's what I meant. Sorry, Jay Daley, no that's what I meant.

Julie Hedlund: Oh okay.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Got you, all right thank you. I needed that clarification, I appreciate it. Any other comments on that first item? Any..

Robert Hutchinson: This is Bob Hutchinson...

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, Bob please.

Robert Hutchinson: ...I have a question. On Item 5 I was wondering whether somebody could explain what (Chang Tang) - is (Chang Tang) on the call - means by default label format and it appears that he's implying that the U-label and A-labels are not symmetric okay in that having one doesn't necessarily lead to the exact other. Is that how I should be interpreting this?

Julie Hedlund: Does - can anyone help out? I think...

Steve Sheng: This is Steve...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...is not on the call I don't believe.

Steve Sheng: (Unintelligible). I think what he was referring to - my understanding was that sometimes when user enter the A-label format and sometimes because there

are so many characters and we - from the WHOIS perspective we need to do a check because sometimes it may not be a valid IDN.

But it's not so much whether, you know, the A-label and the U-label are not matched but there's small opportunities for error if users (unintelligible) a A-label and that's the reason (unintelligible) prefer the U-label. That's my understanding.

Ram Mohan: This is Ram Mohan. I'd like to expand on this. I actually think there is more than just a small possibility because in several languages and in several scripts you have characters that look so identical to a character in - that is adjacent to it - they look the same but they're not the same. And therefore the U-label is therefore, you know, is a pretty appropriate mechanism to use.

It may - I think perhaps what he is trying to say is that the U-label A-label correlation while we know technically there is a one to one map visually there is more than a one to one map.

Avri Doria: This is Avri, can I ask a question?

Avri Doria: Yes go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Sorry to come in late by the way. Wouldn't that be a reason why both were needed or was that point already made? That since they can visually be, you know, too close and since one can make a mistake in the A-label wouldn't it be reasonable to actually have both entered and both recorded?

Ram Mohan: This is Ram. Yes.

Jay Daley: Yeah, this is Jay. I think what we're talking about is the query string that a user submits in order to get the response. And the suggestion is that they ought to be able to either make an A-label or U-label query. And the response they get is both U- and A-label together. Okay we're acknowledging that there

is a high possibility that the A-label query they may make may be complete nonsense because it could not be translated into a U-label.

And so we would need some sort of special indicator to say, you know, that - not that the domain doesn't exist but that domain could never exist because that's not a valid A-label.

Avri Doria: Again could I ask a question? Could it be like when I'm asked to enter my password twice and if they don't correspond to each other in some sense I get back a you want to try again.

Ram Mohan: This is Ram. I don't think so. I don't think it's as straightforward as that. A lot depends upon the implementation. I could tell you that in Arabic script that would - that methodology would not work at all because each character has four representations depending on where they are in spatial coordination with the prior and the succeeding character.

Avri Doria: But forgive me for asking again but wouldn't you be able to tell that it was one of the appropriate answers?

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...an appropriate answers. I know I'm being too simplistic thinking from Hebrew where there's only a couple things that move positions but - and change when they're in a different position. But...

Ram Mohan: Well I think you get - sorry this is Ram - I think you get ambiguity if you take an A-label that - you could get ambiguity if you take an A-label that is malformed and try to guess what the U-label might be.

Jay Daley: This is Jay. I don't think it's relevant because I don't think we need to correct the input that people give to WHOIS query. WHOIS query is - it's a single

transaction, you send a single query get a single response. And all we need to do is handle the case where people send something nonsense to it.

And then from getting the answer back you've sent something nonsense hopefully people will then work out what they've done and take that forward. But if we - anything else such as a double step or anything is significantly complicating things I think.

Steve Sheng: This is Steve. Just to add I think the value of having A-label to mostly tailor some more so other than machine like often they (unintelligible) where they may not be sending. So from a (unintelligible) perspective they will probably end using the A-label but for accommodating (unintelligible) programs A-label (unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: Do we have more questions with respect to that item?

Jay Daley: This is Jay. I've...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Anyone else. Avri, was that helpful to you?

Andrei Kolesnikov: Yeah, it's Andrei, just a small...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Please go ahead.

