

**GNSO/SSAC  
International Registration Data Working Group  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Monday 24 May 2010 at 19:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO/SSAC International Registration Data Working Group on 24 May 2010 at 19:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

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

<http://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-ird-20100524.mp3>

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

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

Present for the teleconference:

Avri Doria - NCSG

Jeremy Hitchcock - DYN-DNS

Rafik Dammak -- GNSO Non-Commercial Users Stakeholder Group

Bob Hutchinson, GNSO Commercial Stakeholder Group

Ram Mohan - Afiliis – SSAC Board liaison

James Galvin - SSAC, Afiliis

Owen Smigelski - Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial Stakeholder Group

ICANN Staff

Julie Hedlund

Steve Sheng

Absent apologies:

Edmon Chung – Group Leader

Steven Metalitz -- GNSO Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial

Coordinator: I'd like to inform all parties that today's call is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. Go ahead ma'am. You may now begin.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. This is the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group call and today is the 24 of May.

On the call we have today Rafik Dammak, James or Jim Galvin, Bob Hutchinson, Avri Doria and Owen Smigelski. And welcome Owen, I just saw that you just joined.

Owen Smigelski: Hello.

Julie Hedlund: And from staff we have Steve Sheng and Julie Hedlund. And I see that Ram Mohan has just joined us as well. Welcome Ram.

Ram Mohan: Hi. Welcome. I had dialed into the 800 number and they told me it was the wrong number. They gave me a new number to dial in.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. They just changed the number. Gisella sent around a notice to the list on Friday I think it was that we had new numbers. And I apologize for that.

Ram Mohan: You're right. My mistake. I missed the new number. I see the note now that you mention it.

Julie Hedlund: I wasn't paying attention and then I thought I better check that number and it is different. So I'm glad you were able to get on. So Ram, I just did a roll call. We have yourself, Owen Smigelski, Avri Doria, Bob Hutchinson, Jim Galvin and Rafik Dammak and myself and Steve Sheng.

And I know that Edmon Chung cannot join us. I don't hear Jeremy on the call but I think we should go ahead and get started. And maybe what I will do is just let you all know that we're planning on having a sort of - I hesitate to call it a public forum per se but a public session in Brussels.

I have set aside tentatively put made a request to put a session on the schedule for the Thursday morning and on I guess that's the 24. And there will be both a chance to provide an update on the discussions we have been having here and then also it's going to be a combined session with the Whois services requirements report as well.

So we'll have kind of a double session that will go for I think an hour and a half. So we'll as we meet now what we'll do is prepare some draft. The staff will prepare some draft ideas based on our discussions for some slides for that session and have the work team, the working group review those and give suggestions.

So we can I think we'll get going on that pretty soon here and get that around so we'll have plenty of time to get the slides posted on the schedule prior to that session. I see Jeremy has joined us. Jeremy welcome.

Jeremy Hitchcock:Hey Julie. How's it going?

Julie Hedlund: Good. Good. Well, wonderful. I'm glad you could join. I don't know how much of that you caught but I'm just saying that we have tentatively put on the schedule an opportunity for a public discussion in Brussels for that Thursday morning.

And Jeremy, just so you know on the call in addition to yourself we have Jim Galvin, Ram Mohan, Owen Smigelski, Avri Doria, Bob Hutchinson and Rafik Dammak.

Jeremy Hitchcock:Hello everyone.

Julie Hedlund: So I was wondering if you like Jeremy, perhaps we could pick up where we left off and there has been some discussion on the list as well as far as talking about the idea behind sort of a fourth model and in particular perhaps doing kind of building in a kind of backwards compatibility.

And I know Jim has provided some helpful information on that on the list. And I was wondering if it's okay with you Jeremy, if I could ask Steve Sheng to summarize that discussion or help get us started.

Jeremy Hitchcock: That would be great. Yes, there is a great amount of discussion but thanks to everyone who participated for adding the comments and (hearing those options would be great). Steve, you want to go through that?

Julie Hedlund: Okay. Thanks a lot Jeremy. Steve, go ahead.

Steve Sheng: Sure. The fourth model that we are talking about is providing to allow internationalized registration data in Whois. We do not put any limit but for backward compatibility for Port 43 (plays) a requirement for that.

So this is really a requirement that is for Port 43 that used to be kind of asking output off the Whois data. There are a couple of ways that we can do that. The first way is registrars can still prefer to transliterate or translate if they will of the RD information into US asking.

