

**GNSO/SSAC  
International Registration Data Working Group  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Monday 01 March 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 March 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/#mar>  
<http://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-ird-20100301.mp3>

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

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

**Present for the teleconference:**

Edmon Chung – Group Leader  
James Galvin - SSAC, Afiliias  
Lisa Lennon  
Owen Smigelski

**ICANN Staff**

Steve Sheng  
Glen de Saint Gery  
Julie Hedlund

**Absent apologies:**

Rafik Dammak -- GNSO Non-Commercial Users Stakeholder Group  
Yao Jiankang, GNSO Registry Stakeholder Group, CNNIC  
Jay Daley  
Erik Iriate Ahon  
Steve Metalitz - GNSO Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial Stakeholder Group  
Ram Mohan  
Mark Kusters

Coordinator: At this time all participants need to be informed that the call is now being recorded. Thank you. You may now continue.

Glen DeSaintgery:Julie, should I do a roll call?

Julie Hedlund: Yes Glen, that would be lovely. Thank you so much.

Glen DeSaintgery: On the call we have Edmon Chung, Lisa Lennon, James Galvin, Owen Smigelski, Steve Sheng and Julie Hedlund for staff. Excuse me. And we have apologies from Yao Jiankang, Ram Mohan, Steve Metalitz, Erick Iriarte Ahon, Rafik Dammak, Jay Daley and Mark Kosters.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Glen. Very helpful. So Edmon, as we've been doing with some of our last calls, we've been going through the set of questions that Dave Piscitello had (distilled) for us as discussion points. And Steve Sheng has been keeping track of the various responses to those questions. And we've also been summarizing from the call.

I wonder since we have a couple of new members on our call, Edmon if we might just maybe see maybe if you could give just a quick summary of where we are just now and then maybe state for the next question I think that we're, you know, set to begin discussion on. Would you be able to do that Steve briefly?

Steve Sheng: Sure. Hi. This is Steve Sheng. I'm with staff support for the working group. As Julie mentioned, Dave outlined a set of questions and it's attached in a summary document.

So basically we've been going over these questions. The first question we discussed is what do we require for internationalized registration data so that a user can submit or have the domain name displayed in their IDN A-label format or the U-label format.

So basically when a - can a user - should we require a user the Whois service to be able to take the U-label queries and return the relevant results? And so the working group has been deliberating on that. And for the past several meetings it seems that the participants present at the call agree that the Whois service should be able to - should be able to submit - the user should be able to submit queries both in A-label and U-label format.

So the U-label is the regular, the internationalized and the A-label is kind of the translated ASCII correspondent of the label. So a user should be able to submit queries in both formats and receive the corresponding replies in both A-label and U-label format. So that's my brief summary on the first point.

Before going forward, I'd like to know if others think that I summarize it correctly or, you know.

Julie Hedlund: And Owen and Lisa, since you're new, and I don't mean to put you on the spot, but do you have any questions? You haven't been able to, you know, see all of the various discussion on these. But I wondered if you had any questions for Steve on that.

Owen Smigelski: My only question is I couldn't find what the difference is between a U-label and an A-label query.

Steve Sheng: You mean the difference meaning - so they are - the U-label and the correspondence A-label they're equivalent representing a domain name. So I think the discussion was we want to allow U-label because it's easier for the end user to remember the U-label. I mean the internationalized version of that domain name.

And the A-label is the ASCII translation, you know, of the U-label and sometimes machines like automated Whois clients may benefit from querying that because those clients may not support - may only support like ASCII type of queries.

Owen Smigelski: Okay.

Steve Sheng: Yeah.

Lisa Lennon: Julie, I didn't have any questions to this point. But if we're going through all of the points, I do have some questions later one which will be (okay). I could get those answered then.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Sure Lisa.

((Crosstalk))

James Galvin: So let me - I have a comment - this is...

Steve Sheng: Go ahead.

James Galvin: Yeah. This is Jim. I have a comment. Just one point for clarity for Steven when he talks about this. I mean we're going through here talking about requirements. And so I think that we want to be careful to not say Whois servers and in particular we're talking about Whois services if we want to use that phrase. I guess we use Whois because that's what everybody understands.

But I think that's important because, you know, Whois is a protocol now. There are Whois servers that are protocols now and they do that. And we're talking about the next generation of stuff, which is not going to be directly applicable to Whois servers today.

