

**GNSO/SSAC  
International Registration Data Working Group  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Monday 11 October 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 11 October 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/gnsso/gnsso-ird-wg-20101011-en.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnsso.icann.org/calendar/#oct>

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

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

**Present for the teleconference:**

Edmon Chung – Co-chair - GNSO Registry Stakeholder Group

Rafik Dammak -- GNSO Non-Commercial Users Stakeholder Group

Jim Galvin – SSAC -Afilias

Bob Hutchinson, GNSO Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG)

Avri Doria - NCSG

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

Ram Mohan - Afilias – SSAC Board liaison

Steven Metalitz -- GNSO Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial

**ICANN Staff**

Julie Hedlund

David Piscitello

Gisella Gruber-White

Steve Sheng

**Absent apologies:**

Avri Doria – NCSG

Coordinator: This call is now being recorded.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's IRD call on Monday the 11 of October.

We have Edmon Chung, Rafik Dammak, James Galvin, Robert Hutchinson, Owen Smigelski, Ram Mohan. From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Dave Piscitello and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. And I do not have any apologies noted for this call.

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

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Gisella. And I should note that I did actually receive a message from Avri Doria, who did send her apologies. She's unable to join the call.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you and thank you everyone. I had sent around a couple of documents a little bit earlier today. I sent the staff summary document that we've been using to guide our discussion. And I also sent around the meeting notes from last week.

We had addressed a couple of items last week. There was quite a bit of discussion relating to what was within the remit of the working group and with respect to whether or not some of the recommendations from this group would be taken up by - within ICANN or if they related to protocol would be taken up perhaps in the IETF.

And just to remind everyone, Dave had noted that this working group, you know, and with respect to its scope is determining the data that are needed for international registration following the recommendations from this group. And this group, just to remind all of us, we're working on a set of preliminary recommendations or a preliminary report to be able to be provided at Cartagena.

Following the recommendations from this group ICANN may form a workgroup to decide how to signal any changes so that clients and servers will know what they're doing. And that workgroup might then decide who is going to publish the standard if there is a standard and whether that would come out of ICANN or IETF.

So this group is looking at the data that are needed. And there may be subsequent steps and subsequent recommendations relating to that.

Are there any questions with last weeks - not last week, the week before last or I guess it was last week. Well anyway, from the last meeting and - or two meetings - yeah, it was too weeks ago. Sorry. Are there any questions with respect to the notes from the last meeting? And if not we can pick up where we left off in the staff summary document.

Thank you. Hearing no questions I'm going to go ahead then and pick up in the staff summary document. Does everybody have that document for reference?

Ram Mohan: Yes I do. This is Ram.

Julie Hedlund: Great. So we left off - we had talked about the backward compatibility issues somewhat. And that was on Page 7. And we were now moving along from there to Question Number 3: should Whois support multiple representations of the same registration data in different languages or scripts? Is it comparable to adopt a must-be-present representation of data in conjunction with local character set support for the convenience of local users?

And I think we did - this was a little bit of the discussion that we go into last week with respect to what's in the scope of this working group. But if we look at the summary document of previous discussions we talked about the possibility there being different models for handling the contact information including registrant name, administrative contact, technical contact and postal addresses, description of Model 1.

Model 1 would require registrants to provide their Whois data in the must-be-present language. In addition registrars may also require registrants to

provide their contact information in a local language. And there is a figure describing that.

So - and perhaps - I don't know. And Dave, I'm - any guidance you have here is useful too. And - well and Edmon is our chair.

Do we want to talk about use of these models separately one after the other? What are the preferences here?

Okay. Why don't we go ahead and start with...

Dave Piscitello: First I'll defer to (unintelligible), I think point. Staff has to, you know, what the working party wants to do.

Julie Hedlund: Right. And that's - and I will - that's a great point, Dave.

And -- this is Julie -- and I just want to emphasize that what staff would like to be able to do is have enough clarity to put together a preliminary report for this working group to look at. And so the sooner we can get clarity on some of these issues the better so that we can get a report out for all of you to look at that we can then have published prior to Cartagena.

And there is a document deadline for Cartagena. And we really would need to try to get something together say by the beginning of November or no later than November (unintelligible) should these items be published. And so time is moving along very quickly.

Ram Mohan: Julie, this is Ram Mohan.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Go ahead, Ram.

Ram Mohan: I have several comments on the staff summary document.

Julie Hedlund: Wonderful. Please go ahead.

Ram Mohan: Okay. The first is on Page 4 of the document. Some of these are nits and some of these are larger issues so I'm just going to go in order and just go page by page what my comments are. And then, you know, you can decide which ones to discuss and which ones are not necessary.

