GNSO/SSAC
International Registration Data Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 12 April 2010 at 14:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO/SSAC International Registration Data Workign Group on 12 April 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://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ird-20100412.mp3
All recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO calendar page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/

Present for the teleconference:
Steve Metalitz - GNSO Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial Stakeholder Group
Avri Doria - NCSG
Rafik Dammak -- GNSO Non-Commercial Users Stakeholder Group
Andrei Kolesnikov -- Nominating Committee Appointee
Bob Hutchinson, GNSO Commercial Stakeholder Group

ICANN Staff
Julie Hedlund
Dave Piscitello

Absent apologies:
Edmon Chung – Group Leader
Ram Mohan - Afilias – SSAC Board liaison

Julie Hedlund: Wonderful. Thank you (Louise). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the International (Edge) Registration Data Working Group Call.

Welcome everyone. And I'd like to do a brief roll call. On this call we have Avri Doria, (John Kong Yow), Andrei Kolesnikov and Rafik Dammak from the working group members. And from staff we have Dave Piscitello and Julie Hedlund.

And I thought perhaps we could start off our discussion, if there are no objections, with the revised version of the matrix that we were discussing on the last call and that Steve Shang has made some revisions to and sent around to the working group list yesterday. Has everybody received that newer version of the matrix?

I'm hearing no objections. I hope that means yes.

So, on the last call we discussed Model 1 and Model 2 and we I think talked about some of the aspects of Model 3. But I should note that in the latest version that Steve has sent around of the matrix he's added some new sections. And I'm wondering if perhaps we want to discuss those sections.

In particular there was some discussion about the need to add a section on impact to users of Whois which we now have as a new section. Also we have a technical impact to application and impact to Whois systems - system itself.

Are there any thoughts? Do we want to discuss these new sections or move to Model 3? Does anyone have any suggestions of which they - way they'd like to go? Hearing none, perhaps what I'll do then is suggest that we discuss the new sections of the matrix and then we can move on to Model 3.

So with respect to impact to users of Whois there are several categories of impacts that Steve has noted. The first is to a local user receiving Whois display in a local language.

And with respect to the different models, Model 1 would have enhanced usability of Whois as it is in his or her own language. Model 2 would be enhanced usability of Whois as it is in his or her own language. Model 3, okay, would be the same. So we're - so for each of the models we're having - we're seeing the same impact to local users for display in a local language.

Perhaps more interestingly for a local user receiving Whois in any language but the local language Model 1, the impact is unchanged because there is - there will be a must-be-present language. But Model 2, Steve has suggested poses significant challenges as Whois now in many languages - Whois would now be in many languages that the local user would not understand. And for Model 3 the impact would be unchanged because here would be a must-be-present language.

Are there any thoughts with respect to these suggestions that Steve has made on these impacts? Does it seem accurate?

Okay. So there are a couple of categories where we're not - we haven't filled in the blanks. And perhaps we could talk about those. And that's in the impact to users of Whois.

And I think that we'll be looking for some guidance here from the working group members, in particular on the impact users of Whois to non-local users receiving Whois displays in "official language" or to non-local users receiving Whois display in a local language. So both of these would be non-local - impact on non-local users.

What do we think might be the impact? Do we have some thoughts with respect to Model 1? And that would be that there's a must-be-present language in addition to give the option to provide data in local languages.

Steven Metalitz: Julie, this is Steve Metalitz.

Julie Hedlund: Oh hi Steven. Welcome. Thank you.

Steven Metalitz: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: I didn't realize you were on the call.

Steven Metalitz: Right. I got here a little bit late so - and maybe this has already been discussed. But I'm not clear why we have these two new lines.

What difference does it make whether the user is local or non-local? It's really a question of what language the user is expecting or can work with, isn't it? I'm just - maybe I'm missing something as to why we think the impact would be different on a non-local user than on a local user.

Julie Hedlund: That's a good question. And we - I mean we did add since the last discussion this entire category of the impact to users of Whois.

But Dave, do you have any thoughts on why we would also have a category for non-local users? These are added here. We don't have any suggestions for what the impact might be in there. Any thoughts?