Steve Sheng: Yes. Thanks Jim. That's a very helpful clarification. Yeah. So we're - when we or when I say Whois, I mean the Whois service, not particularly the servers or the clients. That includes all of the above I guess.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. Owen and Lisa, I did send the document to you that Steve is referring to. And Lisa certainly we'll give you a chance for questions as we go through it as well.

Steve Sheng: So let me quickly summarize the second point that we've been discussing. So the second point, which is the Question 1B that we've been discussing is - so how do we internationalize the Whois data essentially - the key point that we've been discussing.

And from the various discussions, we seem to agree that the various - we should separate the various data elements and discuss internationalization separately.

So for example, if you separate the current Whois output, we have the domain names. But, you know, the IDN standard already says the U-label, A-label already exists. Those are standardized. So we think those are probably enough to internationalize for the display domain name. So that's considered, you know, out of the scope here.

So the next data item we discussed is the registrar. So in the regular Whois output, the registrar name is displayed. And we discussed about should we required - I think require is a too strong a word. Should we recommend, you know, the English, the ASCII, the English representation - the English name of the registrar being displayed?

And there has been some discussions. But it seems the party present at the call, a couple calls back, seems to agree that the registrar name could be one of those instances where we will want to have to display English at least.

So, you know, the different Whois implementations could - in addition to display the English, they could display their own, for example, Chinese name of the registrar, the Japanese name of the registrar. But we want to at least for them to display English.

We talked about the postal address. We talked about a email address internationalization and there are already requests for proposals in the IETF. The RFC 5336 about regarding the internationalization of email addresses.

And we'll be - we are studying that. And I think the consensus on the call was to use that as a way going forward to internationalize the email address.

The telephone number, they're already the ITU standard E.123 for internationalizing telephone numbers and going forward we will probably use that for internationalized telephone numbers.

So those are the things that we've discussed, the entities. There are a couple of things that we couldn't or we haven't I should say - we haven't reached an agreement on. It's the key point is regarding the entity names.

So that is the registrar name, the registrar and contact information and, you know, something that - I think that the key of the discussions, the central point of the discussions is whether we should at least require a English representation of that. And there's no agreement on that yet.

So that's my summary of the second point.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. Thank you Steve. So I'd like to open it up for questions on that summary.

Lisa Lennon: Julie, it's Lisa. So just on that last point from Steve about the no agreement in relation to the entity's name and registrant contact details. So how does that get moved forward? Is that still open for discussion by the working group?

Julie Hedlund: Yeah. This is Julie. Yes I think it is still open for discussion since we haven't come to an agreed upon recommendation for how we want to address that. Steve, you can correct me if you think that's...

Steve Sheng: Yes. I think so. Yes. Julie, you're absolutely right.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Lisa, this is Julie. That's an ongoing discussion and certainly we welcome your ideas on that as well as from Owen since both of you have not had a chance yet to weigh in.

((Crosstalk))

Lisa Lennon: So let me just briefly some background. Essentially there are two arguments both for and against. So the argument for some kind of at least English representation is the Whois service is used to contact registrant and many times those registrant at different country.

And it's difficult - right now it's in English so it's at least it's a more commonly used language around the world. And it's easier - there's high - there's a high probability - sorry, I'm not summarizing this very clearly.

There's a high probability that, you know, people will know English and therefore reach the registrant in question. So going to the internationalizing this information, so some working group members think that at least there should be a English representation.

The argument against it is basically the premise that the status quo is unacceptable in a sense that we're talking about internationalizing Whois. And simply requiring one language, you know, would present a kind of a barrier of entry for those registrants who do not know - for example, in this case for those registrants who do not know English, it will present to them as a barrier of entry. And that in turn could lead to more inaccuracies in Whois. So those are the - that's the argument against it.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. Lisa, did you have a question or comment?

Lisa Lennon: Yes. I understand that it's all about internationalizing and I appreciate the difficulty of that and you certainly don't want to come up with a set of recommendations that would be a barrier to anyone.

I'm just wonder though the other core data that has been discussed and agreed should be available in ASCII. I presume that would be available in another language as well. Is that incorrect?

((Crosstalk))

Lisa Lennon: ...seems to make a registrant information is in the same (unintelligible) as a core piece of information that should be available in both ASCII and also perhaps another language as well.