Andrei Kolesnikov: I support the idea that the WHOIS queries really simple comments, you know, it's just through interaction the question and answer so it should be really simple result, you know, backhand with intelligence of like trying to understand if the query was correct or not correct.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Andrei, that's helpful. Any other comments or questions concerning Question 1A? Then thank you everyone. I shall go onto Question 1B. And that was what do we require from internationalized registration data that registration data be extensible to accommodate users who would benefit from the ability to submit and have registration information displayed in the familiar, quote, unquote, characters from local languages and scripts.

And we had several responses from working group members. Do we want - do we have some comments that people would like, however, to make here on the call on that item?

Steve Sheng: Julie, this is Steve.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Sheng: Before we go into Q 1B is there objection on the on Q 1A that basically Jay outlined that WHOIS must (unintelligible) submit either a U- or A-label and WHOIS must display both in U- and A-label close. Are there any objections before we move forward?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Steve, that's...

Ram Mohan: This is Ram. I have a comment.

Julie Hedlund: Yes please.

Ram Mohan: What is not specified here so I do not have an objection to the proposal. What is not specified here is if a given domain name has a bundle associated with it - a bundle of associated variants but there are all of those variants also need to be displayed because they are alternate characters, they look the same, they are considered to be one unit, you know, unit registration if you will.

I know several ccTLD registries have implemented it in their WHOIS's for if you type in the WHOIS - if you ask a query for a given U-label you will get back a response with the U- and the A- and also other Us that are variants of the asked U. I'm not sure that is covered here.

Andrei Kolesnikov: It's Andrei. I'm not sure it will work this way because if you query with the U-label, okay you'll get the corresponded A-label. I mean, what about the variance I just don't get it, I mean...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Sheng: So here is one explanation, for example in Chinese you have both a simplified and traditional. Let's say usually, you know, let's say Bank of China will be given an IDN both in simplified and Chinese and traditional (unintelligible). What Ram is saying if I interpret correctly is if someone is querying a simplified Chinese U-label for the Bank of China return that it and in addition also return the traditional one, is that correct Ram?

Ram Mohan: That's right. I know - this is Ram - I know of several implementations that follow that methodology because they make the implicit argument that for the user one looks the same or one means the same as the other. And in the registry they are bundled together, they're not treated as two separate names.

Andrei Kolesnikov: Well I didn't know about it.

Jay Daley: This is Jay. Yes, that's quite common to have bundled registrations and so Ram is quite right that we need to specify that the WHOIS with outputs all bundled ones.

Steve Sheng: Ram, quick question, do we want to make that a requirement? Are you suggesting a requirement or we (unintelligible) optional for (unintelligible) how they implement that?

Ram Mohan: My own preference is to make that a recommendation rather than a requirement because really it depends. I know of several cases - and I was going to mention this in a follow-on here - in several cases I know there are terms where the number of variants in a bundle is in the tens if not hundreds. And displaying that on a WHOIS response can really not scale visually.

So I would suggest making it optional. But it should be - for the sake of completeness for defining 1A I think we should define it is, you know, we recommend displaying all of the variants associated in the bundle or some language similar to that.

Steve Sheng: That makes sense.

Julie Hedlund: Any other comments with respect to this option of an output that is unbundled or as a recommendation as opposed to a requirement? So Steve Sheng, do you feel like you've captured the discussion? And I'm noting these as well and this...

Steve Sheng: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Did you have any other questions with respect to Question 1A?

Steve Sheng: No. If there's no objections we can move forward. I just wanted to get, you know, everyone be able to express if there's objections, yes.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Steve this is Julie...

Ram Mohan: Steve Sheng, this is Ram.

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: Could I quickly ask if we could also - if you could - if ICANN staff could follow through with both (Ji Kang) and (Eliza Edmond) who are Chinese speakers operating, you know, registries that use Chinese to just get confirmation of how they do it? I think they may already have definitions that we could simply crib.

Steve Sheng: Okay I could do that.

Julie Hedlund: That's a great suggestion, Ram, this is Julie. Okay then I shall move along to Question 1B. Again that was what do we require that registration data be extensible to accommodate users who would benefit from the ability to submit and have registration information displayed in familiar characters from local languages and scripts.

Then we had several comments from the working group members. And I was wondering if perhaps those on the call would like to comment on this now that we have the opportunity? Comments on Question 1B?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz, I had a question about one of the comments.

Julie Hedlund: Steve, go ahead please.

Steve Metalitz: Regarding the registrar, and this is on 2B of Steve Sheng's list, is this - this encoding for the sponsoring registrar name that's describing the status quo at least in the gTLDs correct so that every registrar would have a number that could be used to - associated with a list of all of the accredited registrars.