Dave Piscitello: Well I just - I had thought it meant to a local language user receiving Whois display in a local language so someone who, you know, is, you know, who is a native speaker of Spanish or of Chinese receiving her Whois display in, you know, a, you know, an extended Latin text for Spanish or in a character that can display Chinese. That's how I interpreted it.

And I admit that I'm not certain that's what I - I'm actually certain Steve meant. But that's the only way I can understand it.

So for example in the web world if I go to Paris for a meeting and I log into the corporate intranet of OECD the homepage is in French. It's anticipating that the local users will prefer their "local language." And if I want it in English I have to go to a pull-down that says I prefer English.

So that's how I'm interpreting it. Does that help, Steve?

Steven Metalitz: Well okay. I mean I - but it doesn't matter whether you sitting at the keyboard for this purpose, whether you're coming from the United States or you're

coming from Senegal where French is spoken or - I just - I'm just not clear why, you know, it matters whether you can read that language I suppose although again we're not talking - as I understand we're not going to be talking about languages. We're talking about scripts.

But it matters whether you read that script. But I'm not sure it matters where you're sitting when you try to read it. But maybe I'm missing something.

Dave Piscitello: Well I think that - I think using script is probably more accurate than using language here. And I'm - yes, I'm taking a leap here because I did, you know, I did not have an opportunity over the weekend to take a look at this. And so I'm (unintelligible) in knowing exactly what Steve had intended.

Steven Metalitz: Yes.

Dave Piscitello: But my...

Steven Metalitz: I understand

Dave Piscitello: My impression is that you are probably right, Steve M., because it ultimately is, yes, it comes down to can I read the script and if I can't read the script what are my options.

Steven Metalitz: Right.

Dave Piscitello: So if we attempt to proceed with this section in that context it's sort of very brain challenging I admit. But - so on Line 15 are we looking at the Excel spreadsheet?

Julie Hedlund: I - if - that's what I was reading off of, yes, so if we looked at Line 15 in the Excel spreadsheet.

Dave Piscitello: See and then the first line would be -- let me see if I get this right -- a user who is receiving Whois display in a script that he understands.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, Dave. I think that's right. So if we want to say it differently it's - we should substitute -- this is Julie -- we should substitute the word language really for scripts. So - and we're not - and whether the user - as Steve points out, whether the user is local or not basically just had users who either understand the scripts or users who don't understand the script.

Dave Piscitello: Yes. I guess the subtlety in 15 and in 16 -- this is Dave Piscitello, sorry -- the subtlety in 15 or 16 would - to me is this a script that I use on a daily basis or is this a script that happens to be one of the scripts that I know.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can I ask why would that be - I mean I have scripts that my laptop knows how to do. I have some scripts other than that ASCII that I can read and most of it I can't. But any time I go to something that might be in a different script I can switch over and use it. So I'm not quite sure if it's a script is accessible to me in a language that I understand what does it matter - and I guess - what does it matter where I am?

Dave Piscitello: Well I'm - I think we're -- this is Dave -- I think we're focusing on the term local user. And let's assume that that's not what we're trying to do for a second. And let's assume we're talking about a user who is in the context of understanding only one language and being able to read the script in that language as pretty much, you know, the larger set of humanity, right? So what encumbrance does that person have, you know, in these three models?

Avri Doria: So you're speaking of them -- this is Avri again -- instead of local you really want to say the IDN-only user or something like that?

Dave Piscitello: Well I guess IRD, not IDN.

Avri Doria: Right. Yes.

Dave Piscitello: Yes.

Avri Doria: Sorry. Yes, the IRD-only user. Excuse me.

Julie Hedlund: Right. This is Julie. That might be - Dave, maybe that's a better way to put it. Rather than having these local, non-local distinctions, you know, we could describe it a little differently like Avri pointed out, sort of the IRD-only user and, what, the non-IRD-only user. How would we describe the other?

Avri Doria: I kind of expect -- this is Avri again -- I guess you've got two categories. And you have them anywhere. I mean I know of places in L.A. where you'll find IRD-only users, probably New York also.

So you basically have IRD-only user and essentially the ASCII-also user. I mean I think rarely will you find multilingual people that don't have ASCII. There may be a couple out there but I doubt it.

