

GNSO/SSAC  
International Registration Data Working Group  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Monday 07 June 2010 at 14:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO/SSAC International Registration Data Working Group on 07 June 2010 at 14:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#june>  
<http://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-ird-20100607.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  
Avri Doria - NCSG  
Jeremy Hitchcock - DYN-DNS  
Rafik Dammak -- GNSO Non-Commercial Users Stakeholder Group  
Bob Hutchinson, GNSO Commercial Stakeholder Group  
Steven Metalitz -- GNSO Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial  
Jiankang Yao

**ICANN Staff**

Julie Hedlund  
Steve Sheng  
Glen de Saint G ry

**Absent apologies:**

Ram Mohan - Afiliias – SSAC Board liaison  
James Galvin - SSAC, Afiliias

Coordinator: This call is now being recorded.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much. This is Julie Hedlund and I want to welcome everybody to the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group teleconference call. Today is Monday, June 7, it's 1400 UTC. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone.

On the call we have Edmon Chung, one of our co-chairs, we have Bob Hutchinson, Jiankang Yao and Rafik Dammak. And we have apologies from Ram Mohan and Jim Galvin. And Jeremy Hitchcock has indicated that the will

join us a little bit late. From staff we have Steve Sheng, Glen de Saint G ry and Julie Hedlund.

So I'd like to welcome everyone and perhaps Edmon, I had a thought to maybe summarize a little bit of the discussion from the last call for those who might not have been on the call. And then perhaps we could discuss the possible preliminary approach that Steve Sheng sent around to the list and maybe go through that in some detail on this call. Would that be a good way to start do you think?

Edmon Chung: Yeah, I think that's great.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Thanks. Everyone on the last call we had a discussion about the various models there being now four models. And we talked about the possibility of pulling out what we thought were sort of the best possible approaches from the four models and then also going back through the discussion from previous meetings to try to identify approaches displaying various elements of international - elements of WHOIS data and try to put together a possible preliminary approach.

And just to let everyone know we also talked about having some - a brief presentation to be able to provide at the ICANN meeting at Brussels. We do have a public session scheduled for Thursday the 24th from 9:30 to 11:00. And that session is split part of the time will be with the WHOIS service requirements initial report and then also a session particularly on the work of the IRDWG and perhaps a discussion around the possible preliminary approach.

We're not really calling it a set of recommendations because I think that many workgroup members felt that we weren't really having a consensus yet around a particular approach but that may be this could form the basis for a discussion. Following last week's call we - the staff put together a suggested

possible preliminary approach and sent it around to the list for discussion and then also on this call as well.

And Jim Galvin who unfortunately can't be on the call today, did ask whether or not we wanted to present information concerning the four models themselves. And I think that's a question we could consider on today's call.

And I want to welcome Avri Doria who I see has joined the call. Welcome Avri.

Avri Doria: Hi. Hello.

Julie Hedlund: And I see that Jeremy Hitchcock also has joined. Welcome Jeremy.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Hello, how's everyone doing?

Julie Hedlund: Good, thanks. On the call Jeremy we have Edmon Chung, Avri Doria, Bob Hutchinson, Jiankang Yao and Rafik Dammak and some staff. We have Steve Sheng, Glen de Saint Géry and myself.

And just to bring you up to date, I just gave a little bit of background on the discussion on our last call and then suggested that perhaps we could use this call to discuss the possible preliminary approach that Steve Sheng has sent around sort of as a suggested starting point and that might form the basis for a brief presentation for our public session which is scheduled for Thursday in Brussels.

And then there's also a brief update to the Council which I think is scheduled on the Saturday, on the weekend before. And also...

Glen de Saint Géry: Sorry, this is Glen. It's actually Sunday.

Julie Hedlund: Oh is it Sunday? Thank you, I keep giving the wrong information but I knew you should know and I should have just asked you. Thanks.

Glen de Saint G ry: It's Sunday from 5:00 pm to 6:00 pm.

Julie Hedlund: Wonderful. Thank you very much Glen.

Glen de Saint G ry: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: So at any rate Jeremy and Edmon if you'd like perhaps I could ask Steve Sheng to - oh I know what I was going to mention too, Jeremy, was that Jim Galvin had just sent to the list this morning a question as to whether or not we wanted to present information on the four models that we've been discussing also in our discussion at Brussels? And I think that's something we could talk about today as well.

So with your permission perhaps I could turn it over to Steve Sheng and ask him to go through this suggested approach that he sent around and the comments he's received on it so far if any and I'm not sure that there were any comments.

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy, that'd be good with me.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Thanks. Steve, would you like to go through...

Steve Sheng: Sure.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you.

Steve Sheng: So about two weeks ago I sent out an email outlining - kind of summarizing the discussion in the working group. And I have received I think one comment from Adrian basically saying we need pictures, we need examples. So that's

the only comment - and the other comment is from Jim saying that we want to have - we want to enumerate all the four models and discuss them in depth.

Those are the comments I have received. Do you want me to go through - how should we do this? Julie do you want me to go through like one by one and discuss or what do you want me to do?

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. Why don't you quickly go through the models maybe find out if the orientation on trying to display the four models during the time in Brussels would be kind of the approach that the working group wants to do to gauge some input from the community.

Steve Sheng: Right. Okay I can do that. So the four models really pertains to the entity names. So these are the name of the registrant - the admin contact - the technical contact and their postal address. So the four models really only apply here. And for others for example the domain name, domain server, the sponsoring registrar telephone and fax number, email address, dates, registration status, those are separate; the four models does not apply there.

Now the four models are the first model is really registrants submit must be present language to WHOIS so that's very much like they are today. They have to submit in English. And then also given - the registrar is given an option for registrants to submit in their local language as well. So that's Model 1.

And the Model 2 is the registrants have the option to submit - so the registrants can submit their registration information in local script. And the registrars can either provide a point of contact if (unintelligible) of language arise or they could transliterate on behalf of the registrant. So those are the Model 2 and Model 3.

And the last model is really registrars provide a backward compatibility for Portfolio (3) WHOIS. So here, you know, we didn't specify how registrars do

that at their own leisure to come up with their solutions. So those roughly are the summary of the four models.