Steve Sheng: This is Steve. So I think the discussion is we recommended a minimum set of information to be included. And whether registrars or registries want to include additional information for example, you know, the - take for example that the registrar name, you know, we recommend they at least keep - have English representation. If they decide to put whatever local language they are in, you know, we certainly don't prohibit that.

Lisa Lennon: Oh, okay. I see.

James Galvin: So this is Jim Galvin. I have a question. Are we having a discussion about the postal, you know, entity names in terms of the requirements for them or were you still just giving a summary and doing clarifications?

Steve Sheng: Yeah. We can talk about postal. I wasn't sure what we agreed on the postal address. I don't think we discussed very much on that.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah. This is Julie. I was just looking through the notes from the last meeting and I don't think that we had completed that discussion.



James Galvin: Yeah, I'm sorry. I threw out an extra word there because I just - you were talking about entity names and you had kind of stopped there and then you were having this discussion about requiring that it be in English or at least you were talking about the two different sides of that. And so my questions was - I didn't mean to drag postal into it although I'm happy to do that too if you want.

My question was really about are we having a discussion about the requirements or entity names or are you still just giving a summary?

Steve Sheng: I was just giving a summary. Yeah.

James Galvin: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Right. Yeah. This is Julie. And Jim and we were addressing Lisa's question since she hadn't been a party to the previous discussions.

James Galvin: That's fine. I wasn't part of any of the previous discussion either, not the one that we had here anyway. This was discussed many times. But that's fine. I won't engage if we're not engaging at the moment. So thank you.

Julie Hedlund: We'll I'm - that's a good question Jim. This is Julie. Steve, since we're - we've just done kind of a summary of this question and there seems to be, you know, more discussion we can have on Question 1B, should we - it's fine with me. What do you think? We can go ahead and just open up discussion on some of these items.

Steve Sheng: Sure.

Julie Hedlund: So great. Jim, then if you've got some comments or questions, this is the time.

James Galvin: Okay. So and I guess this applies both entity names and postal addresses in my view. But I know we go back and forth on this issue of does it need to be in English or should we allow people to do this in their local language. And I guess I'm wondering what our path forward is going to be for these things.

You know, my concern is we specify the things have to be in English, you know, who gets to translate these things and make them be that way? And who's going to make sure that everything gets translated in sensible ways.

And I would argue in favor of not requiring English because if you look at the way postal services around the world work today, you know, there is a requirement - there's a standard for specifying the country, right, so that you can get letters to countries?

But past that point the postal delivery that's written on an envelope can be whatever is okay for that local environment, that local country. And so I'm wondering why we would do anything different in this situation.

Steve Sheng: Jim, this is Steve. One reason that we might do it different is because in the example of postal addresses, when a letter is - when a letter is sent for example from U.S. to Japan, a postman in Japan would pick it up and he has - he or she will have the knowledge of Japanese. So he know where to deliver that address - which address to deliver to.

But for Whois it's a different kind of (inquirer) method. For example, if a ISP in U.S. want to find a registrant in Japan, there's no equivalent of a Japanese postman in this scenario. So the ISP in the U.S. have to go all the way to find that registrant. That's my understanding.

((Crosstalk))

James Galvin: Sure. But I'll be honest with you. I mean sure. But I'll be honest with you. I find that argument specious, you know. I mean there's no - you look at the

way law enforcement works today. I mean if they want to find someone in another country, there are well-developed channels for finding your way down to someone who can get you access to whatever it is you're trying to get to in another country.

And I look at this situation and I think well, if I get a Japanese name put in front of me, I know nothing about Japanese. But, you know, if I really want to find them, I'm going to find a solution to that problem. And that should be my problem, not yours.

Edmon Chung: Hi. This is Edmon.

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Oh, okay. Two comments on this. One comment on this and then something else on the email part. I kind of agree with Jim. However, perhaps the way we look at the issue is not so much in language. If we put it the perspective of whether we want to, the way forward, whether we want to include some sort of backwards compatibility with Whois. Do we want to have some sort of ASCII representation of a, you know, a certain contact?

I think that might be a more fruitful discussion. Because it seems to me that if we go down this particular direction, it's more of a political statement than, you know, something that we want as Whois to be a technical tool.

In terms of, you know, you'd be the example of a U.S. SP trying to find a Japanese registrant, you know, I sort of agree with Jim on that in the sense that, you know, it's not the registrant's fault to not know English. I mean if they don't know English, they should still be able to register a domain name.