The first one is on the end - bottom of Page 4. The last paragraph says - previous working group discussions require that all variants, that's how the paragraph starts. It says - the second sentence says: languages and scripts such as Indian. I'd like that to be changed to Indic, I-N-D-I-C, because there is no Indian script as such but there are Indic scripts.

The next comment is on Page 5 under the item main server names. It says there the working group does not discuss this issue. Then it goes on to provide some alternatives and some suggestions on what should be done. And I did not find that - the discussion of the alternatives useful at this point simply because we have not yet discussed it. And I'm not sure what value there is in providing to the community what the alternatives might be when the working group itself has not taken the time to review it.

The next comment was on Page 6 which is again similar. This is on the item that says date. We've not really discussed dates. And, you know, what's considered here, internalization, is a little different in scope it seems to me than the other types of internationalization because the other types of internationalization we've been talking about have to do a little bit more with, you know, conformance in multiple languages and scripts. I see the uniformity of, you know, looking at this and saying should this also be internationalized. But since we've not discussed it I worry about providing alternatives that people can comment upon if we haven't actually discussed that inside of our committee.

Julie Hedlund: I'm - Ram, I'm sorry to interrupt. This is Julie. But I think -- and Dave, please chime in -- but keeping in mind that this is a document from July 30 and we've actually been discussing - we've been going through - very systematically through this document but though - and discussing each of these things including dates on an earlier call, probably several - at least a couple of calls ago. I think the call - probably the call before the last one that Steve Sheng sent notes around on because I know he's been following through the document and discussing these items.

And so the fact that it says here the workgroup members did not discuss the internationalization of the field is referring back to the discussions that happened prior to July 30 and so in action...

Ram Mohan: So then - I understand that. In that case it should just be clarified because those two things are in contradiction, one to the other.

Julie Hedlund: Well keep in mind, Ram, that this is - this document has not been updated to reflect the discussion that has been happening since July 30. And this document is not the document that will be the preliminary report. The preliminary report will capture all of the discussions that we've been having since we put out this document and will capture, you know, what the workgroup discussed for instance with respect to these dates.

So this is not the document that is going to go out to anyone, you know, that says this is what, you know, the workgroup did or didn't do. There is an updated document that we are preparing that will capture all of the more recent discussions including on this item.

Dave Piscitello: Ram, this is Dave. I think that my sort of vision for what we would publish or staff would provide the working party to publish is something that's similar to the registration abuse pre-PDP kind of document. It would be a report, you know, of what was considered and discussed in committee but not a - but would not have recommendations.

It would have, you know, a list of what I guess (unintelligible) would typically call findings. And then, you know, there would be further work to try to refine what we would actually recommend as the committee, you know, committee, you know, received feedback from the community on the initial report.

Ram Mohan: Understood. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: And I'm sorry for interrupting, Ram. I just wanted to clarify that because there are - there will be updates so that some of what you are looking at here in the staff summary is (unintelligible).

Ram Mohan: Yeah. It sounds as if there's some of it that is work in progress so okay. I understand. And that actually removes quite a few of the other comments that I had.

I really liked - let me just follow through with the other pieces of feedback on this document, on the staff summary document.

The representations of the three models I think are very good and clearly define what, you know, what we're suggesting could be considered for use. I think that that's very good and some version of that should make it into the final document that actually comes out.

But I'd have actually preferred to have had those - I guess in some way it felt like the real meat of the discussion came later in the document. And, you know, we should just make sure that the document that we publish has some of these illustrative examples right up front so that people can take one quick look and see what are the models or what we're discussing. Okay? So that's just constructive feedback.

Now on the issue not yet discussed, Number 4, what do we require from IRD, should it be just collected and displayed uniformly and processed efficiently? I have a - I guess I have a point of view.

And this is my point of view. Given that in a new TLD round all registries are being asked to provide thick Whois or use the thick Whois model rather than the thin Whois model and that there is going to be proxy registrations that are likely to continue to happen because that is not banned it feels to me like there is some level of urgency to ensure that there is some way of uniform collection and display. So my own - as a working group member my perspective is that this is important and we should, you know, make some progress on that.

Now that - and that's it. That's the end of my comments on this document. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Ram, thank you very much. This is Julie. That was extremely helpful. And we'll be sure to include those pointers in the preliminary report draft that we'll prepare for the workgroup to review. And we'll welcome your comments on that as well. Thank you.

Steve Metalitz: Julie, this is Steve Metalitz. Can I make a comment here?

Julie Hedlund: Please do, Steve, and welcome.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you. I'm turning to the page that you say where we're picking up, on Page 7.

And on this and the next few pages there continues to be an issue that I think I've raised at least three or four times on these calls. And that is I think there's some confusion between language and script.