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy...

((Crosstalk))

Jeremy Hitchcock: Oh sorry Julie you want to go ahead?

Julie Hedlund: No I was just going to ask if there any questions for Steve but go ahead, that was Jeremy was it?

Jeremy Hitchcock: Yeah. I was going to say, Steve, do you want to summarize the topics that have not received much discussion where maybe we could do a couple - I don't know - looking at the items I'm not sure we'll come back to kind of some - there might be some fruitful discussion that we could have just to tie up a couple of loose ends before leaving the Brussels.

Steve Sheng: Sure. There are a couple of - so the key issue here - one of the key issues - there's several key issues. So one of the key issues that we have not discussed is for example we set a requirement basically saying that WHOIS clients - the WHOIS Portfolio 3 must continue to work in the IDA environment so that, you know, they must be able to accept like a U-label query and then display the appropriate U-label and A-label.

We - kind of not kind of at the early on we kind of set a requirement saying, you know, that still needs to be the case. But we have not discussed or highlighted, you know, there are inherent technical challenges in the WHOIS protocol to do that. So like the current WHOIS protocol cannot, you know, accommodate what we required.

So I think one thing that working group could do is call attention to this issue. I am not sure if this working group is the right place to address these

technical concerns. But definitely we can call attention to this issue and maybe asking (IETF) or ICANN to come up with something. So that's the first important issue that we have, you know, yet to put it on the table.

Another issue that we've discussed we've agreed that we can internationalize these - we can separate these - the WHOIS records into different fields and internationalize them separately. So we have discussed domain names, that's perfectly fine.

We have not discussed about main server names. So currently most of the main server names are in the US ASCII. But, you know, with internationalized domain names it could be potentially that, you know, someone want to provide an IDN version of the main server names.

It's a possibility and I think it's a, you know, there's a - so we have to decide what do we do, what do we require there, so that's that. We talk about sponsoring registrar telephone number, email address. One thing we have not discussed is do we want to internationalize the registration status for example, you know, the (unintelligible) prohibited, you know, update prohibited - what do we do with those, do those stay in US ASCII?

You know, we have to, you know, kind of talk about that a little bit. So that's about it. So in summary the technical challenges for WHOIS in accommodating IDN and then internationalizing main server names and also registration status. So those are the three things I think are loose ends we need to tie up.

Julie Hedlund: Steve, this is Julie. What about dates that...

Steve Sheng: Dates, yes.

Julie Hedlund: ...is expiration date and update date of the domain?

Steve Sheng: Yes, dates - dates, sorry. Thanks for the catch. I didn't - yeah, I missed that. The dates, you know, do we want to, you know, put the dates in a format that is, you know, kind of the UTC format like the (ETT) uses? So those are the things. I think and those are my kind of personal opinion too; I think the working group can comment on. What does the working group...

Bob Hutchinson: Steve, could you give us some guidance on the internationalization of the dates. This is the first I've heard of this and I don't really understand what internationalization means relative to the dates.

Steve Sheng: Right. The dates are mostly - so for example when I kind of summarized what the working group discussed I basically take out the RAA and go item by item, you know, each field in the RAA that requests and asks the question, you know, what does internationalizing this field mean.

The dates is essentially right now, you know, there are various date formats. And, you know, around the world the US uses the dates in certain format, you know, Europe use the date in certain format and, you know, so does Asia. So for example June 12 in US would be 06- you know - 12, you know, so that - so you put the month first and then you put the date.

In other countries you do that reversed so you put the month first - you put 12 first and then you put 06 second. So sometimes you kind of - you create ambiguous - is it, you know, June 12 or is it December 6? So those, you know, what I mean by internationalization is, you know, something kind of, you know, a unambiguous way to present it so that's what I mean.

Bob Hutchinson: Isn't that a current issue in WHOIS and not - I mean, it's not particular germane to the internationalization discussion other than historically. Is there no precedent in the registration agreement as to how to represent dates; is that what you're saying in RAA 3.145?



Steve Sheng: I mean the RAA does not specify anything other than, you know, what is to be displayed. You know, so for example, you know, telephone, you know, I mean...

Bob Hutchinson: But it doesn't indicate the form right?

Steve Sheng: Yes...

((Crosstalk))

Bob Hutchinson: Is that what you're saying?

Steve Sheng: Yes, yeah. So that's the second issue. I think last issue I almost forgot is another issue is do we want to recommend standardizing the label? That I'm not sure whether, you know, it's in the remit - within the remit of this working group. But those are the issues.

Bob Hutchinson: All right.

Julie Hedlund: So, Steve, this is Julie. Should we I guess the first question is what do the workgroup members think, I mean, if we take these one by one do we think that we would recommend a particular format for the display of it, for instance, more, you know, an international format would probably be date and then month.

Steve Sheng: I think this is - Julie, this is Steve. I have the summary. Maybe we can go over the preliminary approach one item by item and I see whether we have some, you know, what does the working group think. You know, this is what I summarized. I want to make sure that this is what the working group wants as the outcome for this group.

Avri Doria: This is Avri, can I ask a question and possibly make a point?

Steve Sheng: Go ahead.

Avri Doria: On these things I'm not quite clear on all of them whether a change to the RAA or just a clarification to the RAA might be something that would eventually needed/recommended. And that's perhaps one thing that can be answered.

The other thing - and I'm not even sure we know the answer to that at the moment - the other thing I just wanted to point out that on a parallel track there has just been a group that's just finished its work within the GNSO itself looking at changes that are needed or possibly needed - let me back off - that are needed. Changes that might be desirable to the RAA that will be discussed in some fashion or other yet to be agreed on.

That report will be going out for review soon, and so we may find it useful as part of the comment period to raise the flag and say in addition to all these rights and responsibility type issues that you're talking about with the RAA there may be some other clarification, status changes, that can - ought - maybe should be - have I qualified that enough - considered.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. Thank you Avri, that was very helpful. I think that's something that perhaps the workgroup could consider, you know, as a way to provide some comments for the comment period on the report when it comes out.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: I was just going to go back to what Steve was asking. Perhaps we could go through to the items in the preliminary approach. But before we do that I'm not sure that we have answered Jeremy's question and that is that Steve had summarized each of the models very briefly.