So the better more fruitful direction is whether we want the future Whois which is internationalized to be somewhat - to have somewhat of a backwards compatibility because right now we know that Whois takes only

ASCII characters. And, you know, do we want to consider that being one of the - one of the features going forward is to have some backward compatibility to the existing one?

That was the first point. The second point was on email. Apologize for not being on the call last time. But I understand that it's currently pointing towards the EAI specifications. However, as I have been participating in that as well.

But in there there is a concept of downgrading from an internationalized name and that downgrading happens in a, for lack of a better word, a sort of a handshake between the mail - email protocol. That doesn't seem to be possible in terms of - or at least not envisioned in sort of the Whois environment. I wonder if that has been explored further.

Steve Sheng: Thanks. This is Steve. We are still exploring that.

James Galvin: Yeah. And this is Jim and I'll just add that with respect to downgrading in EAI, I'm aware of some other discussions that are going on that suggest that downgrading is simply not going to happen. That there are just too many edge cases where you just cannot do it effectively and make it work in any kind of universal way.

And an argument could be made that you don't need downgrading. I know it's still a point that's open for discussion. So certainly there's been no consensus on this point. But I would suggest that we not get ourselves here wrapped up in a downgrading discussion - that downgrading discussion because that will certainly have its own life in a different forum.

Other than that, I agree with Edmon. I like the idea of - I mean if it's possible, you provide an optional component for backwards compatibility or I could even imagine, you know, a registrar - you know, maybe there's an opportunity for registrars to provide a point of contact that could be visible to people who

would like some, you know, help in translation or access or something like that.

I'm thinking if we focus specifically on law enforcement since I brought them up before, you know, maybe part of the Whois is for a registrar to include an abuse contact at the registrar that can be easily contacted in - we have to decide what the universal way. I mean English is always the easy choice. Maybe there's something else. But the concept is still there.

Lisa Lennon: This is Lisa. So could I just ask another question? And pardon my ignorance. But is it the case that the earlier pieces of information will be available in ASCII? But really you're just talking about treating the registrant's information differently not requiring that that's provided in ASCII. Is that correct?

James Galvin: What information, sorry, did you - the first word that you had there in your question kind of didn't come through for me.

Lisa Lennon: Oh, sorry. It's the lines dropping in and out a bit. My understanding is the registrar information the email address and the telephone number will be available in - the recommendation is that would be available in ASCII. Is that correct?

James Galvin: No. I though we said for the telephone - well, I guess ASCII is a relative term in this case. But Arabic in the case of the numbers according to the E.123 standard.

Lisa Lennon: Oh, I see.

James Galvin: And the email address would be whatever comes out of this EAI group for the standard for internationalized email addresses. Did I get that right Steve?

Steve Sheng: Yes.

Lisa Lennon: Okay. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Yes Steve.

James Galvin: So maybe we come back around to the question I started with here when I raised my comment about entity and postal address. About, you know, how - what is the path forward in this group to come to consensus on what to recommend on those two elements.

Julie Hedlund: So this is Julie. And Steve certainly chime in. But I think we would envision trying to draft a set of recommendations on all of these items that we've identified, at least those that we - as the working group believe are in scope of this working group. And some we may decide are not in scope.

But for those that we feel that are in scope, staff can assist him in drafting a set of recommendations for the working group to consider. And we can discuss, you know, adjustments to those and determine to which of those we agree. And recommendations that would go forward out of this group would be those on which we have reached consensus.

The charter to find consensus as 2/3 of the working group members agreeing and in the case in which there is disagreement, say 1/3 or less, there is the opportunity for including minority report when the recommendations go forward, you know, indicating that these members, you know, X members agreed and X member that is less than, you know, 1/3 or less disagreed and why. And that would then, you know, move forward as a type of working group report.

Steve Sheng: This is Steve. Julie I think you summarized the procedure very well. For - my sense is for other elements of internationalization, we probably - at least my sense is people participated on the call seems to reach some kind of consensus. So I wouldn't worry too much about that.

For the point that Jim raised, I just see it's essentially two camps. And I am not sure how to reach - I think - I'm not sure how to reach consensus on that to put it short.

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon.

Julie Hedlund: Oh please go ahead Edmon.

Edmon Chung: I believe we mentioned a few times in past that about some postal standards. Is there any possibly to refer to that? What's - can you - I believe there was some study on that. Can you remind us what exactly those standards would look like if it's somewhat adopted?