And another way is Jim has suggested using some kind of a signal like the MIME data format. Jim, I was wondering if you could talk more about that?

James Galvin: Well, sure. I mean I think the critical thing here when I look at SMTP and I think about its transition from 7-bit asking to 8-bit, SMTP has an advantage over Whois in that there is actually a convenient place for a signaling mechanism.

If you know the SMTP protocol you know it opens when you open the connection first you say HELO and say your name. And HELO is H-E-L-O and that's the first thing you send. What they did to add 8-bit and then of course all kinds of other options and extensions since that time was to change the opening signal to be EHELO, E-H-E-L-O to be extended HELO - still four characters but they put the E in front.

This has the advantage that anything that was not upgraded would simply reject and say I don't know what you're talking about. And then you would

have to repeat the command with a HELO or perhaps return the message because it couldn't be downgraded and those kinds of things.

What I was talking to Steve Sheng about was in Port 43 we can do something like change instead of normally what you do to Port 43 is you just send to it a domain name, which presumably comes at it in US asking with carriage return line feed at the end. And I was suggesting that you could simply proceed if you wanted an extended response and extended features.

I just casually proposed that the magic keyword at the beginning could be the word extend might be the first thing that you send with a space and you still follow with the domain name. And then in fact you could if you're going to do it, you could have another space and a whole bunch of other options just like the SMTP does.

And that's what you put all there at the end and what happens from a backwards compatibility point of view is presumably extend or whatever magic sequence you put there you would simply get back a response that says it doesn't exist. But you would have to as a client which is extended would have to recognize that as meaning they're not going to provide me extended responses.

And so you would send your request again with just the domain name in it. You might also be smart enough to not try and extend query if the domain name doesn't have one. So obviously you would only issue an extend query if you had an idea of the domain name for example.

But if it understood the extend and then it took the domain name, which it would then return is and there a lot of things we can do at this point. I just suggested you could go the path that HTTP does, which you now return a MIME base content type.

So you have a content type, you then have in MIME designation of a type and everything, a blank line and now you have got extended output of whatever you want to say, whatever we wanted to find in this. I think that that allows the option of Whois in a backwards compatible way returning non-asking output to something, which is willing to accept it. So that's my quick three-minute introduction.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. That is extremely helpful I think. And I'm wondering if maybe we could open it up for questions particularly those who may not have had the opportunity on the last call.

And I should have mentioned before that this discussion arose when we were discussing on last call about whether or not we wanted to require transliteration and the concerns that there isn't a format for transliteration and how useful it might actually be and then what really is the purpose and the output of the purpose of doing that.

And Edmon had asked about the possibility I think of backwards compatibility and that's where this discussion got started. So I'd like to - Steve, also I should say is there anything that you would like to add to this explanation or other comments that came through concerning this issue on the list before we open this up to discussion?

Steve Sheng: There are some other discussions on the list. Let's see. But it's mostly what the value of transliteration, which is probably not relevant to our discussion of Model 4 so I don't have anything to add.

Julie Hedlund: Right. So but I think that there are a lot of questions about the value of transliteration, whether or not that would be a necessary requirement. But it sounds like there is some interest in looking at having some backwards compatibility.

So at this point I'd like to open it up for discussion and questions. What do people think about this possibility?

James Galvin: Julie, I have a question.

Julie Hedlund: Please go ahead, Jim.

James Galvin: So when Steve was talking about comments on the list there was one question on the list that I actually thought was interesting, which really did not get a lot of discussion and I think it does relate to this topic.

It was a question of what is the user of Whois? I mean what is the reason that the service exists? And even we have here in our discussions been talking about a variety of use cases for Whois data and I think that affects this discussion. I mean if you're doing it for law enforcement you have one set of requirements.

If you're doing it just for the general public you have a different set of requirements. Both cases have different privacy requirements and both cases have different access control rules that might apply for different elements. I think that's an important consideration in whether or not transliteration or translation are valuable or even this brainstorming idea that I'm flopping out here for how to provide extended services.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. Jim, thank you. That's - let's get back to that question then and maybe flesh that out a little bit further here. I'm not as used to it myself but I'm not that familiar. I'd kind of like to get a sense of perhaps we can - there are obviously different uses for it and different people using it.

Can we perhaps categorize a few of those and I guess for the purpose of discussion do we want to have different requirements depending on different users or have something that is sort of a lowest common denominator that is sort of across all users?