Do the workgroup members think that that would - such a summary would be useful to present in Brussels to give a little bit of background on the, you

know, the discussion that the workgroup has been going through for many weeks now - to summarize each of the models and include that? Jeremy, do you think that would be useful? Edmon?

Jeremy Hitchcock: Maybe - if there isn't an overwhelming desire for it then maybe not. I mean, it sounds like we've spent definitely a couple calls on it and I think the, you know, just in the preparation for presentation information it sounds like one meta issue that the models really came out of was from saying that we want the current existing WHOIS service to be IDN supportive and that means a bunch of different things.

And so I guess the question then is the presentation of different models and coming down to pros and cons of each one. And, you know, we can either talk about that on this call or - I think everyone had been on at least one of the calls where we were discussing the four different models. And I guess it'd be up to other workgroup members whether or not it'd be useful to kind of go through them, to review them again and decide whether or not it's worth discussing or just diving in and discussing them further.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Jeremy. This is Julie. I think what I was asking might be slightly different, not so much a discussion of the models here but whether or not as background in the presentation that we prepare for Brussels that there could be perhaps a slide or two that just says, you know, what were the models that the working group was discussing. And then just present, you know, that there was discussion on these and that then, you know, the workgroup moved towards, you know, a possible preliminary approach pulling, you know, elements out of the four models to create one approach.

(Unintelligible), you know, addressing - since that's just one piece of the approach that, you know, the presentation of the entity name and contact information. But for, you know, just the purpose of providing background. I'm not sure if I'm being clear, sorry.

Jeremy Hitchcock: No you are, my apologies. This is Jeremy.

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon. And the intended audience is not just the people who have been participating in this group as well. It's a broader community, right?

Jeremy Hitchcock: Edmon, this is Julie. That's correct. This would be a public session and so we can assume that people attending some of them may not have any background at all. So I think in that respect, you know, we would certainly at the very least include on the slide a description of what the working group is and why it was formed. And, you know, what, you know, in general it's been discussing which is a little bit of what we included in that presentation we gave for the Council in Nairobi.

But then we could go into some background on the four models and then into the preliminary approach if that seems...

Steve Sheng: Julie? I've sent the slides - a few slides basically, you know, some - essentially the same as Julie's email. But I include some background - two background slide on the IRD. So if you have it maybe we can discuss.

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: In that case I think it makes sense. I don't know, Jeremy, if you agree to given the context of which I think it makes sense to - because then it does as Julie suggested.

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. Yeah, that makes sense. I was thinking of this call not during Brussels.

Edmon Chung: Oh cool.

Jeremy Hitchcock: It would be - it would make a lot of sense to go through the models and kind of the - how we came about to the genesis of discussing the four different methods for kind of paths that this working group may go.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. Thanks, that's very helpful guidance. And I think that's probably what Jim was - Galvin was suggesting as well is that it might be useful to provide the background kind of summarizing each of the models since some people wouldn't be familiar.

I see that Steve Sheng did send around to this group some slides - possible slides for our discussion...

Steve Sheng: I just made it this morning, sorry.

Julie Hedlund: Well that's okay because actually I wasn't anticipating necessarily that you would have to do this until after this morning's call because I think that we do need to talk about each of the items in this preliminary approach. And perhaps...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...start by doing that.

Steve Sheng: Yeah, I mean, I essentially copy, you know, that email and make a couple slides. But what I did here is I take - I did some markup screenshots so maybe that will be helpful - easier to participants who are new to this area to understand. So that's the value of the slides as I see. I mean, otherwise they're essentially the same as the email.

Julie Hedlund: I see. And I see that you've - and thank you also, Steve, I see your - yeah, that you've got the screenshots in there which perhaps would be answering some - on of the concerns that you mentioned in the comments that we received that it would be useful to have examples, you know, so that we can

understand what we're talking about, you know, how the WHOIS actually looks - the information actually looks.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...so that's useful. Why don't we go ahead and look at each of the items then here as a group that we've talked - suggested. Would you like to go through them each one...

Steve Sheng: Sure, I can do that. Or did all of you receive the presentation email?

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: ...I haven't gotten it.

Bob Hutchinson: I didn't receive it either, Steve, this is Bob Hutchinson.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, actually let me go ahead and forward it to the - I think you sent it - I don't know if you sent it to the workgroup or just to selected people, Steve, but let forward it to...

Steve Sheng: A couple people who are on the call already...

Julie Hedlund: Right, let me go ahead and forward it to the full working group because Steve Metalitz - Steve, welcome - has recently joined us so I don't think he got that as well.

Steve Metalitz: I haven't gotten it.

Julie Hedlund: While I'm doing that why don't you go ahead and just go through the first of the...

Steve Sheng: Yeah.

Julie Hedlund: ...possible approaches.

Steve Sheng: So the first question is what should we require of the WHOIS service in the IDN environment? And those are the summaries we had earlier that the WHOIS clients must be able to accept user query in either U- or A-label formats. The WHOIS client must be able to display results of queries in both U- and A-label.

And third, bundled representations of a single A- or U-label query should be returned. Now do we have any issues with that requirement or any thoughts?

Julie Hedlund: I should note - this is Julie - I should note that this was one we discussed fairly early on and I think there was a certain amount of consensus if I'm remembering correctly that this was an acceptable approach. Steve, would that be correct?

Steve Sheng: Yeah, I think so but I want to make sure because not all of us are on the call on the same time so.

Bob Hutchinson: So to be clear here U-label and A-label means that within the domain name Punycode is a representation for the U-label portion right?

Steve Sheng: Right.

Bob Hutchinson: Okay. I guess I've Googled U-label and A-label and I don't find proper definitions of U-label and A-label for people.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Avri Doria: Excuse me, I was confused by the answer. Did you say the U-label was the Punycode?

Steve Sheng: Let me clarify.

Avri Doria: I thought the A-label...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Sheng: The U-label is in the localized language and the A-label is the translated ASCII for the U-label.

Avri Doria: The A-label would be the Punycode correct?

Steve Sheng: Yes, sorry, sorry, yes. The A-label would be the Punycode.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Steve Sheng: The U-label will be the localized.