Julie Hedlund: Edmon, this is Julie. I know that Dave Piscitello who unfortunately is unable to be on this call had done a study of the universal postal union standards and had put them out as a, you know, possibility for the group to consider. And we could certainly circulate those again to see if that might be an acceptable path forward in the case of postal addresses.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So that has been brought up. Has there been any objections against using something - such a standard?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. I do recall that we had discussed it. I think it was two calls ago. I know that one of the issues that I believe it was Steve Metalitz raised was how the postal addresses could be - that they might not be able to be easily dealt with using computer automation if I remember correct.

And Steve, do you recall what, I'd have to look back at my notes, what some of the other discussion were on postal addresses? I don't think we had come to a (conclusion) on how to address them.

Steve Sheng: Sorry, I don't remember that either.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah. No I don't think so. I think that's one Edmon that we probably need to get a discussion going again on and have - I'll pull up what or have Dave pull up what he sent around before. And perhaps what we can do is see if we can get a discussion going on that on the list as well.

But another possibility too is to see if we can set out the things that we, and I know that Steve has been trying to do this, set out the things that we feel that we're reaching perhaps some agreement on.

And then maybe list out the issues of, you know, on the questions we've discussed thus far, those that are remaining issues such as the registrant information and the postal addresses and so on and try to see if we can get a more pointed discussion on those items. Maybe even just taking a couple of them, you know, on a call and hashing through them a little bit more in detail.

Steve Sheng: This is Steve.

Julie Hedlund: Steve please.

Steve Sheng: I just took a look at Dave's presentation at Seoul on the postal address format. So let me briefly summarize. So the presentation it says the universal postal union international address formatting is the address - the addressee's address should be written legibly in Roman letters and Arabic numerals. If other letters and figures are used in the country of destination, it shall be recommended that the address be given also in these letters and numerals.

So essentially what this is saying is for example, if someone sent a letter from Great Britain to the UAE, which in principle means you write the address twice. You write once the address in Roman letters, which is essentially like in English and you also write the address once in Arabic characters. So that's Dave' presentation on the UPU standard.



So essentially, you know - I think essentially it's saying, you know, it is requiring English and also in another language.

James Galvin: Well actually I don't think that's required because I thought the extra Arabic was optional.

Steve Sheng: Right. Right. The actual Arabic is option. So but the Roman numeral is required.

Julie Hedlund: So the - well, the Roman - so this is Julie. So the requirement is at the least the Roman - the address in Roman letters and Arabic numerals. Is that correct?

Steve Sheng: Yes. That's (correct).

Julie Hedlund: With the option to also put that same information in a local script.

Steve Sheng: Yes.

James Galvin: Actually I thought it was the other way around.

Steve Sheng: Go ahead Jim.

James Galvin: I mean I thought it was the other way around. That you are - you're not required to put it out there in Arabic or Roman. They just recommend that.

Julie Hedlund: Steve, this is Julie. Is it - we probably have to pull up the exact working, but is it clear from Dave's presentation as to whether or not it's a requirement for Roman letters and Arabic numerals?

Steve Sheng: Well, I guess, sorry. I think we can just pull up the slides. And then we can discuss about it.

James Galvin: Yeah. I'm looking for Dave's slides now. I'm...

((Crosstalk))

James Galvin: Oh here it is.

Steve Sheng: In the SSAC presentations?

James Galvin: Oh, in the SSAC presentations? I thought he gave a - he gave an open...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: It is because it's related to the SSAC.

James Galvin: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...at an open meeting. It was a related - it was related to an SSAC issue. I mean being that it's SSAC and GNSO that are on this group.

James Galvin: Yeah. I thought he had given this presentation in a Whois data accuracy thing or something. But they don't have any - oh, here we go. Maybe it's in here in the presentations...

Julie Hedlund: It should be under the presentations if it's posted. That internationalized data - registration data Webinar.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Sheng: Yes.

James Galvin: Yes. And I have to get to the right.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah.

James Galvin: Okay. Thing is not organized and now I have to know which day it's on in order to find the presentation. Okay. So it's on Wednesday afternoon.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

James Galvin: It was on Wednesday afternoon.

Julie Hedlund: But there's also - there was also - let me just see if - there was also a Webinar that was posted - Webinar slides that were posted on the SSAC Web site. I'm just looking through that. Okay. That might not actually have the UPU thing in it.