So it really is, yes, the non - the IRD-only and then I don't know what, you know, PC way there is to say non-IRD-only but I think the assumption is the ASCII user, the ASCII-enabled user, ASCII-capable user or the whatever.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. Thank you Avri. That's helpful to me. Steve, what do you think about that as a distinction as opposed to talking about local or non-local since point of presence doesn't seem to be the issue?

Steven Metalitz: Yes. That may -- this is Steve Metalitz -- that may be more precise. Again if we're talk - I think we should specify script rather than language because many people - yes, I think that - I just think it's more accurate.

Dave Piscitello. Yes. And this is Dave Piscitello. I think the few changes, talking about IRD and talking about scripts, probably refine this a bit.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. This is Julie. I think we can easily make these changes. And so if we do, I mean we really - what can we say about the impacts so the impact on the IRD-only user versus the impact on the ASCII-enabled user with respect to these scripts as opposed to language? Do the - do what we have in the Line 15 and 16 make sense under these new sort of descriptive categories?

And I'm asking really because I'm not a technical person. So I need some guidance. If we have these as two categories what do we want to say about the impacts? Dave, do you have some thoughts?

Dave Piscitello: I'm processing. This is Dave.

Man: Yes.

Dave Piscitello: Unfortunately this is a little hard to do in real-time and (unintelligible) so I apologize. But I thought I was going to be on my way to Hong Kong this morning and have been trying to prepare for a webcam presentation at 3:00 am. So I admit I'm a little bit distracted by this an again my apologies.

My sense is that there are - there's sort of a cascade of issues for users. And if you start off with, you know, with the assumption that you want to accommodate someone in a script they understand irrespective of where they are and irrespective of what system they use then you have the problem of being - of either having a common representation that everyone can default to plus a - some way to always be able to present someone with, you know, with a script they understand or you have the one extreme of the way we are now which is assuming - assume everyone has - can't process ASCII and if you can't well too bad versus the - what we've called the battle effect is assume that you can always transliterate or, yes, whatever you have into a language that - a script that someone recognizes. And that's what we're trying to do with this set of impacts.

So if you don't have ASCII and you can't assure that you always present a script that every user or any user can read then you have a potential for the inability to someone to read, you know, to read the Whois information. That's the one end of the spectrum. I think you see that at both ends because if you just assume ASCII or you assume you can't get them all you have that problem.

Steven Metalitz: Julie, this is Steve Metalitz again. On 16, if we're talking about changing that from - to the ASCII-capable user, in fact I think if you look at Cell C about posing significant challenges as Whois now in many languages local user would not understand I think we're really talking about the ASCII-only user there, right?

So 15 would be the IRD-only user. Sixteen would be the ASCII-only user. Presumably someone who could use both ASCII and the IRD script, you know, leaving aside what their preference might be they would at least be capable of handling just about anything whether - obviously whether it's in the IRD script of the ASCII script, both. As long as one of them is present they're okay. But for - we - I think the two cases we would be focusing on would be the one who could only use IRD and the one who can only use ASCII.

Julie Hedlund: Right. This is Julie. Steve, that's very helpful to me. So yes, so then we would change the description for 15 that Steve as he noted, the IRD-only user and then 16 is the ASCII-only user. And we're not really concerned about impact on the person who can, you know, do both because they're not really a challenge for us if I'm understanding that correctly.

Steven Metalitz: Right.

Dave Piscitello: This is Dave again. Steve, who is the category people who can only use ASCII?

Steven Metalitz: I would, you know, I think most monoglot English speakers would be in that category.

Dave Piscitello: So I...

Steven Metalitz: But assume with...

Dave Piscitello: We really...

Steven Metalitz: …Most monoglot speakers of European languages and most European languages and so forth.

Avri Doria: This is...

Dave Piscitello: Right.

Avri Doria: …Avri.

Dave Piscitello: So...

Avri Doria: I have a question.

Dave Piscitello: Very different. We...

Julie Hedlund: Wait. Hold on. Avri, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: We're making an assumption that just because (unintelligible) all of the web pages in it will be IDN-only or IRD-only. And that's not necessarily the case just because we have now, you know, other scripts and other languages showing up in pages that have ASCII-only TLDs and domain names.