But I guess - I have two questions - one, is that necessarily going to be the same in the future when we may have registrars that don't deal with ASCII registrations at all.

And secondly does this apply to the ccTLDs as well? Is it - I don't think it would be the case that every registrar for every ccTLD is on that list. That was my question about that point.

Andrei Kolesnikov: That's a very good point. It's Andrei speaking. That's a very good point, the last one.

Julie Hedlund: So this is Julie. Do others on the call have some answers to Steve's...

Ram Mohan: This is Ram. On the gTLD side the ICANN contracts require every registrar to have their information in the (INID) format. And registries have a (duthly) enforced requirement to actually support that (INID). So I think on the gTLD side we might actually be okay because the (INA) page itself lists the registrars not only in their local language but in English which I think is a useful thing.

This is actually a - what one of the things that it strikes for me, Steve, is that (INA)'s own page will have to accommodate displaying registrar names in both U- and A-labels, I don't think it's there right now but that's just a tangential thing.

Julie Hedlund: And what about Steve's question with respect does the supply to ccTLDs? Can anyone address that?

Andrei Kolesnikov: Yeah, I can just tell a few words. Also in the (INA) record it's on US ASCII in terms of country code TDL. However with distributive number of registrars within the country or outside of the country who's dealing with an national domain they not - they only can be traced or tracked from the ccTLD, you know, point.

If it would be the U-label only all the data of this registrars which means that somebody who needs the data to be, you know, interpreted or understood it

must be, you know, the person should contact the ccTLD and then follow the link - the food chain down to the registrar. So it's not clear...

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: Andrei, this is Ram.

Andrei Kolesnikov: ...need to be addressed. Yeah.

Ram Mohan: Sorry, this is Ram. I think you're - this is a pretty big security hole I think. It's a good way to hide behind, you know, information or hide information behind, you know, characters that look funny to people who are not familiar with it.

And my own thought is that we should try and work with, you know, with ccTLDs or at least with the CCNSO and try and ensure that registrar information is at a very minimum made available, you know, in some globally recognizable format and right now the default is ASCII.

Andrei Kolesnikov: That's actually how it's done here, you know, for the Russian IDN which we require at least all information about the registrars, the companies who's dealing with the registration IDN must be in US English, it's a requirement here in Russia.

Ram Mohan: Oh that's very good. It's the same in India as well, it's a requirement that it be in English. But I don't think it's - I think it's more good practice than a real recommendation so...

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: ...that should get on our list of things that we recommend.

Jay Daley: I very much disagree with that. Jay here. I think that that's a later conversation for us to have. But Ram, I would say that your assertion that

having everything in English is somehow going to improve security is something I don't agree with or close a data hole. It will for those people who speak English or speak ASCII but it won't for those people who don't.

And what we're trying to do is design a global Internet so I think not something that's just going to work for a particular group of people within that Internet. But I think...

Ram Mohan: Okay.

Jay Daley: ...that's a later discussion for us to have. And that we need to work through the agenda now to get to that.

((Crosstalk))

Andrei Kolesnikov: ...because we didn't mean that security as a security, it means like the ability to get the data.

Ram Mohan: And this is Ram. I just wanted to just restate what I had said because I don't think I had actually said that having the data in English closes any security hole. That's kind of silly anyway. And I would not ever say that.

((Crosstalk))

Jay Daley: Sorry, maybe you meant ASCII.

Ram Mohan: Yeah, or ASCII, fine. But, you know, what I'm really trying to say is that some level of - and maybe it's not one maybe it's three or four but some level of uniformity might be necessary. At least I can tell you in India which has 22 official languages the (Cert) in India as well as law enforcement in India requires us - we operate the backend for .in requires us to have all the data in US ASCII in a country that is, you know, patently and obviously multilingual.

Jay Daley: Okay. So if we can come back to that and just go back to - later when appropriate point just talk about registrars and the ccTLDs at the moment okay?

The different ccTLDs handle registrars very differently both internally within their databases and within their WHOIS output. Some of them will give an ASCII code that can then be used to cross reference who the registrar is. Some of them will give the full details of the registrar with no ASCII code. And some of them won't give any details of the registrar.

So, you know, these are very different practices. And I don't think that anything we - I don't think it's within our scope to recommend to a standard for WHOIS that would then require each ccTLD to then rewrite their internal databases and internal systems to deliver something differently in that way.

