

**GNSO/SSAC
International Registration Data Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 01 November 2010 at 15:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO/SSAC International Registration Data Working Group on 01 November 2010 at 15:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ird-20101101-en.mp3>

On page:

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

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

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

Present for the teleconference:

Rafik Dammak -- GNSO Non-Commercial Users Stakeholder Group

Bob Hutchinson, GNSO Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG)

Avri Doria - NCSG

Owen Smigelski, Sunrider International, Intellectual Property Interests Constituency,
Commercial Stakeholder Group

Steven Metalitz -- GNSO Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial

ICANN Staff

Steve Sheng

David Piscitello

Gisella Gruber-White

Absent apologies:

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon to everyone on today's IRTDcall on Monday, the 1st of November.

We have Rafik Dammak, Avri Doria, Robert Hutchinson, Owen Smigelski, Steve Metalitz. From staff we have Steve Shang, Dave Piscitello and myself; Gisella Gruber-White. And I don't have any apologies recorded for today.

Could I please also just remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you Dave and Steve.

Steve Sheng: Thank you Gisella. Good morning everyone or good evening. This is Steve. I'm actually in Mexico today, so bear with me if the call quality is not good enough. So thank you so much for making today's call -- I know this is one of the extra calls we have -- to discuss the draft reports.

So there are three things I thought we could discuss today. The first thing is we could go over the draft reports. You know, I've - thank you all for those wonderful and helpful changes. For the editorial changes, I've included almost all of them.

And there are two substantial comments; one from (Jeremy) and one from (Rob). I don't know how to include them yet; I need some guidance from the working group.

You know, I'm happy to include them. My only feeling is some of these proposals have not been discussed in great detail in the (unintelligible) before. So I think one of the goals for this call is for the working group to give its staff some guidance on whether and how to include these proposed languages.

So I think that's the primary goal for this call. Do people have other agenda items? Yes, no? Okay.

Why don't we start with (Rob)'s - Robert Hutchinson's proposed language - proposed additions in the interim report for Section 4.1. And then we can go through that quickly, and then see the thing for (Jeremy), and then we discuss the report.

Do people have a copy of (Rob)'s proposed addition? Yes/no? I sent it in the email along with this previous report.

Bob Hutchinson: Yes, this was the one that begins with the map, right?

Steve Sheng: Yes, this is the one that begins with a map. Yes, indeed.

(Rob) if possible, could you explain a little bit more about your suggestion or your proposed language?

Bob Hutchinson: Yes. When I went through the document, I believe that there isn't any description in the document of the language or script sets that are being talked about in the other parts of the document.

And I believe that we have some mental consensus anyway, of the fact that the internationalized version has to support a full suite of human languages. And I was trying to give definition to what that is within this document. And...

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Bob Hutchinson: ...that was the purpose of adding this language.

Now as I mentioned in the text, it's not clear to me whether the work that was done with IRDs -- or International Domain Names -- for the ccTLD work, whether they have adopted a set of language tables and those should be referenced here or how that's being handled in the other parts of ICANN.

And I was hoping the staff could research that. And if these examples are not relevant because there are superseding examples that are already in use at ICANN IANA, we would reference those.

Steve Sheng: Okay. What do others think?

Steve Metalitz: Well this is Steve Metalitz. I wonder, what is the answer to Bob's question? Is there something from the IDN work that would - could be inserted here?

Steve Sheng: In terms of the scripts?

Steve Metalitz: Yes. Okay, I'm reading this as, you know, making some reference to the kinds of scripts we're talking about. And if that - there already is such a list from the IDN work, just reference it.

Steve Sheng: I can check with (Tina) on that. I'm not sure. We have a general list for that.

My understanding is the IDN Fast Track process used a newer manual for countries. So maybe that has language and codings associated with it. But I can check on that. Sorry, I was temporarily dropped off the call so I didn't hear the question.

So for these proposed changes, what do people think?

Avri Doria: This is Avri.

Steve Sheng: Go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: I think adding such a section is really quite a good idea. I think it's probably reasonable to do due process and make sure that, you know, they coordinate correctly with whatever other tables might have been put out in the other processes. I'm not sure that I see any necessity to change these.

So I would certainly both advocate putting something in like this...

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...and making sure that it's consistent with whatever else has gone in elsewhere.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Would it be possible to put the table - put this table in the appendix, instead of put it in the, you know, the report, and reference this in the report? Is that possible?