So too, in the future we could find ourselves in a world where while the domain names are completely, you know, IDN-ish that the content that one

wants to then find out more about the Whois status of the person on might be just in ASCII. And so it's quite - and because we don't get to Web sites just by typing in names that we may not understand but we did it also by clicking on something we could find ourselves very much as a I-read-English-only person in a Web site that was within a IRD content.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Avri. This is Julie. So you could have a mix of the two on...

Avri Doria: We could. Yes.

Julie Hedlund: For domain names.

Avri Doria: Right. Or not even - the domain name could even be purely IDN but the webpage that it has for our English readers might be ASCII. And as just like now I can go to web pages with ASCII, IDN -- I mean with ASCII domain names -- and find myself facing something in, you know, Hebrew which is the one I can read. So, you know, that happens so that the converse will probably happen as well given time.

Steven Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I think Avri's absolutely correct. But I'm not sure where that fits into this matrix because I thought we were talking about - we weren't talking about the Web site content. We were talking about Whois displays.

Avri Doria: Right. But the - often the person who wants the Whois information is somebody that got there because they had some question about some content they looked at. No.

Steven Metalitz: That's right.

Avri Doria: Right. So that's why you may have the English-only user going to the Whois for a site that is totally in Hebrew.

Steven Metalitz: I complete agree with that. And so that person presumably would be in Line 16.

Avri Doria: Right. With the...

Steven Metalitz: Yes.

Avri Doria: Is the non, yes.

Steven Metalitz: Yes.

Avri Doria: And that's - and I was just trying to answer the question of how come you could end up with a...

Steven Metalitz: Okay.

Avri Doria: Line 16 person in an IRD situation.

Steven Metalitz: Okay. I agree with you.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. So this is Julie. Actually Avri and Steve, that's quite helpful too. So that cell would be - would fit into the sort of the Line 16 category as opposed to a new category. But I understand.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: So if we as staff make some changes to these two categories along the lines that we've discussed here do we feel that the description of the impact is accurate for the Line 16 and Line 15 ASCII-only - I mean, sorry, IRD-only? I mean we obviously have to change those descriptions, I understand, because we're now in those impact descriptions we're talking about a user in her - in his or her own language but we really should be more accurately saying scripts.

So for instance 15 for the IRD-only user enhanced usability of Whois as it is in the user's - in the scripts the user understands, I think that's the way it would read and in 16 unchanged because it must be a must-be-present script I assume as opposed to must-be-present language. And the challenge is in Model 2, significant challenges as the Whois is now in many scripts that a ASCII-only user would not understand. Does that seem - would those be incorrect?

Steven Metalitz: Well this is Steve. I -- Metalitz -- have a question I guess about Model 1.

Julie Hedlund: Sure.

Steven Metalitz: You require registrants to provide the must-be-present script -- let's assume that's ASCII -- and in addition give the option to provide data in local scripts as well. So that's the registrant's option. Is that what we're referring to there? And that if the registrant, for example, provides ASCII data both in - excuse me, provides Whois data both in ASCII and in some non-ASCII script -- let's say Hebrew -- then both would be displayed? Is that - am I correctly summarizing Model 1?

Julie Hedlund: Okay. So yes, requiring registrants to provide a must-be-present script in addition -- so you have two options -- in addition to the option to provide the data in the local script. That seems like what you just - that seems like...

Steven Metalitz: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: What you described to me.

Steven Metalitz: I - that's what I understood it to be and - but there's an asymmetry here because the registrant's doing that. That's fine.

But what if the user may have a different, you know, let's say the registrant decides not to provide the local script, the user only can read the local script. So Model - so I'm not sure that B would be right, because Whois is not always in that user's - in a script that user can read because it's left up to the - if it's left up to the registrant basically to decide whether or not to provide Whois data in the local script.

Julie Hedlund: Right.

Dave Piscitello: Steve, this is Dave. In - if I read this correctly in Line 16 since this is the model where the registrar has to provide a point of contact for translation at (unintelligible) issues...

Steven Metalitz: No. This is...

Dave Piscitello: Then...

Steven Metalitz: This is - that's Model 2. This is Model 1.

Dave Piscitello: Oh. I'm sorry.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Dave...

Dave Piscitello: So...

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. Model 1, it's requiring registrants to provide a must-be-present script and in addition give the option to provide data in a local script.