The first example is in English. That is accurate. I'm not sure whether that's what we discussed or whether we discussed having the registrants provide their Whois data in a must-be-present script which would be perhaps US-ASCII 7. But that's not the same as English.

And then if you look on Page 9, the example there, Figure 5, which is transliterated. That is referred to at the bottom of Page 8 as publishing it in a must-be-present language. And yet it's obvious that is not in the same language as in the first - as in Figure 3. That's a transliterated version in ASCII of some - of Russia - of a Russian address.

I think - I'm not sure why this is not getting through. But - I could be - because I think we've raise - we've discussed this several times. And I don't think anyone - there's a difference between saying everybody has to do everything in English and saying everybody has to do certain things in ASCII - in a certain form of ASCII. And...

Julie Hedlund: Right. And thank you very much for that, Steve. This is Julie.

I think there is - part of the issue here is that these models, these screenshots and examples and some of this text was pulled from the presentation that we had done at one of the past ICANN meetings.

We - and it's - I know that you've made the point that we need to be accurate and talk about script and not say English and to talk about, you know, ASCII and to be consistent. And we've been - I think we've noted that as we've been taking the comments from these calls.

But those - as I mentioned - and I don't know if you were on the call at that point just a little bit earlier now today but Ram had pointed out some inconsistencies in the staff summary document.

This is a document that we produced really just sort of pulling language from the slides that we had previously produced on July 30. We've not updated this document to reflect the conversations that we've been having as we've gone through the various issues in this document.

So these inaccuracies unfortunately have remained in this document. They haven't been corrected. But they will be corrected. In the draft preliminary report that we put together we'll ensure that we are using, you know, either saying ASCII or script but not, you know, languages or English or so on.

Steve Metalitz: All right. Thanks for that explanation. I - I'm just saying that we should be sure we're using the language, you know, we're talking about this precisely. And I appreciate that this is not a finished document but I'm just suggesting that when it becomes a preliminary report that we're doing - let's make sure that we are referring accurately.

When we mean ASCII script let's say that. And when we mean the English language or some other language let's say that.

Julie Hedlund: Right. This is Julie. Thank you Steve. I've made a note of that again as well. And we'll make sure that that is very clear in the draft that we prepare for you to review. And thank you again for that comment.

Any other comments?

James Galvin: Jul, this is Jim. You had started this call with, you know, where we are on Page 7 here with these three models.

And the question that I have is down at the bottom here is says that we have not discussed, you know, which one of these models to recommend. And I want to ask if that question in particular is in - is what this working group is going to do. Are we going to make a decision as to which one of these models to recommend? Or are we going to suggest that we believe these are

the three most likely models and this is what requires further study in selecting which one of these models to go forward with?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie, Jim. Thank you. That's an excellent question.

Dave, I'm - do you have some thoughts on how we might want to do this? I mean we - this is - and I think this is apropos to the conversation we had on the last call which was what exactly will be - will this group be doing while it, you know, it's - in the preliminary report or in the final report.

Ram Mohan: Before Dave responds -- this is Ram -- may I jump in as well, just...

Julie Hedlund: Please Ram, go ahead.

Ram Mohan: To answer what Jim is saying I guess my sense of this is that we're going to make some recommendations and they're going to go out to the GNSO and to (SSAC) as well as into - I don't know. Did the - I guess those are the two groups that it's going to go into.

And we - we're going to recommend that GNSO forms a working group? Is that - I thought that was where this was going at least when I read the meeting notes from last time which I missed.

Sorry. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Dave, do you have some thoughts?

Dave Piscitello: Yeah. This is Dave. I think that decision ultimately has to be made by the people on the call other than staff. I don't want - this is in particular, you know, a topic that affects such a, you know, almost everyone in the community. And I don't want to be put in a position where staff looks like we're making the call.

And that's not because I couldn't make it. But I think that it's useful for people to understand the issue that we've been wrestling with because some people think that this is very simple and that - and - but the problem is if you put them all in the room just like us everybody's very simple answer is different.

So one of the - I think one of the better ways to proceed when you have that situation is to just treat it like, you know, your basic identify the problem set - the problem space, identify the solution set that we've come up with and then have people consider whether we've looked at it thoroughly enough and whether any emerge as being the most interesting or viable.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Dave. So I guess the question then really goes out to this working group. And I see that both Edmon and (Jeremy) are on the call, our co-chairs. And that is: what do - what does this working group want to say? Do we - either in our preliminary report or later with respect to recommendations. Are we recommending that another working group is formed, recommending additional work, picking a model or saying that we discussed these models and there needs to be further work?

And I think Dave is right. It's not something that staff can or should design. And it really is central to a lot of what this working group has been discussing for several months now. So I welcome comments from all of you.