Bob Hutchinson: I don't see any reason why we would not put it in the report and put it in an appendix.

Steve Sheng: No I mean, the appendix is part of the report. I'm just saying, you know, maybe it's good to show people a reference instead of to find out - you know this is couple pages, that table is, by the way.

Avri Doria: This is Avri again. I would - support it be independent as much as in line. In line, it does sort of say to everyone - and pardon my voice...

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...that, "You have to read this to understand the whole report." Having it in the appendix says that, you know, "This is an item we discuss and here's more information on it."

And sometimes perhaps a linkage to the appendix of having a footnote in the appropriate place in the remark when, you know, people first mention language support to say, "For full information on et cetera, please consult appendix," so that you've got a placeholder in the text but that the majority of it is an appendix. So that's a sort of in-between hybrid solution.

Steve Sheng: Okay. That's fine, it's - we can surely do that. So (Rob), I have a quick question; is Section 4.1 the correct place to put this? Shouldn't this be one of the - this - shouldn't this be the fourth model? Is that right? Shouldn't this be the fourth model?

I think Section 4.1 just in general says, "What is the capability of the protocol?" It does not talk about the data. The only times we talk about the data is really those three models.

You know, I don't think we do have to include the - this will - this should be more appropriate in one of the models.

Bob Hutchinson: Right. I'm open to wherever people want to put it. I understand why you would want to put it in one of the models. But I believe the language, you know that kind of global language picture is relevant to all of the models, if you will. Okay?

In other words, the language encoding is referenced in this document in several places in terms of a lack of the ability to describe the requested language as well as the encoded language of registrant data, okay. And I believe that's a problem for all of the models.

And these language tables really are the - probably the primary method. Some variant of this is some - is the primary method for addressing that.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. Could I get in the queue please?

Steve Sheng: Go ahead Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, I didn't realize this was even a model until I got to the last three lines here. So how is this different from Model 1? Requires two - again, it's a modification of Model 1 because it only requires transliteration of registrant data. By that...

Steve Sheng: But there's also (unintelligible)...

Steve Metalitz: What's meant by that? Is that just the name of the registrant?

Steve Sheng: (Unintelligible).

Bob Hutchinson: Pardon?

Steve Metalitz: When you say, "Transliteration of registrant data into English, pronunciation is required." Does that just mean the name of the registrant?

Bob Hutchinson: Yes - well, yes, exactly. Just the registrant data, okay? As I say in item - so this is another area that I find difficulty in understanding the current document, is that the current document doesn't reference language labels, okay, or the field labels - or I don't know what you want to refer to them as. Data labels, okay? And...

Steve Sheng: And I don't - go ahead. No go ahead.

Bob Hutchinson: And I believe when you look at Models 1, 2, 3 and 4, it's not clear in those models which data you're talking about in terms of what's getting interpreted, okay?

In other words we've talked as a group about the registrar and registry identification data being in English only, okay? But I believe that what the models are talking about is primarily the registrant data. Is that correct?

Steve Sheng: Yes, correct.

Bob Hutchinson: Okay.

Steve Sheng: That means the registrant's name and address.

Bob Hutchinson: Right. So...

Steve Metalitz: Okay, well in that case I don't understand - Point 1 says - okay so Point 1 is about - is - it's really about all of the - it's about name, address...

Bob Hutchinson: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: ...has to be transliterated; it doesn't have to be translated. That - so that's Model 1?

Bob Hutchinson: Yes. So that's...

Steve Sheng: Right.

Bob Hutchinson: ...I believe for all of them, okay? Except for the fact that Model 1 is English only in its registrant data variation.

Steve Sheng: Right so Model 1 is, the registrant's name and contact information is in U.S. ASCII. So that's Model 1.

Model 2 is, they can be in any language a registrant provides, to the extent registrars accept. And then registrars provide the point of contact for translation - for translation or transliteration.

So and the 3rd Model is registrant - that the registrant provides proclivities for transliteration. And then Model 4 is for translation. So those are the four models.

So looking at this model, it seems to be as a hybrid. So for example, registry and registrar identification in ICANN approved form only; you know, that's already addressed in the previous section. So it's already in the (unintelligible).

So that's, I think (Rob)'s Point 1 is more of a hybrid. What exactly it's saying is - well actually (Rob) is saying, "Transliteration of registrant data into English is required for U.S. ASCII."