And I'm just throwing these questions out for discussion. So I welcome all of you to speak up and help us as staff see if we can coalesce around this idea. I'll ask our Chair first. Jeremy, do you have any thoughts on this?

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. I was just about to phrase the question a different way. So that way I wouldn't have to talk about it.

Julie Hedlund: Good. Good. Please go ahead, Jeremy.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Yes. So we have talked about on a few calls about the use and I think we have enumerated law enforcement and police. We have enumerated IT (as just basically) a way to communicate with someone.

Kind of my understanding is it's been a technical continuity contact for the operations of the names. I think that I don't remember if it was on the same message but there was certainly kind of the noting that there hasn't ever been a systematic document position paper or some sort of institutionalization of what collectively we think Whois is for and probably because there has been the different controversy that's associated with that.

Kind of just as a point of order I would say I think we have to be careful about what we think of as Whois in terms of its use but at the same time it's kind of central to deciding the issues related with internationalized characters. So that is kind of my piece of the puzzle of users.

I don't see a lot of kinds of people looking from one language set to another language set. So I do share the kind of questioning of what the value of translation or transliteration between two different language sets or character sets that are really unrelated. But that said, those applications do come up.

Avri Doria: Hi. This is Avri if I can add something.



Julie Hedlund: Avri, this is Julie. Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes. I think another type of user that certainly has talked to me and also has come up in our stakeholder group are consumers of various sorts. I anecdotally have known of many consumers who use Whois when they're checking out something new, some purchase, some whatever.

So people do - regular people do use it in that respect. And while I'm probably not qualified to go into the depths of the usage, I think that there are concerns within philanthropic organizations where they're asking people to give them buckets of money to do stuff and sometimes those people, consumer is not the word for them in that respect, but the donor community might also use these.

Now to what extent people will be going off to non-local language to do something, to donate or to check on consumer I don't know. But given the translations that I now get all the time on all the Google pages I use, I can quite quickly because I mean as soon as I bring up a page in Chrome it offers to translate for me.

And it works really well so given that I can see myself as one example and anything I do other people do, going to multiple sites that are outside my normal language and getting that information. Now if we can trust Google to do the translations for us it doesn't end up perhaps that big a deal.

But the international use of the Net especially because of these translation services will expand. I'm reading Web sites now in all sorts of languages I don't know. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. Thank you very much Avri and I'm glad you pointed that out. That is precisely the way I have used Whois and not being a particularly technical person but to just sort of check on who owns what and who is running what.

And I found it to be useful. I don't necessarily have the expectation of needing to have the information translated for me and I would likely use one of those online tools. But I think that we shouldn't lose sight of the consumer and the interaction consumers as being one of the key groups using the Whois. Other thoughts from those on the call?

Owen Smigelski: Hi Julie. This is Owen. I'm just kind of following along with that obviously in addition to there is more than just I think intellectual property concerns that could use this.

I know certainly businesses use it for research purposes for determining who owns something, where are they located, what's going on. I can certainly think that the press and reporters might want this information. A lot of times if you go to a Web site and the contact information might be old or there might not be a form.

You would be able to get a phone number or an email address off of the Whois. I know when I was in college I used Whois to contact people even from abroad because I was looking at their Web site and I didn't want to use a Web form. I wanted to contact them directly. So I would use that information for that.

This is just stuff I came up with off the top of my head. I imagine if people were to put their minds to it there are probably hundreds of uses that people use Whois for.

Steve Sheng: Hello. This is Steve. Can I add something?

Julie Hedlund: Yes go ahead.

Steve Sheng: So just some background, in 2006 there was a GNSO working group that discussed the purpose of Whois. And there are two formulations for the purpose of Whois.

So the first formulation is the purpose of the gTLD Whois service is to provide information sufficient to contact a responsible party for a particular gTLD domain name who can resolve or reliably pass on data to a party who can resolve issues relating to the configuration of the records associated with the domain name within the DNS server.

So this is more, this formulation is mostly supported by registrar registry and the NCUC on this. There is another formulation called Formulation 2, which is supported by IPC/ISP and the commercial and business user. This first part is essentially the same but the second part is basically the purpose of the gTLD Whois service is to provide information sufficient to contact a responsible party for a particular domain who can resolve or reliably pass the data to a party who can resolve technical, legal or other issues related to the registration use of the domain name.