Avri Doria: Forgive me for butting in without giving my name.

Bob Hutchinson: Yeah so I - I would like to have those clarified so people understand what you're talking about.

Steve Sheng: Okay. That's no problem. Okay, clarify that. Any other thoughts?

Jeremy Hitchcock: Steve, this is Jeremy. I don't know where we would want to say this but we might want to be specific that when we're talking about WHOIS services we're talking about the (483) WHOIS service.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Jeremy Hitchcock: That might just be something that we put above it.

Steve Sheng: So how would you rephrase this language? Let's do that like on the fly.



Jeremy Hitchcock: Probably just saying WHOIS Port (483) service.

Steve Sheng: The WHOIS Port (483) clients?

Jeremy Hitchcock: Yeah.

Steve Sheng: WHOIS Port (483) clients must be able to accept a user query of domain name in either localized - what's the name for this -localized version or the Punycode format.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Yeah, I'm just thinking that might be important because of other implementations in the wild have different levels of definition for what they would think is WHOIS either with flags or without flags or so we just want to make it clear that it's not a different implementation that we're discussing.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can I ask...

Steve Sheng: Go ahead.

Avri Doria: In that - in terms of dealing with the U-label and A-label words you - when you were rewording that you actually put in localized and A-label and I forget whether you said the...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...or the ASCII. I would actually recommend that looking at this slide that you continue to use the U-label, A-label but maybe underneath your slide shots...

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...educate people and sort of say U-label is the label in the localized format, give an example...

Steve Sheng: Right.

Avri Doria: ...you know, use your example there showing the Chinese characters; A-label is the ASCII compatible label and then give your xn--shot there and that way it - you get to use U-label and A-label throughout the slides but it's clear to people.

Steve Sheng: Okay so basically providing a...

Avri Doria: A little local glossary.

Steve Sheng: ...definition at the beginning and then, you know, use that consistently throughout.

Avri Doria: That's what I would recommend.

Steve Sheng: Okay fine. Any others? Any other thoughts on the requirements?

Bob Hutchinson: One other requirement that seems to be implicit in a lot of what we're discussing is the Port (483) compatibility and there's no definition for what that means to this group.

Steve Sheng: Oh.

Bob Hutchinson: And I don't know, do you want to try to define that on the fly here or whether, you know, you want to try to put that into a sentence or two.

Steve Sheng: I am not certain we - I'm not certain what we have consensus on the compatibility on Port (483). But perhaps we can discuss - when we discussed

the models, you know, because one of the model is provide a compatible - backward compatible Port (483) WHOIS. Would that be this?

Bob Hutchinson: Yeah, so I guess I'm sort of lifting the cover on the fact that I don't agree with the fact that you can do this in a backward - what I consider to be backward compatible fashion. And that's one.

Steve Sheng: Oh yeah, then for that point definitely you want to raise at the discussion where we'll discuss the four models because...

Julie Hedlund: Yeah and this is Julie. I should point out that this is - what we're preparing here is not a, you know, a consensus document. I mean, these are issues as you've noted that we're still discussing. What we're really trying to do is get more discussion around these approaches to say well, you know, here's one way we could do it, you know, do we think it's feasible?

And I think that's a fair question to ask about backwards compatibility and the idea is to get some more discussion on these items in Brussels with a wider audience than we've had in this workgroup.

((Crosstalk))

Bob Hutchinson: Yeah my concern is that on this data we're looking at right here it says that we have accepted backwards compatibility as a, you know, a mantra here.

Julie Hedlund: And this is Julie. I think we probably don't want to characterize is that way.

Bob Hutchinson: No I don't think so.

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. Bob, thanks for raising that. You know, personally I - the technologist in me doesn't think that a backwards compatibility method is going to work with something like this. And ultimately we want the application to be a bit more sensitive to it.

Bob Hutchinson: Yeah.

Jeremy Hitchcock: And my desire for seeing WHOIS Port (483) service was trying to tease that out in a kind of a very subtle way. But probably we should be a little bit more direct on a couple of the issues like that which is hey is this - and is this a protocol type of issue or is this a policy issue? Is this something that should get dealt with in RAAs or should this get deal with in RFDs and that's kind of where the bridge is on a lot of these issues.

So thanks for bringing that up...

Bob Hutchinson: Do we have consensus - do we have a consensus that Port (483) backward compatibility is probably not going to occur?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. I'm not sure we have consensus. I mean, there was an approach that Jim Galvin had suggested could be a technical approach. I don't think we've gone into a detailed discussion as to whether or not that or another approach would actually work or not work. But others can correct me if I'm wrong on that.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...bought into a consensus that we don't need backward compatibility unless technology says it can't happen. But I don't think that's been investigated sufficiently.

Julie Hedlund: Avri, I'm not sure if I heard that all but so you're...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I was basically saying that I don't buy into consensus that backward compatibility can be abandoned at this point; I think that is a technological consideration that, you know, will need further, you know, (IETF) consultation on whether one can include any backwards compatibility or not. And obviously anything is possible but how difficult is it and does the difficulty make it prohibitive is an answer we don't have.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Avri. Others, comments on that? I mean, in any case I think that we need to in this make it clear in our slides that this is an open question and one that we, you know, are interested in seeing, you know, more discussion on.

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

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Since this slide is - or this point is going to be - we're going to make it clear that we're talking about Port (483)...

Steve Sheng: Right.

Steve Metalitz: ...are we going to be seeing anything about Web-based WHOIS in our presentation?

Steve Sheng: Good question. Yeah. My sense is the Web-based application does not suffer as much limitation as Port (483). I could be very wrong. So I guess...

((Crosstalk))

Bob Hutchinson: Yeah it certainly could be, you know, the registrar obviously may have more control over that but I guess there's two questions first if that's true, and I would defer to the people that know what they're talking about on their question and I'm not one of those - then we probably should say that.

And second, you know, this working group at some point probably should make some recommendations about how WHOIS in the Web-based environment should be handled even if the technological problems are not as severe.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Yeah, this is Jeremy. And I apologize for getting your name wrong earlier, Steve. Yeah, I don't think we've discussed Web browsers at all. There's a couple of pieces of information that are a little bit better in the Web http world.