(Rob), do you have - who is going to do a transliteration? Is it registrar? Is it registrant?

Bob Hutchinson: No it would be the registrar.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Bob Hutchinson: It would be the WHOIS system who - that needs to provide transliteration - a literal transliteration...

Steve Sheng: (Unintelligible).

Bob Hutchinson: ...into English pronunciation.

Steve Sheng: (Unintelligible).

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. How would this be different from Model 3?

Steve Sheng: Yes, so how is this different from Model 3?

Steve Metalitz: That's what I'm asking. As far as your Point 1 is concerned?

Bob Hutchinson: I believe it is Model 3 at this - you know, Point 1. Yes.

Steve Sheng: Okay, that's fine.

Steve Metalitz: Your Point 2 says that the registrar and registry identification is in less English, which is also the case in Model 3.

Steve Sheng: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: Or is that not correct?

Steve Sheng: No, well the registrant...

Bob Hutchinson: I think that's the case in all of them, yes?

Steve Sheng: Yes, that's in all of them. I think that's specified previously, like when the registrar name's chosen. I think the registrant (unintelligible) and those will be in English, so...

Steve Metalitz: And then Point 3 is default language for data labels as U.S. English, and that would also be true of Model 3, correct? Because it says, "Domain, contact, organization." I don't think it's U.S. English because it uses an S, but it's English.

Steve Sheng: Right. So I think one addition that (Rob)'s Number 3 is labels defined by ITM. I think we talked about standardizing the labels before. But the working group has not yet crossed it off, but it has been (unintelligible). And some would think it's a good idea.

So I think this will be the major addition for (Rob)'s point. That right?

Bob Hutchinson: Yes. I guess when I look at, also, the text that's in currently for Model 3 and Model 4, okay?

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Bob Hutchinson: It also says in Model - I believe it's both Model 3 and Model 4, when you look at the - it says...

Steve Sheng: Yes.

Bob Hutchinson: ..."Scripts accepted by the registrar," okay? In other words...

Steve Sheng: Yes.

Bob Hutchinson: ...Model 3 and Model 4, according to this document proposal, in one place say, "scripts accepted by the registrar," which allows the TLD to determine which scripts they're going to allow registrant...

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Bob Hutchinson: ...data in. And then...

Steve Sheng: Right.

Bob Hutchinson: ...when you get to the table at the end, Model 3 and Model 4 say, "Any language accepted, translation or transliteration, it's done." And to me those are...

Steve Sheng: Right.

Bob Hutchinson: ...contradictory.

Steve Sheng: Okay, so why is that contradictory? (Unintelligible).

Bob Hutchinson: Because I - you know, you're making policy in one place that says that, "A registrar or the TLD owner can determine what scripts registrant data is..."

Steve Sheng: Ah, okay.

Bob Hutchinson: "...being maintained in or allowed in," okay? And then in the table -- and I thought in our discussions -- that we are talking about allowing registrant data in the registrant's language in Model 3 and Model 4; that's the primary difference for them. Okay?

Steve Sheng: Okay, so I can modify that table somewhere to match more closely with the description of the model.

Bob Hutchinson: I guess I'm saying the other way around. The description of the model should be - should remove the requirement that the script be accepted by the registrar. In other words the registrant...

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Bob Hutchinson: ...should determine what language they want to register their name in.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. Could I ask a question about that?

Bob Hutchinson: Sure.

Steve Metalitz: So that would mean every registrar - every ICANN accredited registrar would have to be able to accept registrations in every script?

Bob Hutchinson: Yes, I guess I'm not - there is a notion that ICANN could allow registrars to - as a - could allow them to constrain the set of languages they allow registration data in. But - or registrant data in.

I believe that that policy is not something that the WHOIS data system needs to be part of if that policy is something that's done elsewhere. Do you see what I'm saying?

Steve Metalitz: No I - not really, because you seem to be suggesting that there would be a requirement that a registrar accept data in all languages - in all scripts, excuse me.

Bob Hutchinson: The system should allow any registrar - the WHOIS system should allow any registrar to accept registrations in all languages - what - is the way I would say it Steve. I guess I'm (unintelligible).

Steve Metalitz: Well maybe then all you need to do in Model 3 is to change it to say, "Registrant's provide their registration data in any script that can be accepted by the registrar."

Bob Hutchinson: And that's what I'm saying is in the description of Model 3 is...