So the difference here, the first formulation is really the technical records and the configuration of the DNS server. And the second one is kind of more broad to resolve technical, legal and other issues related to the registration or use of the domain name.

I don't think these two formulations exist. I'm not aware there is a final agreement on which of the two that we have. But I think for the purpose of this working group we should take this as whatever is given to us, that we should take both definition A, Formulation 1 and Formulation 2 taken as given.

So whatever we do we need to support both. That's what I'm currently thinking.

Avri Doria: Hi. This is Avri. Can I comment?

Steve Sheng: Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: Hi. I think in one sense of course you're right. And you're right, there was no decision. One of those was one vote higher than the other and I believe I was the one vote that was higher on one of them than the other.

But be that as it may, that pertains mostly to the purpose of Whois from a policy perspective and concerns what policy things should be allowed and disallowed. I don't believe that that discussion is necessarily what should be technically possible and so I am not sure that that should necessarily limit when this group is looking mostly at what is technically reasonable versus what is a policy mandate.

So in some ways I may be speaking out of both sides of my mouth because from a policy perspective when talking about individuals I will take the tightest constraints you can find on what can be done with Whois. But if I'm talking about what's technically possible on a Whois against businesses then I have a very different especially from a consumer perspective, different perspective.

So you're right to bring those up. I think we have to satisfy both of those. But I don't think that necessarily even that should be a limitation for what is technically possible. And policy can also change country by country. So thank you.

Steve Sheng: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Steve. That was helpful background and thank you Avri also for the clarification. So we have got several different possible users of the Whois, consumers, law enforcement, intellectual property and others we probably haven't thought of.

And I ask if there are others that we should add to that or if that's even necessary. But do we have a couple of possible policy definitions for the purpose of Whois that shouldn't necessarily constrain what we think might be a technically possible or reasonable requirement.

And I certainly encourage you to suggest other possible uses and then I would ask too if perhaps we could discuss if there are sort of various varied audience or use of the Whois then do we try to reach all of these groups equally or do we - I mean it's obviously complicated if we have different requirements for different groups.

But then we might have consumer users who are happy to just go out and use a Google tool to translate something. But we might have law enforcement who might have a very urgent need to get information or may need something faster or something more complete.

So anyway, it's just a thought so I welcome those of you on the call to help with this discussion.

James Galvin: I have a comment. This is Jim.

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead Jim.

James Galvin: So I asked the question primarily because it was put out on the mailing list. And I don't see that it even is included in some of our early response documents.

And I was - let's see. Sorry. Give me a moment to collect my thoughts here. The question is what really is going on in my mind, the way that I would answer the question is it's not clear to me that we should even be asking the question.

It's interesting that we have a lot of use cases but I think we knew that going in. And so I thought that the charter of this group was really focused on display requirements and what it would take to change existing implementations or infrastructure if you will in order to support something besides US asking.

When I saw the Whois like who is the user of Whois, it occurred to me that that sort of partially answered the question of the value or importance of transliteration or translation because that's one of the questions that we're asking ourselves.

When I listened to Avri talk about how in her particular browser she can go to Web sites and if it's in a different language she has got a translate button right there and can just translate things, I'm wondering if something like that isn't also the right solution for Whois.

We don't really need to concern ourselves with the user or the consumption of the data. It's about making the right data available or the best data that we can available. And if there are services or the ability for people to do what they need in order to see the data and listening to Aubrey talk about how Web sites are handled it seemed to me that we don't really have to answer that question.

And we don't need to concern ourselves with translation and transliteration. So I just put that out there to see what people think.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Jim. This is Julie. That's quite helpful. What do others think?

Avri Doria: Question from Avri.

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks. Now I have that working in Chrome and it's nice. But are we assuming that therefore everyone would need to rely on Chrome and Google's translate service, which okay, I rely on.

But for their Whois needs, I mean one could hope that this does become as ubiquitous as BabbleFish some day in the future. But I mean real BabbleFish, not the company. But at the moment it isn't so I don't know if we could sort of say well Google has solved this so let's not worry. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Avri. Others?

James Galvin: I'll respond if you like.

Julie Hedlund: Please go ahead Jim.

James Galvin: I guess I'm not suggesting that we would say something like Google has solved the problem. I think I more generally was coming at this from the idea that people who - I guess the question is in the user communities that we talked about is there an international user?