Steve Sheng: It does.

Julie Hedlund: Does it? Okay.

Steve Sheng: Yeah. Let me send the working group...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Yeah. If you want - oh, here, I have it. So it's Slide 22.

Steve Sheng: Yeah, 21 and 22.

Julie Hedlund: Twenty-one and 22. Twenty-one, universal postal union and (rational) address formatting. The addresses address, I should say, shall be written legibly in Roman letters and Arabic numerals. Further letters and figures are used in the country of destination; it shall be recommended that the address be given also in these letters and numerals.

And then there's an example on Slide 22. The address of an item posted in Great Britain to the UAE will therefore in principle be written once in Roman character and it's recommended that it would also be written in Arabic letters.

James Galvin: Okay. I actually downloaded a PDF from the ICANN Web site. And it's actually Slide 15 in that presentation.

Julie Hedlund: Maybe it's slightly different because we did this in two different places.

Steve Sheng: Right.

James Galvin: Well, fair enough. So I got it exactly backwards, which is fine.

Julie Hedlund: Okay.

James Galvin: But I see that this is what Dave wrote. So that's interesting and I - that's fine.

Julie Hedlund: But that...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Sheng: But Jim, I think...

Julie Hedlund: But what do you think about that as a possible...

Steve Sheng: Right.

Julie Hedlund: ...you know, recommendation? To follow that standard with postal addresses in, you know, internationalized registration data.

James Galvin: Well, I suppose my initial reaction is that that was an interesting rule in days gone by. And frankly my initial reaction is we've moved past that and it's time

to reconsider that rule. That would be my going in position. I'm happy to be convinced otherwise though.

Steve Sheng: This is Steve. I think we should put other possible options on the table and, you know, so we not limit to UPU standard. I think whatever Jim proposes, you know, is perfectly valid as well, so.

James Galvin: Yeah. I mean I think the situation is different today than it was when these rules were written. I mean you can rationalize this rule as I think through this a little bit, and I apologize. I'm sort of thinking out loud a little bit here.

You can rationalize this rule to suggest that this really was never a problem except for someone who was actually interacting internationally. And it would make sense to have single method to move things around internationally.

And it would be something which would be initiated in - to draw the analogy to where we are today by the registrants themselves. They would initiate this contact. And so the idea that they might put it in some baseline everybody understands makes sense to me.

But we're actually in a different situation. The circumstances under which we're operating here are quite different. This is not about the registrants initiating discussions or conversation or visibility of themselves to anyone. This is about a pull model as opposed to a push model.

And so I don't think that this rule applies as written. It doesn't apply directly. I don't want to close the door on discussion because maybe somebody will think of something else. But as I think about this, it's, you know, the model under which we're operating today is different than the model under which this rule applies. That's where I'm coming from.

Steve Sheng: Got you.

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon. This is Edmon. I'm not sure that it could be entirely the case. I don't think it's so much - it is sort of a push. It depends on how you see it. It is a push because with - the registrant is deciding what information, you know, it wants to push out to the community - to the world. And, you know, you can see it as a pull if you are the viewer of the Whois information and you're looking for the actual information. So it depends on which view you're taking.

James Galvin: Well, I agree. Let me not get hung up on push versus pull and try to describe this instead in terms of behavior and functionality and just observe that, you know, in - at the time that this rule is in place, it's for a behavior model whereby I, you know, I am trying to initiate a communication in an international context. And therefore it seems reasonable for me to want to follow those rules.

On the other hand, in the DNS world in which we are, I'm trying to establish some contact information with my local representative, if you will, the registrar. So I only need to be able to communicate with them and the rest of the world is really not relevant and important to me.

The fact that other people may have uses for some of the information that I'm going to give to my registrar is something I probably need to know but it shouldn't be my responsibility to provide that information in a way that you can consume it. If you want that information, you should have to create a mechanism or a means by which you can get it in a format that's suitable for you.

Steve Sheng: So Jim, let me see if I can summarize what you're saying. What you're essentially suggesting is an option that we don't require registrants to submit their Whois information or publish their Whois information in English. They can submit or publish in whatever languages they feel comfortable with. But we do want registrar to provide a point of contact.

And if such issue. for example, a translation issue would arise where a registrant need to get in touch with another registrant, the registrant point of contact would respond and provide the translated information. Is that - am I getting that correct or no?