Steve Metalitz: Could be one script or it might be 50 scripts.

Bob Hutchinson: Right. But the policy, as to whether ICANN allows registrars to self-restrict languages, I think is kind of outside the scope of what we're walking around with.

Steve Sheng: Okay so the proposed change for the language - sorry I got dropped off. The proposed language is - so Model 3 would be a registrant...

Steve Metalitz: To provide their registration data in any script that can be accepted by the registrar.

Steve Sheng: (Unintelligible) the registration data in any script accepted by a registrar?

Steve Metalitz: Yes. You're just changing the word A to the word Any, I think.

Steve Sheng: Okay. All right. Bob does that satisfy - is that what you mean?

Bob Hutchinson: That's closer, yes.

Steve Sheng: Okay. So I'll go ahead and make that change.

So we have not really discussed about standardizing the label. So do people on the call think it's a good idea to standardize the label? If so, I can put that in a separate section.

I think standardizing the label is captured on each of the models. From any of the models the label can be summarized. So if people think that's a good idea, I will write that text. Is that all right? Yes, no, maybe?

Bob Hutchinson: I support it.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Bob Hutchinson: This is Bob Hutchinson.

Steve Sheng: Steve? Avri? Rafik?

Steve Metalitz: So you - you'll send out another iteration that includes this; is that what you're saying?

Steve Sheng: Yes, so I think it's - you know, instead of putting out a new iteration I'll just write in languages and send it to an email group. And that would be separate from...

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) question?

Steve Sheng: ...fundamentals. Hello Avri? (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: I have a question; what do you mean by...

Steve Sheng: Go ahead.

Avri Doria: What do you mean by standardize it? Do you - I'm not sure how you're using the word standardize in this case.

Steve Sheng: So what I mean's the label, right? That's the last hand...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Steve Sheng: ...of the data. You know, some label will say, you know, "Address," you know others would say, you know "Street." You know, so there are different ways the label can be presented.

And what I think (Rob) is suggesting is we standardize, or you know probably in this case ICANN has to standardize, how the label (unintelligible) will be. You know so that, (unintelligible) all the (unintelligible) will have the same label standards, that's what I mean.

Avri Doria: Okay, yes. I understand the sort of, setting of a required template. I'm not sure that standardize is the right word. Maybe I'm being picky.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Avri Doria: Maybe I'm being picky, but...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...to certainly define a - you know, one template for - as I say, maybe I'm just being picky about the word standardized. Because if it's a standard, then where are we going to set the standard? And that's something I think we might want to avoid.

Steve Sheng: Okay, so instead of saying, "Standard," we'll say, "Define the template for the labels."

You know, Avri I think to a certain extent, this to standardize the labels. Because right now, you know, different registries and different registrars; they have different labels.

So it's more of a harmonized, you know, the values labels. And in this case with what (Rob) proposes, probably it's you know, the ICANN working group come up with that (unintelligible); their harmonized version at least.

Avri Doria: Yes. This is Avri. Harmonized works too. It's just standard - the only issue I'm having is perhaps a pettance (sic) issue with, standards means there's some standardization body that's arguing about it...

Steve Sheng: Oh.

Avri Doria: ...and defining a standard.

Steve Sheng: Yes, harmonizing.

Avri Doria: Right. And so that's why I was having a problem with the word; I have absolutely no problem with the activity.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Steve, what are your thoughts?

Steve Metalitz: On whether the data labels should be the same?

Steven Shang: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: Whether you'd call that harmonized or standard? I agree with that.

Steven Shang: Okay. Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Steven Shang: Do you support that, or no? Yes?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Steven Shang: Okay. Any others on this call other than staff?

Okay. So, we will take Rob's suggestion and put it into a separate section. You know, we can term it harmonized related, or if you find a template for the labels - find the correct language. Rob, is that okay with you?

Robert Hutchinson: Yes. I think that's a big step forward, so great.

Steven Shang: Okay. So, what I - what we're going to do regarding your suggestion is we will now take - put your models in because those are essentially Model 3. So, we will modify Model 3 to - should say you know, registration script can be any script accepted by the registrar. And then, we'll put your - we'll create a separate section to standardize - to you know harmonize the labels. Yes. Is that okay with you?

Robert Hutchinson: Yes.

Steven Shang: Okay.

Robert Hutchinson: The other thing that I would like to point out about this table is I ripped this table from a Web site that actually is involved in localization of training materials. It is not a probably public domain table. And if we are going to use a table, we need to find one that is - that we have probably permission to use or at least cite this.