Browsers will frequently include a language accept header so for, you know, my browser, being in the United States I send en-US which says that I'm using the English language with the US variant. Web servers can do different things depending upon translations or different types of language scripts.

So Web applications definitely have a lot more visibility into the type - oh and also the encoding is pretty much not limited; you're not really worried about plain text and trying to worry about XML and coded data. You can pretty much rely on a browser that's, you know, http 1.1 to pretty much accept any type of data so there's definitely a lot more flexibility for display.

Another consideration that seems to come up a bit more is many registrars will run a WHOIS service on Port (483) and we'll basically include a link to a Web-based WHOIS service. And, you know, that's done for abuse reasons, it's done for, you know, one less interface. They're kind of right and maybe left/right reasons for it.

But maybe that would be probably a good separate topic to bring up is the presentation both on Port (483) services and also Web-based interfaces. And actually one last thing I think in the RAA only Port (483) WHOIS services - and whenever I'm referring to Port (483) WHOIS services I think in the RAA there's some mention or there's some reference to some relevant (RFC)s so

that's usually the definition that it's defined by - I don't think that there is a stipulation or a requirement for Web-based WHOIS information. But...

Bob Hutchinson: There is the RAA there is.

Steve Sheng: It's in the RAA.

Jeremy Hitchcock: That there must be a Web-based interface?

Steve Sheng: Yes.

Jeremy Hitchcock: And that's in the - that was in the previous 2009 update?

((Crosstalk))

Bob Hutchinson: ...it's always been - it's been since 2001.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Okay, all right.

Bob Hutchinson: So that would apply to, you know, the gTLD IDNs.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Yeah, okay, thanks.

Julie Hedlund: So this is Julie. So, Jeremy, your suggestion was that we raise this issue sort of as a question or as a point of discussion in the presentation slides also - the requirement for Web-based...

Steve Sheng: Is that what it is?

Bob Hutchinson: Yeah.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Yeah, I think that that would be include at least a couple discussion items of what, you know, how should the Web-based WHOIS interface with

internationalized registration data. I mean, it's a little bit easier because there's a lot more known parameters that are in the environment and you can rely on a Web browser to display scripts and a little bit more efficiently or more reliably than the Port (483) service.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Sheng: Okay so do you want to add - do we want to add a requirement? I see the working groups go maybe to stipulate a set of requirements and then we may not have the - enough technical depth to figure out the solution. So but at least we can, you know, say what the requirements should be and then, you know, somebody else can figure out how to do that.

So shall I add a requirement on Slide 8, Number 4, basically saying WHOIS Web - WHOIS Web clients - WHOIS Web clients should basically meet Requirement 1 or 2.

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. I'm personally just looking at the slide deck. Yeah, I mean, that probably looks like a good spot for it. Or just as a, you know, maybe just as a discussion point or just to say same - should similar requirements apply to Web-based interface for WHOIS?

Steve Sheng: Sure, so add a discussion should similar requirements be applied to Web-based - okay that's fine.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Jeremy. Further discussion on Slide 8? I'm sorry, was that someone speaking? Apparently not.

Steve Sheng: No.

Julie Hedlund: Steve do you...

Steve Sheng: Yeah.



Julie Hedlund: ...have what you need to proceed to the next...

Steve Sheng: I think so. So Slide 9 the question - the next question is what do we require from internationalized registration data to accommodate users who want to submit and have registration data displayed in familiar characters from local scripts? And I think the working group decided to internationalize these, discuss this question, you know, separate but the different fields.

So on Slide 10 I list the set of the key fields from the RAA Section 3.3. So they are 1, 2, 3, 4 - so there are nine fields. And I - we can go over them quickly. So on Slide 11...

Julie Hedlund: Steve, this is Julie. This is just a (unintelligible) point but perhaps instead of the picture - and I know you put these together quickly maybe another screenshot could go in there?

Steve Sheng: Yes, sure.

Julie Hedlund: It's a lovely picture I have to say. But...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Sorry, please go ahead.

Steve Sheng: Go ahead. On Slide 11 for the domain names the requirement is WHOIS service should return both A-label and U-label representation for the given IDN domains queried as well as the variant. And I provide an example for that. So the example is the test.com but it's in Chinese.

And then, you know, so, you know, a user can submit the U-label test.com in Chinese and also the Punycode, the ASCII one. And then the WHOIS server

will return, you know, both the A-label and the U-label as well as the variants.  
Is that requirement we want to call out? Yes? No?

Avri Doria: It's Avri. It seems like yes.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Jiankang Yao: Hello?

Steve Sheng: Hello? Jiankang Yao, go ahead.

Jiankang Yao: Yeah, I think for this there as well as the (unintelligible) so maybe the label (unintelligible) and not only (unintelligible).

Steve Sheng: Okay. So how do you...

((Crosstalk))

Jiankang Yao: So, I mean, test.com maybe in Chinese both the simple and the traditional Chinese and then maybe other word.

Steve Sheng: Like what?

Jiankang Yao: Other words. I think the usual Edmon (unintelligible) word variant - should be variants.

Steve Sheng: Oh okay oh, variants. Can you provide any other variance for those two names so I can add it on them?

Jiankang Yao: (Unintelligible) there may be more than four variants.

Steve Sheng: Okay then can you provide me with an example? Just...

Jiankang Yao: Oh okay, okay...

((Crosstalk))

Jiankang Yao: I will email you.

Steve Sheng: I can make the screenshot.

Jiankang Yao: Okay. Okay thank you.

Steve Sheng: Okay moving on - anything else besides on Slide 11? Okay on Slide 12, domain names, as I said we have not discussed about it. You know, suggested approaches are welcome. Right now, you know, everything is still in US ASCII and I don't know whether the working group wanted it to stay that way. Thoughts? Hello? I might got disconnected?

Avri Doria: No you're not disconnected.

Jeremy Hitchcock: No you're still here. This is Jeremy. I just think that - I guess this one hasn't - there's really no strong opinion. Maybe the community will have some input that the working group can consider.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. If I have an opinion at all it's yes it has to be listed once there are, you know...