James Galvin: Just - I mean yes. The two things that you summarized, you summarized correctly. But let me just clarify one thing. I was only offering as a suggestion that it would be in the context of backwards compatibility an alternative to requiring the registrant to also enter things in English. An alternative - another option might be for the registrar to translate it for the registrant and that's what they put in the Whois.

Another option yet again might be for the registrar to provide a point of contact that would provide, you know, translation services upon request or perhaps for a fee or perhaps as required by a local judicial authority. I guess what I wanted to clarify is that I'm not saying that - I'm offering that simply as a discussion point; not as something that I'm proposing.

Steve Sheng: Thanks Jim.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Jim. This is Julie. So we'll try to capture those alternatives and present them as suggestions for discussion to, you know, the rest of the members. What do you think about that approach Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Yeah. I think that makes sense. I'm still a little bit unsure what the UPU standards are. I'm actually - in confess I was trying to search around what they are in more detailed format. But just that one slide and discussion might not give it the whole I guess all the, for lack of a better word, respect it should get. Because I believe it - I was just searching around and I see that it was formed in 2004.

I'm sure it's a relatively modern - that the newer standard would be (a) modern manifestation. I somewhat agree with, you know, the idea that in

essence the registrar should be sort of a point man for the international world and a local registrant should just be able to deal with their local situation. But I think in terms of how you decide to move forward, that's - that works.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Edmon. This is Julie. What we can also do is see if we can track down a little bit more detailed text on the UPU requirements. I'm sure that Dave has access to that. And I think that would be more...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Because that really - I think that would help us. I mean I can imagine that they probably have some sort of standard for, you know, local (manual) as well. I don't know. Like maybe if we adopt the whole thing, I mean just point to that, then we have a - I won't say more of - I'm just speculating here. But if we - the thing is if we have a standard to point to, I think it would help us a lot in terms of trying to come to a solid framework.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Thank you Edmon. This is Julie. I'm noticing in some detail it's in one of the presentations that Dave did that there are some additional elements to the requirements that it might be useful for us to capture.

In particular, in addition to writing the addresses on Roman letters and Arabic numerals, it also says - has the requirement that the person addressing the piece of mail must comply with the recommendations of the postal authority of the country in which you post your items as regards indication of the destination country.

And you follow the recommendations of the destination country postal authority for the remainder of the address element and that you always write the name of the destination country in one of the languages used in the country in which you post your items. If this language is not an international known language, you should add the name of the destination country in an internationally known language.



So there's several details there that perhaps we can pull out a little bit because that seems to provide us a few more options of capturing the information both in Roman letters and Arabic numerals but also in the country's local script and language. So we'll take that as an action to maybe pull together a separate email string on the postal addresses and get some of this information out onto the list and see if we can get some additional discussion on it.

Are there - is there more discussion on...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: That sounds good. And I think in terms of the - it might be fruitful to go down that path for also the contact name because, you know, there might be - because in the whole postal address, they probably also address the name of the recipient as well and so.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah. This is Julie. Thank you Edmon. That's a good suggestion. That might be able to be a way of formulating some possible recommendations for some of the other elements including the contact name. Got some further thoughts on this others on the call or and Jim?

Steve Sheng: Do others on the call have other suggestions, options of moving forward?

Julie Hedlund: On the postal elements or any of the other elements?

Lisa Lennon: This is Lisa.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah.

Lisa Lennon: I don't any suggestions at the moment. But I'd love to have a look at the postal elements and then have a chance to think about it and come back and discuss it at the next call.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Lisa. That's great. And Jim, how does this sound...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...moving forward if we try to, you know, pull out some of these different alternatives and maybe a little bit more detail on the UPU standards for discussion?

James Galvin: Yeah. No, I agree completely, you know, and obviously I guess implicit in the way we've been talking about process here is the - and I want to say this out loud just so that people can say I've got it wrong if I'm wrong. That we are having discussions here and we're trying to collect a requirements document together but ultimately it's going to have to go to the list and it's the mailing list through which we're going to declare consensus and final discussions.

And, you know, I guess I want to ask if that's true. But then I'll just say in response to your question to me Julie that sure, I agree completely to try to, you know, collect all the stuff and put it out to the list and see what other discussion we get from people.

Julie Hedlund: Right. And Jim, this is Julie. To answer your question, we'll - we will of course continue these discussions on the calls. And we'll try to get, you know, people to say yes or no, they agree or not on different items on the call. But I think ultimate you're right. We'll probably ask for people to respond in one way or another, positively or negatively, to each of the recommendations we make as we craft.