So like I said, I pulled this together quickly as an example, and was hopeful that there would be tables that have already been created by the IDN working group about...

Steven Shang: Okay. I will check with the - I'll check with (Tina) and (Kim) on that (Tuesday).

Robert Hutchinson: Right.

Steven Shang: If you have a - if (IONA) is using a table, or if the IDN working is using a table, then I'm happy to put that in the appendix. And if don't use a table, then we probably wouldn't be able to include a table because then we don't have a table.

So, let's move on to - if it's okay, I would like to move on to Jeremy's proposed languages. So, let me just quickly read out Jeremy's proposed language is - you know, it's actually a document I understand. And, Jeremy essentially proposed a couple of things. One thing is - also, the preliminary recommendation from WHOIS clients to registration data query protocols. I think that (reading for that) is - you know, when people talk about WHOIS, they usually confuse the data and the underlying protocol. So, (when the seller's) saying, and the clients who just say the registration data query protocol.

And second, under the findings section, (unintelligible)...

Steve Metalitz: Excuse me. Can I ask a question? This is Steve Metalitz.

Steven Shang: Go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: You may not be able to answer this, and maybe only Jeremy can answer this. He says, "Do we want to alter the preliminary IRD WG recommendations?" As I look at this document, there's nothing under recommendations.

Steven Shang: There is none.

Steve Metalitz: So, when he says alter, what is he talking about?

Steven Shang: Right. So, here's what I'm thinking you know. That most of the group (is working) through staff document that summarizes all the discussions. And, much of that staff document has been relating to turn in to this interim report,

right. So maybe, we add staff document, you know some of - some part of it have preliminary recommendations, you know from (WHOIS).

Steve Metalitz: But, there's not one in the - the document we have in front of us does not have any preliminary recommendations, right?

Steven Shang: Let me see. So in Section 4, right - well, the document does have some preliminary recommendations. So for example, in each of the sections like 4.1, you know we have the IRD working group recommends that the following requirements for WHOIS service - that those I think is what Jeremy is referring to, but it's in a different place.

Steve Metalitz: Oh, okay. All right. So, I see. So, he's referring to...

Steven Shang: Right, the discussion...

Steve Metalitz: (Unintelligible) .1. Okay. Thank you. That's helpful.

Steven Shang: Okay. So a second of Jeremy's point is under the findings section -- which currently there's nothing there -- Jeremy wants to put something about the deficiency of the WHOIS protocol, which has since - this is - I'd rather you have some sort of that in the document. So, what Jeremy is proposing here is (unintelligible) don't work on a system called (Chris) to increase the flexibility, and so to (get a protocol) that allows one to find and access information associated with Internet labels. So, he's referring to the (Chris) and (Iris) working group.

And then, he proposed you know some findings, "There has been no demonstrated efficiencies with Web-based (query) tools such as HTTP-based protocol (set) for a language and script encodings." And he suggest recommendation that ICANN phase out the requirements for the (RFC 3912) (query) system. This will lead the Web-based query protocols.

And then, another recommendation that ICANN derive a working group to choose a replacement for both the WHOIS Web-based query tool to be a single point of access, (but) the name label (remain). This working group should examine privacy concerns, accessibility to data concerns, and registry (that this would impact).

So, those are the languages that Jeremy proposes. What do people think?

I'm reading out his recommendations because he's not on the call, so...

Steve Metalitz: Well, let me - this is Steve Metalitz. Let me ask you a question about the next to the last one.

Steven Shang: Go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Would phasing out the requirement for the (RFC 3912) WHOIS system mean there would no longer be any requirement for WHOIS access via Port 43?

Steven Shang: That - you mean for the face of that recommendation, yes. But, I think Jeremy was saying that to have a single point of access. So, like maybe just to access WHOIS via the Web. I think that's what he's saying.

Steve Metalitz: Well, I'm not entirely sure I understand because the next to the last recommendation said there would be a Web-based query tool, and then the final recommendation says that we'd work toward a replacement for the Web-based query tool.

Steven Shang: Well, so for example there are two options, right. The one option I think you know that's really on the table is the (Iris) protocol that you know kind of a (unintelligible), as a replacement for WHOIS. The other protocol a (Web) server has been offered. It's called the (Web Tool) Web WHOIS Service, so that allows access to WHOIS servers via the Web, like...