Steven Metalitz: So if they don't take that option then the user doesn't get - and I'm not sure B is correct for the user.

Julie Hedlund: Right, because - yes, because if a - since these are options we - while we require - the first part is a requirement, requiring a must-be-present language.

But the second piece is an option to provide in a local script so yes. So if you have a user who can't read the local - well who could read the local script but the registrant has elected not to provide in the local script then B, yes.

Dave Piscitello: Well doesn't Line 13 say that the registrant, you know, has to know or find someone to translate it into English? I know that this is not precise but, you know, but it seems that if what we're saying is -- and this is my interpretation -- if what we're saying is the registrant must provide both or the Whois is not accepted which is a stretch then there would be enhanced usability.

I think a more practical interpretation is that there may be enhanced usability for someone who does not recognize ASCII in those circumstances where this is a script that he does recognize.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. So Line -- this is Julie -- so Line 13 says for the impact to the registrant for Model 1 some barrier of entry because they'd have to know or find someone to translate into - well into ASCII or English.

Man: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: I'm not sure if we really mean English there or ASCII.

Steven Metalitz: Yes.

Dave Piscitello: It's supposed to be ASCII.

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Dave Piscitello: This is Dave again. You know, one of the things that we might want to add there, Julie, is not only the possibility of not having to know or find someone but some automation.

So as an example if you - and I - if you type in a Web site in Chinese characters or in Japanese characters on - in the Google search bar you will get asked whether or not you want a translation of that page into English because the browser, you know, Firefox or Chrome, know that you are actually using ASCII.

So one of the things that we probably want to understand or also consider is the possibility that to some extent automation will actually be ported over to Whois application that would facilitate a registrant being able to say here's my postal address in Chinese or in Japanese script, please change it for me or transliterate it for me to the best postal approximation according to the (IT) - the postal standards, use standards and submit that along with the Chinese or Japanese script that I just gave you.

Steven Metalitz: I think, Dave, you're describing Model 3.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. I think -- this is Julie -- Dave, I think actually there might be an error in this because it sounds...

Dave Piscitello: You're right.

Julie Hedlund: You know, because I think that Line 13 for Model 1 talks about the barrier with respect to the translation but I'm not sure that that actually applies to Model 1 based on the description of each of the models. I mean wouldn't that apply to Model 2?

Dave Piscitello: No, because Model 1, Line 13 and Cell 13B, is I must provide the must-be-present language and then I can also provide my local script, must-be-present script and then I also can provide the local script of my choice, right? And Steve is correct that I was describing something that would be more appropriate for Column B.

Julie Hedlund: I see, for Model...

Dave Piscitello: So I think that Cell 15B is actually wrong. And I agree with Steve, because the - there is no insurance that there's enhanced usability for me if I only know how to read Chinese script and someone has actually submitted the ASCII(7) and Japanese because if I don't know ASCII(7) and I don't know Japanese it doesn't do me any good if all I know is Chinese.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Dave. This is Julie. Okay. I understand. So we need to amend 15B because we would have cases in which there's not enhanced usability.

Dave Piscitello: Steve, did I get that right?

Julie Hedlund: Steve, does that sound right to you?

Steven Metalitz: Yes. I think that's correct for 15B.

Dave Piscitello: Right.

Julie Hedlund: And so what about 15C? I mean in that case we've got for Model 2 an additional requirement to provide a point of contact for translation and abuse issues based on request in addition to registrants providing their registration data and the script that can be accepted by the registrar and a registrar to provide the point of contact. Pardon me in what I just said.

Steven Metalitz: Yes. I think -- this is Steve Metalitz -- I've raised this question before about what - who that point of contact was to be provided to. And I understand that among others it would be provided to the user. So the user, the IRD-only user in that case would have the capability of - assuming that point of contact actually functioned would have the capability of getting a version of the Whois data in the script that he could read even if the user had only submitted it in ASCII.

Julie Hedlund: Right. This is Julie. So then you would - assuming that the point of contact works and the user had access to that then you would have enhanced usability with that requirement.

Steven Metalitz: Right.

Julie Hedlund: Right. And then for Model 3 you've got an added requirement of a transliteration service and publishing that - in a must-be-present language in addition to providing registration data that can be - in a script that can be accepted by the registrar.