And I - and we'll probably - we may be doing them in a piecemeal fashion as opposed to trying to go, you know - so we might pick the ones that - I think

we'll probably pick the ones that we think we're getting close on and put those out there. And Steve has been trying to summarize them as we go along in any case.

And then when we get to the point that we feel we have something fairly firm, you know, ask people, you know, do you agree or do you disagree and, you know, and if so, what changes would you like to make, et cetera? And that certainly can happen on the list because we're unlike to have everybody together on one call.

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon.

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Once - this is a little bit separate from the discussion we had today. But I remember - I recall there was one thread that I believe it was (unintelligible) from bringing up the issue of variance in - varying domains in terms of IDN registrations.

I'm just wondering have we ever touched on the topic or is this going to come up later on after we deal with some of these basic elements?

Julie Hedlund: Edmon, this is Julie. I do remember seeing something on that, and Steve, you can chime in as well. I don't think - I'm just checking through the various questions that Dave has put out to see whether or not variance is an item that's capture there.

And I think Edmon that's obviously an issue I think has, you know, that's come up I think in some of the other conversations about internationalized domain names. I'm not seeing variance in here as a point of discussion. Steve, do you recall discussions around variance?

Steve Sheng: No, I don't. But we can - I can dig up email and we can discuss it next time I guess.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah. I think we should try to capture that one. I think there are potentially a lot of issues there that we may or may not - we may decide are not in the scope of this group. But I think they need to be fleshed out. Thank you Edmon. That's a good point.

And so suggesting a way forward, we'll summarize this discussion and pull out the postal union standards information and some details there. And also pull, you know, put together some possible alternatives for (unintelligible) some of these elements.

And - but also so that people know, we have - we put together some draft slides and Edmon, we sent those to you and (Jeremy) the latter part of last week I think it was. It might have been - it might have been on Thursday. I don't know if you've had a chance to look at them. But we, you know, we do have an opportunity to give an update on the IRD-WG work at - actually it went out Thursday, the 25th. I hunted around.

At the SSAC open meeting in Nairobi, that will be Nairobi from 2:00 to 3:30 on Tuesday the 9th. I will send information on that and other related meetings to this list probably later today or tomorrow morning. Edmon, did you - just if you could when you get a chance maybe send around any comments you have on those slides.

Edmon Chung: Sure. Yes. I did get it. In terms of my schedule to Nairobi, I will know for sure tomorrow whether I will actually be in Nairobi. If I am there, I'll definitely be able to make a presentation. If I'm not going to be there, then perhaps it might be more useful for somebody who would be there to give the presentation.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah. So we'll try to see if we can work that through. There's, excuse me, not very many people - very, very few people from the - from this working group will be there. I think it's yourself - well, you may or may not be there. Excuse me. Andrei said he'll be there and Avri, excuse me, will be there and Ram also. And I think that's all I'm aware of at this point.

So we'll try to see...

Edmon Chung: And if you want - if you want me to do it remotely in the case where I won't be there, I'm happy to do that too. But...

Julie Hedlund: Well let's wait and see.

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Yeah. I'll know in about 20 hours and I'll respond.

Julie Hedlund: Great. And if you could in the meantime just - well, obviously not now since it's - well, whatever, 4:00 in the morning for you. But if you, you know, tomorrow, whatever could get a chance to look at the slides in any case and just let us know what you think if there are any changes, that would be great.

And then we'll wait to hear from you and we'll try to work out, you know, perhaps an alternate to give the presentation if you're not able to go.

Edmon Chung: Sure.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you everyone. We're now five minutes after the hour. I apologize but I wanted to deal with some of those logistical issues. Are there any question on - or anything that we have missed that I should mention or address?

Then thank you everyone. We will not have a meeting in Nairobi given that there will be so few working group members in Nairobi and the time

difference makes it very difficult to try to have a call and have people join. But we'll resume our regular scheduled calls after Nairobi. But in the meantime we'll try to keep the discussion going on the list.

Thank you everyone and welcome again to Owen and Lisa. Thanks for joining us. And thanks Jim for all your great input as well and Edmon for chairing. And if I don't see you in Nairobi, we'll hear you on next call.

Edmon Chung: All right. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Bye bye.

Man: Bye.

END