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon. Yeah. I...

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead Edmon.

Edmon Chung: I just want to - I guess I wanted to ask Ram and others about this (unintelligible). To me of course the preliminary report and then it goes into the GNSO. I guess the GNSO council will look into it.

But it seems to me that - or I guess this is the question, whether people feel that this group itself is in fact a good group to finish the job and actually

provide the recommendations and then the GNSO would probably not have to create another working group but rather at that point make a decision on whether or not to adopt the I guess final outcomes and final recommendations from this group if that's not also a possible report.

Ram Mohan: This - Edmon, this is Ram. I - my response to that is very enthusiastic in joining your point of view.

I don't think we need to create yet another working group. This got constituted directly and appropriately. And so my own thought is to, you know, extend the term of this group and make sure that it actually tries to complete the work that it set out to do in the first place.

But that charter extension, that may need to get some sort of ratification. I don't know what the process is, Edmon. But I like the end result that you're suggesting.

James Galvin: And so - this is Jim. My only comment to that is that based on prior discussions in these meetings we have - we don't have - well what's going to be the process for making a decision? Just to focus on these three models here what's going to be our process for making a decision?

And the reason why I ask the question is because we very clearly have at least two points of view that have not reconciled in discussions to date on these two models. So, you know, are we going to go by consensus decision process? Or are we looking for unanimity? And if it is consensus, you know, are we going to make any attempt to represent a minority view?

I mean I am very much in favor of wanting to get to a place where we make a decision. But I think we have to face the fact that there are different points of view even on this committee.

And that will only get worse in a larger community. I agree with that. So if can decide here that's great. But now we've got to talk about the process b which we're going to make a decision.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Jim. This is Julie.

We do actually have a decision-making process in - as part of our charter. Section 5.1 of the charter in the 5.0 section, Rules of Engagement -- and I'll send around a link to this to everyone -- says that the working group shall function on the basis of rough consensus meaning that all points of view shall be discussed until the co-chairs can ascertain that the point of view is understood and has been covered. Anyone with a minority view shall be invited to include a discussion in the submission of any workgroup deliverables and should be documented as an appendix to these deliverables.

I won't go through all of it. But basically the co-chairs - it says co-chairs shall be responsible for designating each position as having one of the following designations: unanimous consensus position, rough consensus position where no more than 1/3 disagrees and at least 2/3 agree, strong support which is at least a simple majority but there is significant opposition -- that is more than 1/3 -- or no majority position.

And I'll send around the link to the charter so you can see the details. But there is a process for coming to a decision and also for taking into consideration dissenting views.

James Galvin: So thank you for bringing that out again. You know, I just think that that's important that we all understand where we're headed here because this is going to be a particularly - this is going to be one of our more contentious issues in choosing between these models.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Jim. Other thoughts with respect to...

Robert Hutchinson: Yes. Julie, this is Bob Hutchinson. I have a couple of thoughts on the models and the process.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. Please go ahead, Bob.

Robert Hutchinson: One is that I think Models 1 through 3 are not inclusive of all of the models that we should consider. I think there's at least a fourth model which has to do with translation of any registration language into one of the major languages of the world. Okay? So we don't have a option for a Model 4 which includes translation or automatic translation or computer-assisted translation.

Steve Sheng: Hi Bob. This is Steve Sheng.

Robert Hutchinson: Yes.

Steve Sheng: I think we discussed this translation issue at the very beginning. And the working group consensus that is - the translation is too expensive and that automated translation...

Robert Hutchinson: Whoa. Whoa. Whoa. I didn't say that - I said that the model should be represented because other people are going to read this report. And they're going to go okay, these are the three models that you guys came up with.

I don't care if you put a model in here that the group rejects. But we should put it in for completeness if that's - and I guess I don't agree that it's rejected for expense reason. There's lots of translation facilities now available. And I guess I'm - I don't think out of hand that we should reject computer-assisted translation.

Well the reason that I say that is because what if you are Korean and you're trying to do intellectual property rights and the registrant is in Hindi. Okay? You know, we're looking at it from a very English-centric viewpoint. I think

that we need to look at this from the standpoint of the internationalized community and where the internet is heading. And I think computer-assisted automated translation is probably the right answer.

Steve Sheng: Well that's the first time I heard it. But what do others think? You know, we're happy to include it in.

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon. I think a couple things. I think we - I actually agree with you, Steve, that we did have discussion and at that time we thought, you know, generally the group - at least my feeling was that generally the group felt we - that would not be a good option.

But I actually agree with Bob that if we are going to publish the report we should include it. It was discussed, as you said, as well and it shouldn't not - well include it for completeness and also do a preliminary report that could actually get more comments into it. If there is, you know, I guess overwhelmingly interest or support in that maybe that's something that we need to look into.