Steve Sheng: I'm sorry it has to be what?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I think once there are internationalized server names then, yeah, they kind of have to be listed in their international variance. So I would think

that, yeah, this one follows from just about everything else but maybe I'm wrong.

Bob Hutchinson: I'm wondering whether there isn't an alternate way for us to display U-label/A-label combinations all the time side by side so that we have both representations, the example here in the name server area.

Steve Sheng: So we could...

Bob Hutchinson: I'm wondering whether the (IETF) shouldn't specify that when you have internationalized domain names they should be represented visually this way. I don't know, just a thought.

Steve Sheng: The (IDNA) guideline only specify the domain name; it does not specify anything else. So the domain name is, you know, A-label, U-label, you know, side by side but for the rest is really up to us to decide.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. I think that's maybe the suggestion here. Correct me if I'm wrong but that may be the suggestion could be that name server - the recommendation would be name server names also could be displayed in U-label and A-label side by side?

Steve Sheng: Yeah, okay. I mean, I could...

Julie Hedlund: I mean, these are all just points of discussion...

Steve Sheng: Yeah, points of discussion, yes.

Julie Hedlund: Right, you know, I mean, it's important for us to get feedback and particularly in the public session for people to say yes I, you know, that's a good idea or crazy or whatever but so I think we can put it out there for discussion.

Steve Sheng: Sure, okay, I'll add that, name servers should also be displayed in A-label and U-label side by side.

Julie Hedlund: Was that Bob - was that you that made that...

Steve Sheng: I think Rafik or Bob...

Bob Hutchinson: Yeah.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, did I capture that correctly because if I'm not sure always if I get these technical things right.

Bob Hutchinson: Yes I think that's - would be helpful if people had an idea of what we're talking about. I totally agree with Avri's opinion that once you head down this road everything has to be capable of being internationalized, okay, so we have to - that's a requirement of what this group is trying to do.

Steve Sheng: Okay, all right. I think I suggest in Brussels for that presentation we have some representative from registrars and registries, you know, we want to hear their thoughts and socialize these with them. These could become very significant changes for the operation.

Okay so Slide 13 the registrar - the sponsoring registrar I think it was discussed and agreed earlier that we should keep the sponsoring registrar's name in ASCII to aid the investigation purpose of law enforcement. And I think Avri has...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Steve Sheng: ...a comment here.

Avri Doria: Yeah. It's my - it's understanding my knee jerk reaction although basically I'm taking it to a meta level. Let's list people reasons other than just law

enforcement. Obviously there's intellectual protection agencies that may want this and whatever. But I think it's a good suggestion, you know, that the registrar should be there but let's not single it out to just law enforcement...

Steve Sheng: Sure, okay.

Avri Doria: ...so those of us with a knee jerk reaction don't have to avoid it.

Steve Sheng: So and for the purpose of law enforcement and intellectual protection agencies...

Julie Hedlund: Actually, Steve, I'm not even sure if you have to say, I mean, I think there could be many people - myself included - who would be interested in knowing who the sponsoring registrar was. And it might - in listing - in making a list - and Avri, correct me here if you disagree, but I'm concerned in making a list we're saying well these are just the entities who would care about this information...

Steve Sheng: Ah, right.

Julie Hedlund: I think others, you know, even your average users might have a reason to be interested in this information and be able to use it.

Avri Doria: Yes this...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Sheng: So should we just take out - just say make available in ASCII.

Avri Doria: Yeah, this is Avri again. Actually and if you added the intellectual property one and didn't add consumer you would for example have both of my legs knee jerking.

((Crosstalk))

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. I was going to remind about the consumer interest too for finding out the owner of a business.

Avri Doria: And so you might want to say that, you know, to aid, you know, whatever and give examples but make it, you know, a - not limited to or you may just want to - if you want to give a reason to aid users, consumer agencies, law enforcement, intellectual property, you know, etcetera. So to give a long list or follow Julie's thing and just say, you know, it makes sense for it to be there. But...

Steve Sheng: Sure.

Avri Doria: ...either one's fine.

Steve Sheng: Yeah.

Julie Hedlund: Right, I mean, you could even just say make available in ASCII to aid in identification of the sponsoring registrar. I mean, for anybody who wants that information because it could be anyone. But, you know, you could then say for example, you know, consumer, you know, whatever, consumer entities, law enforcement, etcetera, you know, something like that.

Steve Sheng: Okay so I put those entities in the - in (unintelligible) as kind of talking points so...

Julie Hedlund: Or well I don't even know if they need to be...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...as examples but not as, you know, an exhausted set of examples. But, you know, just, you know, an add etcetera, you know, just so people know that we're not deliberately leaving someone out.

Steve Sheng: Oh by the way Julie, who will present this?

Julie Hedlund: Well that's a good question. And, you know, staff certainly can. I know you're unfortunately not going to be able to be in Brussels. Dave will be there but Jeremy or Edmon I don't know your availability but you would certainly be welcome to present this or join in the presentation if you wished. It's, you know, entirely whatever you feel comfortable with.

Steve Sheng: Yes. I think it would be better for the co-chairs to present.

Julie Hedlund: Well if...

Avri Doria: This is Avri, I agree.

Julie Hedlund: ...Edmon and Jeremy are you both going to be in Brussels?

Edmon Chung: I will be in Brussels. This is Edmon.

Jeremy Hitchcock: And this is Jeremy. I'll be in Brussels as well.

Julie Hedlund: Would you like to jointly present or would you prefer staff present? We can do whatever you would prefer.

Jeremy Hitchcock: I'd be up for it.

Julie Hedlund: And Edmon, just so you know we tried to schedule this so it didn't conflict with any Council activities.



Edmon Chung: Oh thanks for doing that. And, yeah, it would be great if Jeremy did it. I think I did one last time so.

Julie Hedlund: Well Jeremy, yeah, if you could do it. And of course staff will be there, Dave and I will be there in person and I think Steve will be there, you know, on teleconference so we would be there to assist of course.

Steve Sheng: Yeah. Okay and I'll make sure I'll double my effort on the slides to polish them and make them - but I want to...

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, we'll have you send out another version for everyone to review after...