Dave Piscitello: This is Dave again. I think that, Julie, if you'll make a note that Steve and I should reword the description of Model 3 to consider the case I talked about earlier where the registrar can actually provide a tool or somebody - some tool exists to assist the registrant in submitting transliterated information according to a standard convention for things like contact information.

Julie Hedlund: Sure, Dave. I've made a note of that. Do we have more that we want to discuss on the impact of users of Whois with the different models? What about Line 16 (unintelligible), now Line 16 being of course as we described more the ASCII-only capable user or ASCII-only user?

Steven Metalitz: Well I think Model -- this is Steve Metalitz -- I think Model 2 would kind of be the same as for previous line because it depends if that point of contact can translate - can transliterate from the local script in which the data was submitted into ASCII then the ASCII-only user would be okay.

Julie Hedlund: Right. This is Julie. Okay. Yes. I see what you're saying because we do have additional options there so we could make that change. Okay, good. Anything else?

So we also added a section, moving along on the technical impact, to the impact to applications. That was a new addition based on our discussion on our last call.

And we have, you know, some information that Steve Shang was able to suggest. And we, I think, lack some clarity with respect to some of the other impacts particularly Model 2. That is Column C, 22C and 23C and also 24B as well.

Any thoughts on the information we've provided on technical impacts? Any suggestions for other impacts where we're, you know, not clear what the impacts might be? And it may be that it's, you know, we'll have to research a little bit more on.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can I ask a question about Model 3 on 21 and 22? And it probably portrays a very large non-understanding of where we've been.

Julie Hedlund: Sure. Please go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: Is - I don't understand why there'd be no impact if indeed don't you have both languages in Model 3. And wouldn't that have some technical impact to application?

Julie Hedlund: Dave, any thoughts on that? Right now we're saying well we're not sure what the impact would be.

Avri Doria: I thought that was on Model 2.

Julie Hedlund: Right, Model 2. But we're saying...

Avri Doria: And I was...

Julie Hedlund: Yes. You're right.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: We're saying on Model 3 no impact to the existing Whois. Why would there be no impact? That's a good question. Dave?

Dave Piscitello: Because it's always in the must-be-present language, right?

Avri Doria: It's always in that. But is it also available in the transliterated?

Dave Piscitello: I guess -- this is Dave again -- I guess the question is if the transliteration is on the fly or if it's, you know, stored.

Avri Doria: But in either case if it's something that is not provided only on request that therefore I was assuming that it's something that was always available.

Dave Piscitello: Well...

Avri Doria: So at the very least...

Dave Piscitello: I'm...

Avri Doria: The client would have to know what it was asking for and...

Dave Piscitello: So there's two ways to look at it, Avri. The - let me give out a webpage as an example.

If the data are present in an - in my data store I can do one of two things. I can have a copy that's in a must-be-present language and a copy in every conceivable language that somebody might inquire. Or I could have a utility that allows me to do transliteration of any data that people request.

So if you want to consider both those always available that's okay. That's just different than the way that I was thinking about it.

Julie Hedlund: But then - so Dave, this is Julie and I'm, you know obviously struggling a little on the technical side. So in both those cases though we're talking about needing to have either something stored or having a utility. So if you need to have either of those options or both to accomplish the transliteration wouldn't that be an impact on the application?

Or I'm maybe not understanding. Is it you don't have an impact because both of those are present?

Dave Piscitello: Well I'm assuming there's an impact on applications. And the question is whether it's the client...

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Dave Piscitello: Or the server or...

Julie Hedlund: Okay. All right, so that's I guess my question is that to say - it's not accurate to say no impact on the applications? There'd be some sort of impact.

Dave Piscitello: I - yes. I mean I can't - I don't know what Steve was thinking. And I don't want - and I'd like to be able to talk to him about it. But I would think that there is - there would be an impact on, you know, on the Whois application.

Julie Hedlund: And Dave - and I -- this is Julie -- I should point out that Steve has, you know, in sending out this latest version of the matrix was really looking for guidance from the working group members, you know, to check the accuracy of his assumptions. So I think this is a good case in point where the discussion helps him at their end.

So I think that's a change that we can make, Avri, to this chart and maybe flesh out a little bit more what that impact would be.