Personally though we probably should - it's just my personal view that we might want to distinguish between something of a policy mandate - mandated operational thing from a policy point of view versus some - I guess some tools that registrars might want to provide to, you know, to attract registrants and stuff.

So I'm - personally I don't - I think, you know, translation might be problematic as in not only in terms of cost but also in terms of accuracy and other types of liabilities if you want to provide it. But again, you know, I think including it in the preliminary report might be useful regardless as a - for completeness.

Robert Hutchinson: Okay. That's my observation about the models. The second observation I have is about the process.



And I believe that whatever models, maybe four, five, whatever, we come up with we should go to Cartagena with a definition, a reasonable understanding of those models and try to get a straw vote from the GNSO members or body or presentation time that would allow us to get feedback from the wider community as to which model they would prefer us to pursue. And then we can look at how much consensus there is within the community and at least get that feedback.

Julie Hedlund: Bob, this is Julie. That's a very interesting point. And I think this Group should discuss how it wants to present this preliminary report to encourage clinics.

For example in addition to submitting the report to the GNSO and to the SSAC we could ask for instance that the GNSO, you know, if we send it to the GNSO Councilors we could ask that they send it on to their Stakeholder Groups and constituencies and we could ask for a, you know, a particular response back.

We also have the option of publishing the preliminary report for public comment from the wider community prior to Cartagena, although we'd need to check the timing on that because we do usually try I think not to overload the public with comments immediately prior to a meeting.

But Edmon - and I'd be particularly interested in your thoughts with respect to a way to approach this on the GNSO side to try to engender some helpful comments from the community.

Edmon Chung: No, that's interesting because when Bob brought it up I'm - I was thinking, you know, whether the Staff can suggest anything because the GNSO sort of sessions are quite tight and, you know, we'll probably have to figure a slot.

That will probably come on a Saturday or Sunday but then again it's not easy to get everyone in the same room, those, you know, but there are multiple - usually there are two sessions going on.

So I guess we should - need to find a good slot if we want as much participation as possible, maybe just before or just after the new gTLD session or something like that so that, you know, more people is in the room.

But in general I guess, you know, we just need to work with the GNSO schedule Staff. I'm not entirely sure - probably with the current and - so perhaps Staff can help meet - help us out a little bit better there, but to find a slot that's - that works for doing the GNSO sort of workshops and over the weekend before the ICANN meeting opens.

Julie Hedlund: Yes Edmon, this is Julie. Actually we will have a slot to be able to give a presentation to the GNSO Council in their working session either on Saturday or Sunday.

I'll be working with Glen de Saint Gery to schedule that, but we will definitely have a slot. We have done and generally the Council makes time for updates on any of the related Working Groups, so this one will have a slot.

And the other item that we can schedule and I certainly - if you - if the Working Group thinks it's useful I had anticipated that we would want to schedule a public session probably on Thursday of the meeting to present our preliminary findings and to encourage discussion with the community.

I'd do it earlier in the week but as you may know the - Monday is generally pretty much full up of sort of the spoke sessions and Tuesday and - Tuesday is problematic because it's constituency day and so on and Wednesday has other things as well.

But we certainly will have the opportunity to have a public session on the Work Group's work.

Robert Hutchinson: Well...

Edmon Chung: I think that sounds good but I guess my point is, you know, the timing is important in order to get as much participation as we want. And in terms of the public one we might want to look at - I don't know whether there are other Whois stuff going on to try to put us in times that are more approximate to each other, so if people were interested in this general topic they can be there.

Julie Hedlund: Right, and actually I'll work with Liz Gaster on that. I imagine that there will be Whois items on the agenda and I think as we've done before we will try to make these, you know, schedule them together back to back if possible so that we get the same, you know, people who are interested.

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

Julie Hedlund: Yes, any other comments Edmon or I will move on to Steve?

Edmon Chung: No. Steve, please go ahead.

Steven Metalitz: Thank you. I guess I had two comments. One, getting back to what Bob said about the other model, I think I'm fine with other models being presented but I think with - that whatever we present in terms of a preliminary report probably ought to reflect some of the discussion that we've had about these models.

For example the point about the new internationalized domain name registrant if you will. Part of the discussion is that I recall about Model 1 was that anybody, whether in a country that uses ASCII type script or a country that uses some other script, anyone that's participating now is already - has some ability to deal with ASCII scripts because that's how all domain names have been expressed up till now.

That obviously is changing but one of the arguments for Model 1 was that it would be relatively easy to implement based on the experience of the people that have been working in the system now.

Now that may, you know, that may - people may disagree with that but I think it's worth having our report reflect that we've talked about some of these issues in preparing these models.