I don't think it's going to fly because it won't get accepted. But now I understand that that's, you know, not as good as people would like but I don't think that's necessarily going to be possible to deal with any other way.

Steve Sheng: So this is Steve Sheng. Currently how that is done - how is that done in the ccTLD?

Ram Mohan: There is nothing uniform as far as I know. This is Ram. There is nothing uniform as far as I know. And as Jay is saying, you know, your mileage varies almost by jurisdiction and by who is running the registry.

Now I will say this, Jay, and I don't think the status quo is a great place to be. And it feels to me suspiciously that your, you know, you may not be wanting the status quo but we continue down this approach we will stay with the status quo.

Jay Daley: I don't - okay, this is Jay again. I think it is possible for us to design a mechanism which gives the people the ability to plug in better functionality as

they develop that functionality. And so it accommodates all of those different methods that people have at the moment but as people choose to move away from that method to something we might regard as more standard it still fits in.

So for example if we were to take that list of headings of - sorry that breakdown of the different types of data that we have there, if we were to have an individual flag on each one that said, right, this is registrar data, the following is in (EUTF8) or something like this, you know, or it's in US ASCII then people can start to amend those as they, you know, as they develop.

And I think that's more useful, giving people the toolkit with which they can put these things in as a ccTLD rather than having to try to mandate something which frankly I think a great number of ccTLDs will either reject or ignore.

Ram Mohan: But nobody listens to it anyway, Jay, so I don't think we can mandate it but we can certainly request it.

Jay Daley: I think, Jay again. I think Ram that you're underestimating the views that people have about the efficacy of their system and the way they do things. For example within my own WHOIS we do not give a code for the registrar, we give the full details of the registrar. We give their, you know, their name, their address, their telephone number, all of that.

And we do that because we believe that when somebody sees the WHOIS record they should see all of those details and not have to go and cross reference it elsewhere. And, you know, if the suggestion is that I replace that with a US ASCII code that then looks up elsewhere I would, you know, argue quite strongly against that.

Now that's just on example, other people have very different views about these things which they would equally strongly defend unfortunately.

Ram Mohan: Okay we might actually be just talking past each other because that was not what I was proposing. I was proposing something else all together Jay.

Jay Daley: Oh good.

Ram Mohan: So let me explain myself. Let's say you have registrar, you know, XYZ who actually is - has provided registrar information to the registry authority in their local language along, solely in their local language.

Jay Daley: Yeah.

Ram Mohan: Okay so let's take the case in India, someone comes in and they say, you know, they are the Taj Mahal registrar and they submit the information in Hindi only. I'm saying we ought to recommend that that information about that registrar ought to be presented both in Hindi and in English or in ASCII that's it.

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: I'm not saying it should be converted to some number or something like that.

Steve Sheng: I agree with Ram. I think that's Item B of proposal.

Jay Daley: Okay even then we're getting back to what I think is the main crux of the issue here is there a language or a character or another script which is somehow universal that we could do that with? And what would be the benefit of doing that and who would benefit from doing that?

Now in the case of India, you know, there is a historical reason why the use of ASCII and English has some value within doing that, okay? But in other countries that simply may not be the case. And I think it is important for us to

recognize the global nature of what we're providing and not try to make a solution that will only suit a particular group of people.

Andrei Kolesnikov: I just - I already said it in my message before in the mailing list, you know, I'm just trying to apply common sense. We all know there are some nations not covered by the Internet or, you know, premature development mode. Of course we should consider these nations but in Russia, I mean, we all speak Russian, it's the Cyrillic character.

About 80% of, you know, Russian people they don't speak English, okay? But for the people - for the person who actually register the domain name at least this person have a computer or some kind of device with like keyboard. And there is 100% confidence that this keyboard has some - has ASCII characters on it even though the default character set is local.

And, I mean, the person who's like applying I'm just thinking from the point of the applicant, the guys who register the domains, you know, there's like, I don't know, it's just a common sense, those people know ASCII. I'm not saying they know English but they supposed to know ASCII at least.

Ram Mohan: This is Ram. I agree with what you just said.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie, do we have a comment? I think we're, you know, there are several elements that are broken out under this and that is the elements of registration data.

We've been talking a fair amount about the registrar elements, but also I think crossing over into entity names, also the issue of postal addresses, email addresses and telephone numbers and whether or not, you know, there are existing conventions for these. And some of those have been pointed out on the list or whether or not we should strive to make specific recommendations

for a standard. And I think there are disagreements on that. But other comments from people on the call on this item?