Avri Doria: That's fine. Yes. I believe that, you know, a not sure is a good thing. And I believe that I'll probably (unintelligible) there may be no impact to half of the existing system or to the existing system but we'll have to add something on to support the rest of it. So the not sure is probably a good category all the way down there because I don't know...

Julie Hedlund: Thank you.

Avri Doria: That it's gotten enough thinking. Maybe Steve has. I don't know. But I certainly haven't thought about it but at first blush I see possible impacts.

Julie Hedlund: Right, so not sure of possible impacts until we can, you know, investigate a little bit more and find out what exactly that might be. And that - I'm wondering then, that would seem to me to suggest that we're looking at a not sure.

But I think it - you - this is what you were just saying, you know, for web Whois clients Column D then becomes a not sure and other Whois applications a not sure as well, as well as impact to the Whois system itself. Is that what you...

Dave Piscitello: This is - okay. I think that if you read the non-impact to existing Whois in Column B for 22 and 23 perhaps what Steve meant was that if the must-be-present language is ASCII(7) or must-be-present script, sorry, is ASCII(7) then to a certain extent he's right, there is no impact to existing Whois clients that currently process ASCII(7), right? If the must-be-present script is something in UTF-8 then of course it would be different.

Julie Hedlund: So this is Julie. So Dave, maybe we need to have a little bit more precise description there. It...

Dave Piscitello: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: As...

Dave Piscitello: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Okay.

Dave Piscitello: And I think that it drills down a little bit further than the one line that it has and actually covers what Avri and I discussed, you know, earlier.

Julie Hedlund: Avri, how does that...

Avri Doria: Yes?

Julie Hedlund: What do you think of that? We're really talking about a - we'll need some more information as far as like where the impacts are. You might not have an impact if you - if the script is ASCII(7) and the client can process ASCII(7). But if you've got something else then you would have an impact.

Avri Doria: Right. And - yes -- this is Avri -- and that's pretty much what I meant by some of the clients no impact but for others yes, impact. And I think that's the same thing I meant.

Julie Hedlund: Right. This is Julie. Thank you Avri. That's very helpful.

Anything else we want to discuss on the technical impacts or impact to Whois? Thank you. I've made notes of these changes. And I'll summarize them so that we can do a revision.

I think that on the last call we had with respect to impact to registrars and registries we had begun to speak about Model 3. And there were some concerns if I recall correctly.

I know that (Rom) had raised a concern. And I think Andrei, you had mentioned it as well. I think we tried to capture it up in our (unintelligible) Model 3. And that is the distinction between transliteration and translation. And I know (Rom) had mentioned a concern about even having a requirement relating to translation as opposed to transliteration.

And I think we hit - (Rom)'s suggestion was that we continue that discussion on this call. And I was wondering if those of you on the call have any thoughts in that regard.

For instance right now an impact to registrars, Model 3, we talk about providing translation services and translating registration information to English and translations resulting in possible inaccuracies. We want to discuss whether or not we want to have that type of requirement in Model 3 or are we really talking about a transliteration service.

Andrei Kolesnikov: It's Andrei.

Julie Hedlund: Please go ahead Andrei.

Andrei Kolesnikov: Yes. Regarding the translation I think that the translation from one language to another language is very costly service because I don't think that (Roberts) or Google for instance can translate it appropriately especially if you're talking about the address of the domain holder.

You know, it's really expensive. I don't know who'll - who can carry the cost of this.

And also regarding the transliteration as I remember from the last - from the conversation from the last time there was mention that for example it's not working in every country. For example in Russia it works. We have a transliteration rules where we can apply certain languages - change certain languages from Cyrillic to other languages. But it's mostly to the Roman groups of languages because I don't know if such mechanisms or metrics exist for Chinese or Japanese language for example. And also somebody -- I don't remember who exactly -- mentioned that it doesn't work for Chinese languages. That's my comment.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Andrei. This is Julie. I know (John Kong Yow) is on the call. (John Kong), do you have any thoughts on the utility of having a transliteration service requirement? Is it - would something like that work, say for instance Chinese script?