Secondly, I think what would probably be most useful to the broader community or to the GNSO if you're just looking at that little community, is not just having a document that presents different models, but having some pro and con arguments put forward about the different models.

So - and Bob obviously has a pro - he may have a pro position on the translation model and other people think that it's, you know, it may not be the best model.

It'd be good to have some of those arguments summarized in our report that people can look at prior to the Cartagena meeting. I think that would certainly improve the quality of discussion likely to happen there.

I just think if you put out some models and don't really explain why some people favor some or some people favor others or think others are problematic then you're - most of the community isn't really going to know how to react to that.

And they're interested - I think they would be interested to know what people think about these different models and that would help promote a better discussion if we want to have one in Cartagena. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Steve. Other thoughts?

Robert Hutchinson: Yes, this is Bob Hutchinson again. I guess in terms of process I wasn't trying to dictate how we were going to do this. I think there's lots of ways we can get feedback.

I don't know whether Staff can tell us right now whether they can do a survey off of the ICANN Web site for different - for the four different models or five different models. Is that a possible option?

In other words we don't necessarily have to get feedback from plenary sessions at the - at an ICANN meeting. We can do it through other channels. I guess my feeling was I would prefer to see feedback from the community at large help steer us, okay. I'm not - in any event that's my comment.

Julie Hedlund: Well thank you Bob. I - that's a really good question about whether or not we could do a survey of the community. (Dave) or (Steve), do you know whether or not that's something that is feasible?

(Steve): Hi, this is (Steve). So what Bob was just suggesting is we create a short document with the three models and put out the survey to the community to solicit their viewpoints, right. Is that what you're suggesting?

Robert Hutchinson: Well, I'm saying that I would prefer to - when we get to the models that we think we're considering I would like to have feedback from the larger community.

There's two groups of the larger community. I'm thinking one is the general ICANN community and the other is the GNSO Board itself. They're the ones who are going to have to ratify this - whatever comes of this.

And if they're radically different, you know, and I guess the other forum is what - how would you ask for feedback? And I guess my technique for asking for feedback would be give us your number one choice and your number two

choice out of these four or five options, or give us a completely ranked list of how you see this and then we can do a statistical analysis on one.

(Steve): Okay. So would a public comment be okay to get the community feedback? So the Working Group...

Robert Hutchinson: I guess I would definitely not want a public comment. This group has essentially done - distilling down into a set of options and, you know, supporting eight different options as opposed to five is not helpful I don't think.

(Steve): Right. And so does this group make the decision during that process that Julie discussed earlier? That's how the decision in the Working Group have been made, right.

The Working Group make a decision and then you open up a public comment and if the public thinks, you know, very different from the Working Group then maybe that Working Group come back and say this is their position.

Steven Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. Could I make a comment here?

Julie Hedlund: Just go ahead Steve.

Steven Metalitz: I kind of hear Bob and (Steve) talking past each other a little bit if I'm understanding it right. I mean, I agree with Bob. You wouldn't want to just say, "Public comment - what do you think should be done in this area?"

I think that what might be viable is to have a document that says, "Here are the three, four or five, however many models we've talked about in the Working Group.

Here are some points pro and con about them. Based among these - this limited number how would you rank - how would you, the public, rank them or

do you - are there some that you think are particularly good or particularly not good?"

I think that might be one way of getting this feedback that wouldn't depend on, you know, who has the time and money to travel to a particular spot on the globe at a particular time.

So I don't think that's - the two - public comment doesn't have to be wide open, anything you want to say, you know, tell us anything you want to say. It can be here are three or here are a finite number of options. Which ones do you think are better and why?

(Steve): Okay, I think - my understanding is Bob and I disagree on the point that Bob think we should not make a decision. We do just present the options and then let the community decide.

My understanding is the decision making process is the decision lies within this Working Group. The Working Group make a recommendation or no recommendation either based on the consensus process, and then go on public comment.

So we make the decision first. The Working Group make the decision first and then for community, instead of you're just opening it up for community. You know, what do others think? I could be wrong. I mean...

James Galvin: So this is Jim. What I hear Bob asking for is getting some guidance from the community, not for them to make a decision. So we want to put the options out there and, you know, see what kind of input we might get from the communities.

And then we can take that under advisement, you know, do some statistical analysis on the results and also consider our own view based on our

discussions about these things in order to make a decision. That's what I hear him asking.

Edmon Chung: Right. This is Edmon and I sort of agree to what Jim just said and so this group has to - this group should come up with the recommendations and, you know, sort of getting the public comments from the community sort of at large.

But ultimately we need to be the ones providing the recommendations even though, you know, at this particular point because it's preliminary we might not have a final solution so to speak to recommend that we have a number of models.