Ram Mohan: This is Ram.

Steve Metalitz: Steve Metalitz if I could get in the queue.

Julie Hedlund: Steve, actually why don't you go first and then Ram?

Steve Metalitz: Okay. I'm just not sure what Jay is proposing. I think that - I think what Andrei and Ram are saying is that the registrar name would always be in ASCII and...

Ram Mohan: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: ...Andrei is giving the - sort of the practical reason for that. But I'm not sure what Jay's proposal is on this point. There's this sense about represented by a code that is then cross referencing a different list which I think is sometimes going to be true but not always going to be true. So I guess I'm just not clear on what Jay is proposing.

Jay Daley: Steve, this is Jay. If I put to one side the code represented on different lists, sorry, that was my - that me using an example that was inappropriate at the time. My issue is that I would not want us to make a recommendation that says to any ccTLD - to every ccTLD you must require all of your registrars to provide their information both in your local script and language and also in US ASCII, because that would constrain the registrar market in every country to those people who can use US ASCII in that type of way.

Now, okay, let's just - being realistic as Andrei says, with the registrar market I probably can cope with that because US ASCII is sufficiently embedded in the way computers work that you have to be able to do that, okay.

But the general point I was making is that certainly when we get down to the registrant side of things we should not be requiring that so that every registration, you know, the registrant details are also in ASCII as well as that because at that point we certainly can't make those assumptions. Does that help?

Steve Metalitz: So you would be willing to accept Ram and Andrei's proposal as far as registrar name but not as far as some of these other...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: ...the entity names and so forth.

Jay Daley: This is Jay. Yes, I'm uncomfortable with it but I would accept it for registrars though I think it is - it is still unwise for us to make a strong recommendation for ccTLDs but we'll see how that goes on time. But I would - but it's my general point about us not trying to - not believing that there is a single script or language or anything like that that is universal, you know, this is my concern.

Julie Hedlund: Ram was in the queue, are there others who'd like to be in the queue?

Steve Sheng: Steve Sheng.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. Ram you - please go ahead.

Ram Mohan: Thank you. I think this is pretty fundamental as an issue. The - my experience - and I work with several ccTLDs most of which actually do not have English as their primary language. I mean even in India only about 100 million people speak English in the country of over 1 billion.

The one area where I have found pretty consistently a request to have information available in some uniform format. And the preference that has

been told me or to folks in my company is a preference for US ASCII actually comes from law enforcement where there seems to be a common need or request or a desire to have, you know, some of the important information be accessible or available in US ASCII.

So I think that's something we ought to consider perhaps consulting or asking folks who are involved in law enforcement for their points of view if they are not already represented in our list here.

Andrei Kolesnikov: It's Andrei.

Julie Hedlund: Andrei, yeah, go ahead Andrei and then I think...

((Crosstalk))

Andrei Kolesnikov: Just a short note. Yes, our local law enforcement in Russia also just, you know, demanding the universal representation which is by default is ASCII, it's true.

Julie Hedlund: And Steve Sheng, you were in the queue.

Steve Sheng: I will hold my turn for later.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. Others would like to speak on this?

Jay Daley: This is Jay again. The point I made in previous emails is whilst the requirements of law enforcement and others are very important I see those as second order effects and the first - second priorities. The first priority ought to be the ordinary Internet user, the registrant, and what they can do and what they can't do.

My concern is that we must not end up in a situation where there is a technical or linguistic barrier to becoming a registrant for the domain names

that excludes a large set of the population of the world. And that is - strongly concerns me.

If I were somebody who did not speak English, did not recognize ASCII at all and only spoke, you know, a different language and I were asked to put some - put my details in both in my local script and in ASCII, I would either give up or just put rubbish in or go and seek help for somebody to do that for me. But it would still be a barrier to me. And that's what I would strongly like to avoid.

Avri Doria: This is Avri, can I get in the queue?

Julie Hedlund: Please Avri go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay. First of all I want to be clear, we're still talking about what the registrars put in or we're talking about what the registrants put in? But in either case - and this is going to sound like a strange thing coming from my mouth for anybody that knows me - when we're talking about the registrants and not even having to go so far as law enforcement but whatever information is there - and I'll argue there is certainly places that certain information shouldn't be there.