Steve Sheng: Yeah. But I want to ask the members is this the right approach like specify the requirement and then provide an example? Is that the right thing to do or are you, you know, I mean, I don't know I just make this just mock up a screenshot. I'm not sure if that's what the working group wants.

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. I think that the examples are going to be extremely helpful because, you know, we've been talking about A-labels and U-labels a bit and unless people see them I think that they'll walk out not being able to provide good feedback.

So I think having the examples like that would be great. Maybe doing one with a Web interface as well would be helpful for just one of them. And then for the rest of them you could just use the WHOIS slides that you've created.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. I should note we're at five minutes after the hour. This is a very useful discussion. Do people - would people like to consider going through the slides and staying on the call? I don't know if you have conflicts. Alternatively we could schedule a follow up call instead of in two weeks which

would put us in Brussels but for next Monday to finalize discussion perhaps at this same time? What do our chairs think?

Edmon Chung: I can go for a little bit longer. I don't know how much more time are we looking at?

Steve Sheng: Ten minutes?

Edmon Chung: Yeah, I can do 10 more minutes.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...proceed through and get as far as we can. I think that will help us to...

Steve Sheng: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...some drafts here, a good draft. Go ahead Steve.

Steve Sheng: So Slide 14 the title...

Bob Hutchinson: No let's go back to 13, 13 I think that you need to include the fact that the sponsoring registrar could also be represented in international characters as well or not? There's - it's not ASCII only or English only for the registrar; wouldn't you also encourage the international - whatever native language that registrar is accustomed to working in. In other words you should have dual representation here. Is that not correct?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. Is that, I mean, maybe is a question whether ICANN is going to be doing that in the accreditation process. I mean, when they

accredit Registrar X are they standardizing some type of representation in another script?

Steve Sheng: Yeah, that's a very good question. So should we - well I think what the proposal is should we also internationalize it like, you know, provide ASCII and as far as far in their local languages.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I think both is reasonable and good for the local users, you know, the ASCII may not be all that usable whereas the local is. And internationally obviously we need the ASCII. So...

Bob Hutchinson: Yeah.

Bob Hutchinson: So I just didn't want to imply only here. So...

Steve Sheng: Right, right, right, right.

Avri Doria: Now that may - this is Avri again. That may have RAA implications that would have to be noted somewhere in saying hey you got to collect it if you have an accredited local registrar. That seems to be, you know, common sense but whether the RAA says that or not I don't know Steve, you've been reading it more intensely than I have. And I don't know if it does or not but...

Steve Metalitz: I mean, I don't think it does now. Maybe we could say something like, you know, let's make available in ASCII and to the extent consistent with the registrar accreditation process also in the local script, something like that.

Because I just don't know what the plan is. I don't know whether for example, yeah, you'd have to submit - if you were a registrar using that other - another script you'd have to submit to ICANN all this information in the other script or just how it would work.

Steve Sheng: Yeah, okay. So, you know, I'll add that. Yeah, we haven't discussed this, I mean, I think the - in previous discussion we agreed on ASCII but we have not, you know, discussed about making it available in local languages. But I put it in there anyway.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah this is Julie. I think it's important to include for the purpose of the discussion...

Steve Sheng: Yeah.

Julie Hedlund: ...for the public section.

Steve Sheng: Yeah. Okay so any more on Slide 13? Okay Slide 14 the telephone number is applied to (UTU) standard using international notation. So actually the phone number and the fax number in this example conforms to that. Okay? Any comments on 14?

Steve Metalitz: Would this also be - this is Steve Metalitz. Would this also be applicable when we get to the telephone/fax numbers of all the contacts?

Steve Sheng: Yes, yes.

Steve Metalitz: Okay.

Steve Sheng: This is all the - this is kind of a meta category like all the phone numbers and fax numbers.

Steve Metalitz: Right.

Steve Sheng: Slide 15 the dates, yeah what do we want?

Bob Hutchinson: My comment about this was you should provide some examples of the different formats. But what confused me or made me unclear about your

comment about internationalizing dates is I didn't know whether you were talking about internationalizing calendars as well. We use the Gregorian calendar.

I don't know and I'm not an international person to know whether some societies use entirely different calendars and they would be offended if we said you have to use a Gregorian calendar. You know, I don't know so maybe somebody on the call does.

Steve Sheng: Thoughts? I'm not sure either. I'm just, you know, throwing out the question.

Steve Metalitz: Other societies certainly use other calendars but I wonder if they would ever - any other societies would use it for this type of purpose. I mean...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Every society I know that uses another calendar also uses - and I can't name off the top of my head what standard is used to disambiguate dates because there are the people that do the month day and then there are people that do the day month.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah.

Avri Doria: But I expect that somewhere in UN or, you know, (ITA) for the airlines or for something there is a standardized format for date expressions. And...

Steve Sheng: Yeah, I mean, the EPP also specified that the UTC format, right, the EPP protocol.

Avri Doria: That's probably good enough.

Steve Sheng: We could use that. That's also...

((Crosstalk))

Bob Hutchinson: Then cite whatever standard we're referencing here and let it go at that I guess at this point.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Right so that would be - this is Julie - that would be the UTC EPP standard you said Steve?

Steve Sheng: Yeah for dates.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: And then of course it's referring to a particular standard...

Julie Hedlund: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: And I think we have to be very clear on, Steve, when we do these that we put in the full reference because people - and avoid using acronyms for these things because well myself included I don't know necessarily what these things stand for and I'm sure our audience - many members may not as well.

Steve Sheng: Okay. I can put it in there. Any more thoughts on 15?

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy, I'm going to drop off now but I'll certainly follow up with some comments on the list. Great job on the slides and really enjoyed the discussion everyone.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks so much, Jeremy, for your help and we'll be sure to send out a summary set of notes and we'll revise the slides of course.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Great thanks. Talk to you guys later.

Steve Sheng: Later.

Avri Doria: Bye-bye.

Steve Sheng: Slide 16, the registration status. So, you know, we thought a few options, you know, leave it in ASCII 7, always publish the exact EPP status code and leave it to the clients to decide whether to localize it or not. Identify a more easily understood representation or publish the easily understood representation in (mandatory) and local character sets.