Steve Metalitz: Steve, are you still with us?

I think we may have lost Steve.

Woman: Steve just dropped off. Sorry.

Steve Metalitz: We'll wait for him to return.

Woman: Steve's back now.

Steven Shang: (Unintelligible) apologies. I keep getting dropped.

Yes, so another - I'm sorry. Another subject that has been widely discussed, it's called a (Web Tool) Web WHOIS Service. They've been providing WHOIS via the Web, but it has a number of very neat features that you know can allow you know somewhat automated query as well, so maybe that's what Jeremy is referring to. I can only speculate what he is trying to say, so...

Robert Hutchinson: Yes. Steve is there a chance that we're going to have a call next week and we could have - we could address these when Jeremy's on the call?

Steven Shang: We will have a call next week, and I will definitely send Jeremy an email to request him to be on the call.

Robert Hutchinson: I really think it's difficult to have a full discussion without the author of this being on the call.

Steven Shang: Yes. I agree with you. And, I hate to put myself in this position to explain - to (unintelligible) how this work. So, okay. So we'll have Jeremy on the call, and (we'll now) - we will not take his languages into the report.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. Let me just suggest that...

Steven Shang: Go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Since our deadline is November 15th...

Steven Shang: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: Since we will have only one call between now and then...

Steven Shang: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: ...in which to discuss this...

Steven Shang: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: ...I think we have to chose whether we will issue an interim report on November 15th, or whether we will issue one without any final - without any proposed recommendations, because this is the first time that we've discussed any findings or recommendations.

Steven Shang: That's right.

Steve Metalitz: The author of the proposed findings and recommendations isn't here.

Steven Shang: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: We will have at most one opportunity to do that...

Steven Shang: I agree with you.

Steve Metalitz: I just don't think we have time to do findings and recommendations by the November 15th deadline under this - under these conditions.

Steven Shang: Okay. No, but that's a good point. What do others think?

Owen Smigelski: Hi. This is Owen. I agree with Steve.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I do agree.

Steven Shang: Okay.

Robert Hutchinson: This is Bob Hutchinson. I agree.

Steven Shang: Okay. So, let's take out - in this situation then, let's take out the findings and recommendations. And, I think there's still value in putting the interim report out. The effect is that we'll get public comments and we'll get people to give feedback from the community. So, I see - I mean, the benefits of having the - an interim report. So, I will suggest we take out the findings and recommendations section.

Avri Doria: Yes. This is Avri. I very much agree with you that there's value in putting out the report. And in fact, I mean I think there's some you know, very large bits of thinking that have gone into this and that we need comments on. And you know, those comments will have a lot to say about what kinds of recommendations we're making. I mean, if we get...

Steven Shang: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...back community comments that say you know, Models 2 through 4 are brain dead. Go away. You know, then there's - I mean, I don't expect that, but that's - you know, that would change the thinking. So, I think that you know, maybe we need a couple lines that sort of say while the group has started perhaps looking at some possible recommendations, you know that work will continue once comments are in on the stuff that's here.

Steven Shang: Right. Right. Another way is in each of the points we have discussed, there were like some preliminary recommendations. We could also put those that

have already been discussed into a recommendations section. But, it's really up to the working group.

Why don't we quickly go through the document? We have about ten minutes left. I have pretty much take all your feedback into the document, so I apologize for some of that's late. I have a couple last minute added scattered in, so (unintelligible).

Did we have - does this - what do you want to take from here? Do people have additional comments?

Steve Metalitz: Well, this is Steve Metalitz.

Steven Shang: Go ahead, Steve.

Steve Metalitz: One comment I had, and I think this was in Bob's submission also; it doesn't seem as though the figure...

Steven Shang: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: ...figure - the last figure has been changed yet.

Steven Shang: I delete the last figure.

Steve Metalitz: Oh, you deleted the figure.

Steven Shang: I haven't got Avri to make a new figure yet, so once that is made I'll put that in.

Steve Metalitz: Okay.

Steven Shang: That's for reminding me.

Any other comments?

Steve Metalitz: I'll just say - this is again Steve Metalitz.

Steven Shang: Go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Since I came in so late on Friday, I really haven't had the chance to go through this, but...

Steven Shang: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: ...I think if we focus on this - what's here, and as people - as Avri has suggested, we just - we say we don't have findings and recommendations yet, what do you think? Then I think you know, it may be doable to get our - get this report done. But, I guess I would need a little more time to look at what was circulated Friday night.