But whatever information is there also needs to be accessible by the user of the Internet elsewhere who has a problem with some kind of traffic or whatever that comes from that undistinguishable name.

And so to say that the issue of the registrant's capability in ASCII - and it is kind of a prejudicial redundancy to call it US ASCII - but to say that a registrant's ability to deal with ASCII to eventually get it translated, to make it somebody else's responsibility that it eventually get filled in so it's there and can be given back is also to ignore the fact of other users and registrants who may be affected by, as I say, people that know me will find it strange for me to utter these words - by the malicious behavior of others.

Jay Daley: This is Jay. I recognize the point there Avri. But again the issue is if I am a registrant and I am putting in data and I understand that other users of the Internet may wish to be able to decode that data so that they can contact me for whatever reason can I reasonably make the assumption that all those people will understand ASCII or not?

And I think that the logical conclusion of what you're suggesting is that it ought to be in in as many scripts and languages as possible so that the many people around the world can understand and interpret that data. Because if you were to just pick ASCII then I think again you're just picking on a smaller group of people and suggesting they're the ones who will have the ability to decode any, you know, record they see.

Avri Doria: If I can answer. Avri again. Again this will sound strange but as someone already said in different words the lingua franca of the Internet is ASCII, it's not English, it's not whatever language it's ASCII. So as a second - as the sort of largest second language of the Internet it makes sense that no it doesn't need to be in all - in all scripts or even in all UN scripts but merely that it be there in one other script that is accessible to most of the people in the Internet.

Jay Daley: This is Jay. I think though the only reason that ASCII is the lingua franca is the historical, you know, use of it that we - and that is by definition an exclusive use. That what we want to do is design an Internet for the future that is inclusive, that includes everybody.

And if we continue with the view that ASCII is the lingua franca then that will continue to be exclusive.

Avri Doria: As a second language I don't think so. I guess I disagree.

Ram Mohan: This is Ram.

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead Ram.

Ram Mohan: Could I get in the queue Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Please go ahead Ram.

Ram Mohan: Okay. I think we've covered this topic. And I don't see Jay necessarily moving off of his point. And I think we could debate this but perhaps we should come back to this and get our - get further thoughts, etcetera, on the list. And I'd like to move forward because it feels like I've been hearing the same points between all of us for the last 10 minutes.

Andrei Kolesnikov: It's Andrei, just one little proposal. Can we just, you know, light up this topic and put it in the kind of research asking a different non-ASCII user groups like from India or other countries, China, you know, just, you know, to answer the simple question do you - do they accept the universal kind of universal computer language - let me put it like this, as a naming convention for the universal purposes, you know, like simple questions to see, you know, what kind of results we can get from the different countries and different specialists and different (unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Andrei. What do others think of that proposal?

Ram Mohan: Andrei, I can support that but - this is Ram - I can support what you're saying I just don't want to make our movement forward contingent on demonstration that US ASCII which is on every keyboard and which, you know, pretty much if you want to use a computer right now you have to be able to navigate...

Andrei Kolesnikov: Absolutely.

Ram Mohan: ...that it somehow is a historical relic and we should, you know, create a space for something new.

I think we should create a space for something new but at the same time we ought to recognize that, you know, in a world of transition from ASCII to IDN, you know, ASCII is still going to remain. It doesn't mean that, you know, we should not - we should recommend against others but certainly I think as a lowest common denominator it feels like ASCII is a good place to begin.

So I can certainly support what you're saying in so far as it is not - it doesn't become - the survey results do not become a requirement for moving forward.

Julie Hedlund: Any other comments on that? So we're about five minutes before the hour. And I agree with Ram I think we need to move forward. I don't know how much - we don't have a lot of time here. The next item was Question 1C. And...

Robert Hutchinson: Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Yes please go ahead.

Robert Hutchinson: This is Bob Hutchinson.

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Robert Hutchinson: Can we go back to 1B, there's some areas other than entity names and registrar question. In the - pardon?

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, you're quite right, Bob, there are some other items there, you're right. The domain names, postal addresses, entity names, etcetera. Did you have...

Robert Hutchinson: Right. My question is the UPU my understanding of what they have for standards is not computer-based but essentially hand written textual based. And maybe I'm wrong but when I've looked at this issue from Webpage

capture of international addresses it's a fairly healthy labyrinth to try to write a Webpage that will capture addresses anywhere in the world for example.