Those are some of the options that, you know, we think of. We mean, you know, Dave and I.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead, I'm sorry. Someone else...

Bob Hutchinson: I think this is fine as long as it's noted that no consensus or no discussion has been had on this. We need some work here.

Julie Hedlund: Right so this is Julie. So if I understand correctly then we would just list the possible approaches and leave that up for a point of discussion in the public session?

Steve Sheng: Sure.

Avri Doria: Yeah. This is Avri. I agree also. The only thing I might change is considering it just (ors) because we tend to understand the or that is the exclusive or as opposed to the inclusive or. And I know when I looked at it I said oh two and four or a lovely combo. So we may want the inclusive or, or an and/or.

Steve Sheng: Oh.

Avri Doria: Sorry, I shouldn't be using logical terms but inclusive ors and exclusive ors. At least I didn't say it in Latin.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Avri Doria: But - an and/or or just list the, you know, just list the choices and say pick any two, pick any one, whatever but just not start it off as a exclusive set.

Julie Hedlund: Right we could say, you know, list these and say are any, you know, and any possible combinations, you know, of the above or something like that to indicate that it could be, as you said, two and four, you know, or someone else might like one and three.

But we don't want to say leave it in ASCII or two or three because it could be a combination; is that what you're suggesting Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah, as I said you can look at this list and say giving the EPP code is a really good idea but also giving it in either the mandatory language or mandatory and local, you know, is a good idea. So leave the discussion open.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Good. Slide 17 here is where I had the most difficulty. I'm not sure what's the best way to present all these models.

Julie Hedlund: Steve if I may make a suggestion - this is Julie.



Steve Sheng: Go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: That you might want to break this out into...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...several slides.

Steve Sheng: Okay. And then for each model provide a screenshot?

Julie Hedlund: I think that would be helpful but I'd be guided by what the other workgroup members think.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. Yeah, I think something like that would be helpful. And since we already talked about, you know, some of this has already been dealt with in the earlier slides if you're talking about the - some of the contact information.

So this is - you have - this slide is entitled Entity Names but it also applies to postal address and...

Steve Sheng: Right.

Steve Metalitz: ...some other things that we haven't I guess...

Steve Sheng: This is mostly postal address.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, I would think so. Entity name and postal address, yeah. So yeah I think if you can - it will be very helpful to provide examples.

Steve Sheng: Okay I can do that. Now providing examples do we want to add a - kind of a comparison, you know?

Julie Hedlund: Well it - this is Julie. I don't know if we want to - maybe if we just provide each model with an example we could get some discussion around each one. But what do the workgroup members think? Would a comparison be better? I'm just - I'm not sure if we want to make - I know we did the matrix before but that gets fairly complicated...

Steve Sheng: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...may not be a technical audience and it might be hard to present. Any thoughts?

Bob Hutchinson: I'm fine with trying it with four slides or, you know, I think the suggestions you made are good. Let's revise it and have a discussion either on the email list or - that's good.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks. So we could start with four slides, you know, one for each model and - with an example for each and we'll see how that looks when we get the next draft out.

Steve Sheng: Sure.

Bob Hutchinson: Right. And when will we see the next draft?

Steve Sheng: I can finish that today and I think it will be helpful that Julie can take a pass with editing the languages and make sure they are the most appropriate, the (unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, if you send me a draft and then I'll try and turn it around quickly. Let's say for the work team - workgroup's purposes we'll try to get you something tomorrow.

Steve Sheng: Okay. And then probably we want to comment on the email list like instead of editing the slides it's probably just, you know, put your comment for each slide on the list itself so that we can - we have a record there.

Julie Hedlund: I think that would be helpful. We'll certainly ask workgroup members to comment to the list and to be specific as to which slides they're, you know, referencing.

Steve Sheng: And then maybe by next Monday we'll have a phone call again to go over and finalize?

Julie Hedlund: Edmon are you still on the call? Do you think we should try to have a call next Monday at this same time perhaps?

Edmon Chung: Yeah, I'm still here. And sure it's - well I personally won't be able to attend that meeting but I guess that's fine.

Julie Hedlund: Or would it be better if we switched to the alternate time?

Steve Sheng: The 3 o'clock, yeah.

Edmon Chung: The alternate time would probably be better. But I - that week we're having an (IGF) Asia meeting here in Hong Kong and I'll be pretty tied up with that.

Julie Hedlund: I see, yeah, okay...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Why don't we - why don't we ask if workgroup members, you know, who might be able to attend the call and if it looks like enough people would be able to attend the call, you know, at what would be their rotating time, the alternate time then we'll - we can decide if we want to set up a call. Or otherwise we can just do the discussion on the list.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Sheng: Julie, when is the deadline we have to put the slide in?

Julie Hedlund: When they're ready.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Sooner is better but, you know, we need to make sure we're happy with them as well. So we'll try to move quickly but I think we need the workgroup members to have at least a week to discuss them.

Steve Sheng: Sure.

Julie Hedlund: We need to have them posted before the meeting.

Steve Sheng: Yeah, that's next Sunday? Next, next Sunday?

Julie Hedlund: No - well the Council meeting, yeah, I mean, the Council meeting would be that Sunday the - whatever day that is - Sunday the...

Steve Metalitz: Twentieth.

Julie Hedlund: ...yes, exactly thank you. Sunday the 20th so sometime before that day.

Steve Sheng: Oh yeah so we have a time crunch.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...week. So but we're very close. And thank you everyone here. I don't want to keep everyone longer. But was there - I'm sorry, Steve, was there another slide after this? No.

Steve Sheng: No.

Julie Hedlund: All right so great, we'll work on getting revised slides out to you tomorrow and for discussion on the list and possibly a call next Monday depending on workgroup member availability. And thank you everyone so much for your helpful input and for staying longer on the call, we really do appreciate it. Anything else anyone wants to mention before we sign off?

Bob Hutchinson: No, thanks Steve. This was a big help I think.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Steve Sheng: Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you everyone and if we don't speak on a next call I hope to see many of you in Brussels.

Avri Doria: Okay good job.

Steve Sheng: Thank you. Bye-bye.

Avri Doria: Bye.

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Bye.

Julie Hedlund: Bye-bye.

END