(John Kong Yow): This is (Etienne Kong Yow). As for Chinese I think a translation tool for ASCII English is relatively easy because Chinese - every Chinese character has some - Chinese (P) as a (P) is the - is in the form of ASCII. So many persons - most of persons - most of Chinese can understand the (P). So the - for Chinese they can easily translate a Chinese character into (P) so - from our China national standard. So for Chinese address was translation so you can just use the (P) form so I think for Chinese it's relatively easy. Maybe for other language it will use some translation so it is very expensive I think.

Rafik Dammak: Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Please go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: It's Rafik. So about the transliteration it can be done for Japanese is not problem but for other Arabic it would be really (unintelligible) because there is no really rules for that - for the same ones - for the same ones there can be many, many version of transliteration. My name - for my name for example I can write it in three or four variations.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Rafik. This is Julie. That's very helpful. So there's not a particular national standard then in Japanese for transliteration from Japanese from, you know...

Rafik Dammak: No, no, no. So - Julie, so it's - for Japanese it's possible.

Julie Hedlund: Oh I see. I see.

Rafik Dammak: It's for Arabic it's not really possible because for example in North Africa when we make transliteration it's from Arabic to French. But in the Middle East when they make it's from Arabic to the English. So that's why it can be really different.

Julie Hedlund: I see. So for the Japanese yes, but something like Arabic could be - could have a number of variations.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

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

Julie Hedlund: Yes. I hear Avri and Steve. Avri...

Avri Doria: Quick...

Julie Hedlund: Please.

Avri Doria: Quick question. Those transliterations whether they be English or French would still be expressible in ASCII, would they not?

Andrei Kolesnikov: Yes. I was talking about ASCII. It's Andrei.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Avri. Steve?

Steven Metalitz: Yes. I was just going to say that from - for our job the fact that there isn't one totally authoritative standard for transliteration may not be an insurmountable obstacle. When you think about it -- again I'm thinking in terms of the analogy of the postal service -- they have to be able to deliver mail even when there's misspellings and phonetic spellings of different street names and so forth.

I'm thinking of one example in - where I live where there's commonly - very commonly misspelled street name. And they have to be able to deliver it. So even if there is some variation in how it's translated I think -- or excuse me, transliterated -- I would think that if there is a readily available automated transliteration facility that that might fit the bill.

All I'm saying is it's - it may be very standardized in Chinese as was said before, from Chinese to ASCII and less - and not standardized from Arabic to ASCII. But I'm not sure that that's an insurmountable problem.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. Thank you Steve. That's helpful.

What about - right now what we are saying here for Model 3 is we're talking about translation services. And as Andrei has pointed out that could be extremely costly. So separating that from transliteration we could say - we could have a requirement for example with respect to providing transliteration since there are a number of different ways to do that but perhaps not a requirement relating to translation which I think is a concern that (Rom) had on the last call. Any thoughts on that?

Steven Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz again. I agree that the main issue here - for Whois data the main issue's going to be transliteration. You want the name of, you know, for example you would transliterate the name of the capital of Russia as Moskva. But in U.S. English that would be translated as Moscow. But I think someone who seeks Moskva will be able to figure out what city you're talking about.

And given what Andrei has said about the difficulties of translation as compared to transliteration I think for the most part you're talking about taking something that's in one script and putting it in another script. And that's transliteration rather than translation.

Julie Hedlund: Right. This is Julie. Steve, that's very helpful to me. So then my suggestion would be that we alter our - the description that we have for impact to registrars for Model 3 and change the translation to transliteration because that's really what we're talking about. Does that seem right?

Man: Think so.

Steven Metalitz: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. Okay. Well we are at the top of the hour. I think that this has been for my part an extremely useful discussion because it's really helped us as staff to flesh out some of these issues and to provide some - make some changes and provide some information.

So we'll go ahead and make these changes to the matrix and get that out to you prior to the next call which will be in two weeks. That will be at the rotated time which I think is 19:00 (unintelligible) to accommodate those who are in New Zealand and Asia.

Is there anything anyone else wants to discuss before we close the meeting? Then I want to thank everyone so much for your help today and for joining us. And we'll get some notes out and look forward to speaking with you all on the next call. Have a nice morning, afternoon or evening.

Steven Metalitz: Thanks Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you.

Man: Thank you Julie.

Andrei Kolesnikov: Thank you everybody.

Woman: Bye-bye.

Man: Thank you Julie.

Man: Bye-bye.

END