And are we - I mean should a requirement on providing non-asking characters be that we have to accommodate all of those international users? And what I mean by that is it occurs to me that Whois in many ways is a regional kind of thing, right? I mean I'm going to be looking around for things.

I suppose there is a user community that is going to want to know about things in another country, looking at Web sites, want to check out domain names from a whole completely different area. And maybe they will suddenly get things that they can't read or can't see.

But presumably they're already getting that from the Web site they're dealing with then too. I mean I don't know. I'm just sort of tossing things out here. I'm suggesting that the translation and transliteration issue, the onus really is on

the user that wants that data because the people who are going to use the Whois data are going to be mostly regional. They're going to be able to deal with the fact that it's in a different language. That's my comment.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Jim. Other comments?

Ram Mohan: This is Ram.

Julie Hedlund: Ram, please go ahead.

Ram Mohan: Thank you. I guess my perspective is that it's to some extent aligned with where Jim is going. I think the goal of our working group is less about why should there be a Whois and what should be done with Whois.

And it's much more about how do we make sure that with internationalization of registration data that how do we ensure that there are appropriate standards and guidelines developed to accommodate the internationalization of data? And to me I guess I'm still stuck on some fundamental things like what is mandatory in terms of display and what is optional?

If somebody provides, if a registrant provides solely internationalized data is that okay? And I'm not sure those issues have been laid to bed. And so I'm kind of a little confused as to why we're talking about who is the user, etcetera, because it seems like regardless of who the user is and whether the user is local or whether the user is international, some of the fundamental questions have to be laid to bed.

What is the minimum required standard with internationalized data? What do we think is appropriate and what is necessary and what is sufficient? And I don't think I have the answers for that or as a group we have arrived at some sort of consensus for that. Thank you.



Julie Hedlund: Thank you Ram. This is Julie. So those are excellent questions thank you very much. And I think that probably we may have gotten a little sidetracked with discussion right now as far as who is the user.

But we have talked quite a bit in these calls as far as what - how to treat the various elements of data, what standards might there be already existing say for email or for telephone numbers or the various contact elements. And we had come down to trying to see if we could coalesce around a particular model.

Steve had put forward three possible models and their approaches as far as the contact information and now we sort of tried to see if there was maybe another model, maybe a fourth model to move away from this idea of transliteration or translation and talk a little bit about whether or not we wanted to require backwards compatibility.

But unless I'm wrong I think you are quite right, Ram. We don't have a consensus yet. We are trying to see if we can pull together some agreement around a possible approach. I'm not sure that we necessarily are at that point. What I think Edmon had said on a previous call was that it would be good if we could have some discussion points, possibly an approach that we could have out there for discussion in a public session in Brussels to try to socialize some of these ideas a little bit further and get more comment on them.

Steve, could I ask you perhaps to summarize? And I don't know if it's easy to do here but we talked there were a number of areas I think where there was some agreement early on with some of the more straightforward elements. And then there is some discussion of the three models.

What is your sense as far as some of the early conversation that we had in this group because it's probably worth reminding all of us as far as where

there did seem to be some agreement and some of the more kind of straightforward areas like say email or telephone numbers, that sort of thing.

Steve Sheng: Sure Julie. I think the working group, the discussions that we had since the working group wants to have a requirement that with clients must be able to accept a user query of domain name EU in UNA label format.

So they must be able to display that in both UNA label format. So I think since that's kind of the requirement that we agreed early on to do that and then the second part is we kind of discussed about separating these data elements and see how do we internationalize them differently.

And we have agreement on domain names that both UNA label. We have agreement on sponsoring registrar, that they remain in the US asking since that email address and telephone and fax number, those are existing standards. The one thing that we did not, we have yet to reach an agreement is on this what do we do with the contact information for example, the postal address, the name of the entity name, the name of the registrant?

Should they be US asking or should they be internationalized? And that's why we discussed the three models. So as Ram suggested, we haven't decided on what is required, what is necessary and what is sufficient. You want me to go through each of the models or...?

Julie Hedlund: Steve, this is Julie. I don't think you need to go through each of the models necessarily although unless - I thought actually though there was some discussion as far as the three models that there was some agreement around some of the - one of the models.

Steve Sheng: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: I'm wondering if you could remind us if you can what that was.

Steve Sheng: Right. Of the three models that we discussed, Model 1 required a must be present script in Whois with the option for registrars to provide localized data. So the requirement is still US asking Whois.