Steven Shang: Okay. That's fine. I'd now like to kind of turn to the document. Yes? No? If not, then maybe we can discuss the next (item).

Robert Hutchinson: Yes Steve. This is Bob Hutchinson again. A comment on Page 19...

Steven Shang: Go ahead.

Robert Hutchinson: On Model 3 and Model 4.

Steven Shang: Okay.

Robert Hutchinson: I don't believe that - I guess I don't believe that these models are really that costly to registrars, and I don't believe that a lot of the verbiage that is here on Model 3 and Model 4. And, I don't believe that we as a group have really voted on that or...

Steven Shang: I think with - Bob, I think...

Robert Hutchinson: ...discussed it.

Steven Shang: I think we have. I'm pretty sure we have. If you go back to the previous minutes and the email discussions, what we did - we did believe otherwise we can (put you) you know, whenever you want to see. We can send you know, some of these (amenders) also you know, have (thoughts) or (unintelligible) if it's costly. That's perfectly fine. But overall, I think the consensus you know, to the - this was discussed pretty long time ago, and that providing translation service is - it's costly to registrars.

Robert Hutchinson: Yes. I guess once again, the only translation that I believe is on the table is the translation of the labels, and the translation of the labels is a one-time thing and it's not an expensive thing.

Steven Shang: But then - you know, then we would have a - used to have like a staff to do that (unintelligible), otherwise, (probably you destroy) the accuracy. I mean, that's where the cost is, right. Staffing is - it's very expensive. (Unintelligible).

Robert Hutchinson: Yes. I'm with - once again here, this is I believe a function that (IONA) or ICANN should do. If we're talking about using the term standardize the labels, if we have a set of standardized labels and we translate those labels into a number of different scripts or languages -- okay -- that's a one-time cost per language, and I can't imagine that that's not something that somebody will volunteer to do. It's not expensive for the registrar. It's just a set of tables.

Steven Shang: Oh, but that's not what you are referring to. What model to employ you're referring to. Model 3 and 4 is translate and transliterate the registrant's name and contact information. It's not the label. The label you know it's a one-time cost, but translation and transliteration of each (unintelligible) registration, although is the one-time cost, that's a lot of costs, and the registrars will have someone to staff it.

Robert Hutchinson: Yes. I guess I'm saying that - we're having some confusion about what Model 3 and Model 4 are then.

Steven Shang: Model 3 and Model 4 is translating and transliterating the contact information of the registrants, (not just registry information). It's not about labels. You know, we'll have a uniform for all of these labels. It's done - a harmonized label (set).

Okay. So...

Robert Hutchinson: Okay. Yes.

Steven Shang: Is it - if you still have some additional thoughts can put them proposed languages or you can just - you could tell us what you think and then I can (unintelligible), you know given the time to - for the (unintelligible)...

Robert Hutchinson: Yes. Thank you.

Steven Shang: ...to meet the interim report. If not, then we can discuss.

Okay. Any other thoughts?

Dave Piscitello: Hi. This is Dave. (This has been a) productive call.

Steven Shang: I'm sorry, Dave.

I'm sorry. Dave?

Dave Piscitello: Yes?

Steven Shang: Oh, okay. Yes. Go ahead. You have something to say?

Dave Piscitello: I said I think this has been a productive call.

Steven Shang: Oh, okay. Sorry. Couldn't hear you. Just barely. I apologize for the bad connection.

Any other thoughts? Comments?

Steve Metalitz: Thank you Steve for Chairing the call.

Avri Doria: Yes. Thank you.

Robert Hutchinson: Yes. Thank you Steve.

Steven Shang: All right. So...

Robert Hutchinson: Great update on the document.

Steven Shang: Okay. So, what I'm going to do is I'm going to modify this - I'll check with (Ianna) and then (Tina) on the IDNs to see whether we have a table, and I will put a separate section on harmonizing the labels, and I will modify a language in the Models 3 and 4 to change the registry to (unintelligible) any script accepted by the registrar. So, I - those are the things that staff will take on. And, we will have a call next week.

And oh, we will just take out the findings and recommendations section because we don't have time and we need to focus on this report. Did I capture the comments?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Steven Shang: All right. Well, thank you so much, and we'll see you next week.

Avri Doria: I'll see you next week.

((Crosstalk))

END