We should definitely talk about what was talked about here in the group and also provide the direction for the community and if they feel that the direction is completely wrong, that's when, you know, they can put in comments indicating that.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Edmon. So I - what I'm hearing then is Working Group members suggesting that at this juncture we have several models, but it would be useful to get some input from the community with respect to preferences for the models and a way to, you know, better inform the decision or the recommendation that this Working Group will make.

But at this juncture it would be useful to get some outside input from the community. Does that sound correct? So if we were to do that then I think Bob had suggested not trying to do something in the public comment.

But if we did a public comment that was asking for feedback just on the models, basically we'd have a, you know, a summary of the discussion. We'd need to present the discussion around each of the models but this would be sort of a request for comments and feedback or however we want to put it,



this would not be a publication of our, you know, preliminary report or recommendations, but a way to gather some more information.

Would that be - but I also heard the possibility of maybe having a survey as opposed to going to the public comment process. I'd be interested to know if the Working Group members have a preference and I don't - quite frankly I don't know the feasibility of doing a survey but certainly that's something that I can, you know, as Staff we can look into and see how feasible that is.

But is there a preference between doing a survey or a formal public comment? Any thoughts?

James Galvin: Well this is Jim. So I think a survey would be a better positioning on what we're looking for. I mean, to me the problem with a public comment is it opens the door for I don't know, too much input.

You know, we're really looking for a particular guidance on where we already are. If you do a public comment then you kind of have to leave the door open for people to be able to make arbitrary comments and I don't think that that's - at least I don't - my sense is that's not what we're looking for here.

You know, we've sort of already arrived at an interesting place and we're trying to get ahead of what are likely to be some comments that we'll get down the road, that we're looking for guidance here. So I prefer a survey.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Jim. Other thoughts?

Steven Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I'd agree with that. I think that would be more useful than - and maybe the label public comment would send the wrong message.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Steve. Bob, what do you think?

Robert Hutchinson: I'm happy with whatever the group comes up, but I'm happy with a survey. I'm also happy if the group says, "We haven't got time for any of this nonsense. Let's just figure out what our recommendation is and go with that."

I just thought that it would be a stronger process from my personal view if we had some feedback from the wider audiences before we, you know, charged off into the woods with the like final recommendation.

Julie Hedlund: So I have a question about timing. We, you know, we do have various events we will schedule at Cartagena recognizing that, you know, not everybody can go to the meeting.

So we need some other way to gather information as well. We - if we want to have something to present at Cartagena, we need to have that - whatever that is, whether it's just another presentation, whether it's a preliminary report, whether or not it's a set of questions on the models, we need to have it published - well, ready for the community to be able to read no later than the 15th of November.

It's the cutoff for any documents that will be considered at Cartagena. And so my question is what do we want to - what does the Working Group want to produce for Cartagena?

Is it a set of questions that we can then also put out in a survey? Because I should say that we probably - I'm not sure that we would have time to put out a survey, to gather the information and to synthesize it and put it into a report by the 15th of November.

We really only have about a month to try to pull this together. So do we want to have sort of our survey document set of questions be the items for publication and perhaps have a survey open concurrent with a public session in Cartagena?

And I'm not suggesting any alternative over another. I'm just looking for some guidance. Edmon, Jeremy, any thoughts on how we might approach this?

Edmon Chung: Julie I - this is Edmon. I have to pause that. There was a somewhat distracted for a couple of minutes just now. I didn't catch the last part. You were talking about a - an approach from now to Cartagena.

Julie Hedlund: Right. My question was that given - if we want to have a presentation at - in Cartagena so, you know, both an update for the GNSO Council but also a public session and in coordination with, you know, Whois session for instance.

And there's been discussion here about having a survey and I was suggesting that we may not have time to post a survey and to gather the survey data, analyze it and roll it into say a preliminary report in time for the publication deadline for Cartagena, which is the 15th of November, so giving us just a little over a month.

So I'm asking what should we try to prepare to have published and to present at Cartagena? And conceivably we could have, you know, a survey go out prior to Cartagena and we could emphasize at Cartagena the importance of, you know, people responding to the survey.

And we could also use that as a topic for our presentations or, you know, sessions. I'm just looking for guidance as far as what we want to try to prepare for Cartagena.

Edmon Chung: Sure. Yes, in fact I actually jot down a note just before I was distracted earlier that yes, I think a survey is great and, you know, it's a good suggestion.

And I share the - I was just going to ask what Staff - how quick Staff can put it together and also it will take us some time to define the survey perhaps

because I guess people understand that surveys are only useful if they're developed properly.

So I think what you just suggested probably works best. If we can get this preliminary report out the door first so people can have the document for Cartagena, and then also have the survey either right during that time or just a little bit before or even, you know, if we run out of time or even slightly after, I think that that would be fine too.