And I guess can Jay or Dave respond to that? And, you know, where would we look for reference on what you're proposing here for the postal addresses?

Jay Daley: This is Jay. I think my main concern was that we didn't invent our own standards. If it is, you know, too difficult to do something localized for each country that's fine, I don't have a problem then with using an international standard that already exists. I just very strongly didn't want us to get into the business of trying to create international standards for postal addresses.

Julie Hedlund: Are there other comments on that question? Dave, unfortunately - Bob, Dave is not here although I think that you are correct that the - and this is Julie - that the UPU standard relates to the - not to a computer-based but hand written or typed, you know, type of address. Any other comments on that one - on the postal addresses?

Ram Mohan: Ram.

Julie Hedlund: Ram please.

Ram Mohan: Jay, do you want to take a minute, and, I mean, I'm actually okay with your suggestion on the list. But do you want to take a minute and just talk about 49, 52 and 53, 36 as your suggestion for email addresses?

Jay Daley: Well, okay, they're just international IDN email addresses aren't they?

Ram Mohan: Right.

Jay Daley: Well it's two (RSV)s that specify that a more modern specification that our email addresses could read.

- Ram Mohan: So I like it and I certainly endorse that. You'd asked in your email if there were any takers; you got one here.
- Julie Hedlund: Other comments from the team members on that - on the email addresses?
- Steve Sheng: I second that, email address and telephone number are, you know, the tools that (unintelligible)...
- Julie Hedlund: Steve, you're breaking up. You were saying - I think you may have got a echo I think. You may need to go on mute.
- Steve Sheng: (Unintelligible). What I'm saying is email addresses, telephone numbers I think they're already (unintelligible) use those.
- Julie Hedlund: Okay I think what Steve is saying here is telephone numbers we already have a convention that's the (unintelligible) convention. And Jay has mentioned considering this could be solved by reference to (E123) internationalized notation for telephone numbers. Any comments...
- Jay Daley: This is Jay. I think everybody uses that, I just don't know if that particular standard which is what everybody uses has been explicitly declared as the standard to use.
- Ram Mohan: As far as I know in ICANN for gTLDs it is has not been.
- Julie Hedlund: The telephone numbers. Ram do you know if that is the standard in gTLDs?
- Ram Mohan: There is none.
- Julie Hedlund: None. Thank you. Okay any other comments on the (unintelligible) item Question 1B?

Ram Mohan: I will add the same caveat, the one area of - this is Ram - the one area of complexity that I would like to reduce is when it comes to registrant and other contact data that we focus on only display in a standard character set and local language set and not worry about things like variants and other characters that look confusingly similar.

I think we will have real trouble if we go down that path. So my counsel is to stay with most used local language set and a standard character set.

Julie Hedlund: Other comments? Thank you. We're now a couple minutes past the top of the hour. We obviously still have some additional items to discuss for our next meeting. We have been scheduling our meetings in a somewhat - we haven't really settled on a schedule. I think we originally talked about so a bi-weekly schedule.

Are the people on this call comfortable with a call in two weeks or do we feel that we want to continue this discussion on a call next week? And we had been varying our times rotating the times to accommodate different time zones in which case we would rotate back to the earlier time at our next meeting. Any comments on that? Biweekly or weekly, any preferences?

Jay Daley: This is Jay. I think biweekly and rotating is a good policy.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Jay. Anyone else?

Ram Mohan: I support that.

Julie Hedlund: Okay.

Andrei Kolesnikov: Andrei supports this.

Julie Hedlund: All right very good. Then I recommend that we continue our discussions on the list for those who haven't weighed in on these other questions. And we'll continue to track the discussion.

Steve Sheng and I have noted some of the areas discussed today and where there's agreements and disagreements in some of the questions that have come up and we'll report back to the team on those as well.

And our next call will be in two weeks time on February the - well anyway in two weeks time, February the 15th. And we'll be sending out notice information. Is there anything else anyone wants to bring up before we close?

Ram Mohan: Thank you for running the call in the absence of our two chairs.

Jay Daley: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: They owe me.

Robert Hutchinson: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Anyway thanks to all of you for joining us. We do appreciate it and have a good day or evening or afternoon...

Andrei Kolesnikov: Good night.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, and night.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Thanks bye-bye.

Steve Metalitz: Bye-bye.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, bye-bye.

Andrei Kolesnikov: Bye-bye.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, (Sean), enjoy the rest of your day.

Coordinator: Thank you, you too.

END