The option is registrars can put a localized data. And I think the working group thought that was kind of the bare minimum that we have, the lowest denominator that we have. The second model is really that registrants can provide the registration information in whatever script accepted by the registrar.

And registrars provide a point of contact if issues of translation arise or are requested. And I think the working group thought that is workable too. And the last one is we get hung up by the transliteration. It's registrants provide their information in a local script.

It can be any script that can accept registrars and the registrars provide tools to assist the registrants in providing for transliteration and then publish that in a must be present language. So we still require must be present language. So the only difference between Model 2 and 3 is who does the transliteration. And so those are the three models that we discussed.

Julie Hedlund: And so Model 4 is...

Steve Sheng: Model 4 is we don't say about we do not require a transliteration or translation. We simply require a backward compatibility for Port 43 Whois. So the registrant basically sending a baseline in the registrar's can transliterate, they can translate or as Jim said, they don't have to do any of these. They can use the extended format MIME to signal that.

James Galvin: Well, I'd like to suggest that we describe the Model 4 a little bit differently.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

James Galvin: I had imagined that it would mean that Whois could stay the way it is, which simply means that I guess it's a lot like Model 1. It's Model 1 in the sense that we have a must be present language.

Steve Sheng: Right.

James Galvin: So we probably continue with the US asking model so whatever is coming into the registrar, whatever they're doing, they have to do something to make a US asking version of that in order to continue to support the backwards compatible Whois.

Steve Sheng: Right.

James Galvin: But I can also imagine that they might be encoding a lot of the data that they have been ordered to make a US asking, which would make it essentially unreadable and unusable to someone who doesn't know how to decode it. But if they didn't know the language they wouldn't be able to do anything with it anyway.

And then so it's changing Model 1 to simply add a piece that says if I happen to be an extended client I'm going to query and see if you're an extended Whois server. And if you are then I'm going to get all kinds of good stuff and I'm going to get it in the local language displayed for me. But presumably I'm able to handle that. That's why I'm making an extended query.

So I guess it's a specific way of supporting the option. The question that I had with Model 1 although I agree with you, I think we seem to have consensus on that particular option or at least more of a majority towards that model. What does it mean to optionally provide a local language?

I don't know what that is. I don't know how one gets that optional data. I guess we had at one time talked about in every field it might appear twice, once in US asking and once in a bunch of whatever the script is. And that's

interesting too I suppose but we never really talked about how you deal with that given that you have to maintain a US asking presence in order to have backwards compatibility, which we don't even have today, right?

There are Whois servers out there today who are doing things that are strictly speaking a violation of standards. So anyway, I guess that's my comment.

Ram Mohan: This is Ram.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Please go ahead, Ram.

Ram Mohan: I'm sorry Jim. I'm not sure I understood the point you were driving to. What do you think we should do? I mean I understand your observation but where do you want to drive it?

James Galvin: Well, one way to look at this is that I guess I'm thinking that it's possible we're done except for the question that you raised, which is do we need to specify what is the minimum data that has to be offered?

I'm suggesting here that the way forward is that we allow for people to simply enter in their local language and we suggest that a mechanism be developed to query for that response in a local language. I mean we seem to be focused a lot here on how to provide translation and transliteration or an optional way to provide the local language.

Ram Mohan: What about Port 43? What about it's what happens to that? And what happens to that in your suggested model?

Does it get deprecated over time or does it just stay in place and escape characters get used? I guess I'm not sure what you're saying. You're suggesting we may be done but if you declare that we're done, would we have solved the original goal of our working group?

James Galvin: Well, the goal was to speak to the issue of how to support non-US asking characters. And I think I'm going with Model 1 and I'm actually proposing a potential mechanism for what it means to allow the optional data to be provided in the local language.

So I think that Port 43 always stays around in the same way that SMTP has always stayed around. We have not moved off of Port 25 for SMTP. And eventually what happens is everybody migrates to the extended models, the servers and the clients.

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. What do people think about that?

Ram Mohan: I guess it's definitely a different - it's not really a model that falls in there. I guess it is as Jim said, the first model if anything but it's basically do we say the client side tools are robust enough to provide translation services or transliteration services or language interoperability?

James Galvin: I don't think I'm quite suggesting that. I think what I'm saying is that translation and/or transliteration if I'm not speaking to whether they're robust enough. I mean I guess in our own conversations here we're suggesting that there are tools that do appear to work for the most part.