But for me, of course others please speak up - for me it seems like having the preliminary report out would be more useful as a - sort of a departing point for discussion, point of departure for discussion in Cartagena.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Edmon. Any other thoughts?

Steven Metalitz: Yes, this is Steve Metalitz. So as I see it the two choices would be do we focus in the next few weeks on getting the - a survey out and then in Cartagena, you know, publicize the survey and encourage people to respond to it, or do we focus on getting a preliminary report out, including our recommendation on these options and then have that discussion in Cartagena? Is that the - kind of the two options that are being considered now?

Julie Hedlund: I think that's right, or conceivably we could do both. We could do the preliminary report and also put out a survey.

Steven Metalitz: Well I think those two are contradictory. A preliminary report says this is what we think should be done, and the survey is - I thought was to get us feedback from the community on...

Julie Hedlund: Not necessarily. The preliminary report - one of the things we discussed recently was the preliminary report could say, "Here's what we've discussed so far. Here are the things we think we need more information on and

therefore we're doing this survey." I mean, it really can say anything you want it to say. It's preliminary.

Steven Metalitz: I'm trying to specify it so that it's one or the other, because I think whatever is done has to be done in the next three or four weeks and I don't know that we can do both those things. But...

Julie Hedlund: That's a good question and I don't know that the - I don't know the answer to that either. I heard someone else speaking up.

James Galvin: Yes this is Jim. I'm sorry. It's the top of the hour and I have another call to move to here. I would like to see us do both in these two options, but if we can only do one I'd prefer to see the survey before the preliminary report, although obviously the survey will need some context and we'll have to figure out how to do that. In any case I need to drop off at this point.

Edmon Chung: Jim, just quickly a clarification on that. Do you mean have the survey out before Cartagena or the survey results in and we do the analysis before Cartagena?

James Galvin: The survey out and before Cartagena and in fact we could probably allow the survey to close after Cartagena so that we can also use the opportunity to promote it. I just put that out there as an option.

Edmon Chung: Okay, good.

James Galvin: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Jim and thanks for joining.

(Steve): This is (Steve).

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead (Steve).

(Steve): We could also in the preliminary report just capture the discussion we had a few months back. We did run through each model very carefully, you know, outlining the approach and count the cost - cost to whom at what cost.

You know, we could put that into the preliminary report for information and maybe the Working Group, you know, we just present it the way it is - there's no recommendation from the Working Group on which one we should choose and instead, you know, we just saying that, you know, we would like to hear your input, hear the community's input on this survey. How does that sound?

Julie Hedlund: Any thoughts on that question?

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon. I - as I mentioned earlier on I think, you know, I personally feel that that seems to work but it seems like from a couple of the comments, people might want to do the survey first and, you know, before we even have a preliminary report.

On that particular point my sort of inclination is that - or I should say my feeling is that usually if we put out a report that helps generate more discussion than putting out a survey is - that's the nature of I guess how people respond.

So my, you know, I'd still like to be able to be in a position to publish something as a preliminary report before Cartagena along with the survey which we'd fill out and then, you know, that would actually drive a little bit more attention to the subject matter.

But, you know, if people feel overwhelmingly that we should not have the report yet and still conduct the survey, that's, you know, I think that's fine. In the meantime though, I mean, in the next two weeks perhaps in terms of Staff if I'm hearing correctly then perhaps we are trying to put up something,

drafting a survey might be the - an important, you know, part of the work in helping to staff that.

And then perhaps in our next couple of meetings we'll be able to make a better decision on how to go about the whole thing.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Edmon.

Ram Mohan: This is Ram. Actually - sorry, this is Ram. I have to leave for another call. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Ram. Yes, Edmon, we'll take this as an action item. Staff will attempt to do a draft survey and then perhaps also, I mean, the survey is going to need to have some kind of text with it, some context with respect to what are the options, where did these come from, you know, what has the Working Group been doing?

And that could be the preliminary report if we don't want to call it a report since we're not really making recommendations. We're really seeking more information and we can call it something else.

But perhaps we could also draft up the text that would go along with this survey to give context to the survey, and we could take that up as an action item in the next two weeks prior to our next call.

Edmon Chung: Sounds good.

Julie Hedlund: Good. Okay, well we are six minutes after. I don't want to keep anybody. If there are - if there's no other business for this call we'll hold our next call in two weeks at the same time, and we'll try at Staff to see if we can get something out for you to look at prior to that call.

Robert Hutchinson: Thank you Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you everyone. It's a very productive call and I appreciate it, and I wish you all a good morning, afternoon or evening.

(Steve): Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you.

Edmon Chung: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

END