Maybe not all languages are supported but I'm suggesting that we shouldn't put the onus for translation or transliteration on a registrar, on a registree or on the registrant. It should be on the client that wants the data.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can I come in with something?

Julie Hedlund: Please go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes. I think I guess I'm not absolutely sure that I'm hearing correctly or understanding so that's one of the reasons I want to speak. I think from the perspective if I'm understanding correctly of saying a technical requirement

on Port 43 or whatever, what you're saying is that it should be able to support both the US asking and optionally and I'm not sure whether you're saying one or more other languages.

As for a requirement of how you get that into another language at the user level, that is A, a different question, B, one you're not recommending that the registrars be required to support though that could indeed end up a policy issue. And so it comes down to from a technical perspective the base level is it can support several languages.

It doesn't convert between them. It takes what it's given, it stores it, it gives it back correctly. This is done by technical extensions and fits that say whether you're working in old mode or extended mode, etcetera and that anything that's layered on top of that may be a requirement for registrars, may not. But it's not a requirement to the basic Whois system. Am I parsing it close to correctly?

James Galvin: Yes with one well smaller or large depending on your point of view change. Really what I'm suggesting is making Whois 8-bit clean, not actually speaking to what languages it does or doesn't support. That's a technical answer, which I think you'll understand.

Avri Doria: Yes. That would be your extended mode and whether you were working in 8-bit clean or not.

James Galvin: Right.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yes. No, that doesn't - yes. That's fine.

James Galvin: (The main point is) that languages really don't factor into the discussion. Now I mean I think that from ICANN's point of view I mean what we do is we say that we need a technical solution that allows Whois to be 8-bit clean.

And that as a policy matter we want to allow registrants and registrars to use their local language and that's what should be able to be stored in the system. And so we need that technical solution and push back on the IETF to come up with the technical solution.

Avri Doria: This is Avri again. At the policy level there would need to be a decision that said what the base everyone had to do. So there would be a policy decision that said everyone would still have to use US asking or not.

And even if they were using a local and that's where you would get into the other policy issues we have gotten into of translation, transliteration. But those would not be this group's problem but they would be the next problem that sort of says technology has enabled you to store both. Now for a policy perspective you need to decide which you want to do and how.

James Galvin: So as a clarification I think I'm not necessarily suggesting that both be stored. In the spirit of 8-bit clean there is just one data set. I mean I'll pick on contact information just for purposes of example or even email address.

I guess to store my email address and I can store my email address in whatever it is. I don't have to have a 7-bit clean version of it. If I have got an IDN email address whether that's a local part or a domain part, the system is going to allow that to happen.

And further if I do a query I can query with an IDN name right out of Whois server and that should work if it's 8-bit clean.

Avri Doria: But and stop me if I'm asking too many questions please. This is Aubrey again. So that means that one could have an application that did not also provide the 7-bit in your proposal?

James Galvin: Yes. That's what I'm offering at the moment.



Avri Doria: Right.

James Galvin: I'm certainly open to being persuaded otherwise but I'm thinking right, just the system we have now but 8-bit clean.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks. Now I understand what you're saying.

Steve Sheng: But Jim, with 8-bit there is - we're still talking about what about Chinese and Japanese? There would still be issues with transliteration.

James Galvin: Well, obviously if you're going to make it 8-bit clean you do have to indicate the character set in which something is encoded.

Steve Sheng: Right.

James Galvin: But that would be part of the technical solution that would have to come in. I mean the Whois protocol is defined in the ITF and so what they do is they turn it into - I mean I don't know. I'll invent something here.

So you just make it an XML document because then by definition you get all of the rest of the parameters you need so that you can deal with what you're getting. And the tricky part just becomes how you do the query in a backward compatible way.

Steve Sheng: So I guess my question to the working group is is that within the remit of this working group to discuss about the technical solution or the working group specifies the requirement and then somebody else does the technical work?

Ram Mohan: This is Ram. I think it's in the remit to say that it has to be done. I'm not sure we have all the right experts to actually provide the technical specifications. You should ask for the specifications to be developed if you think that is the right thing to do.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Then would a goal be for us to agree on a model? Is that right?

Ram Mohan: This is Ram. Yes, I think so.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Steve, this is Julie. So I think what would be helpful at this point perhaps is if we could simply enumerate briefly what are the elements or approaches that we think we have agreement on including in particular I think this discussion, which I think has been extremely helpful on what to do about the contact information.

And so in a way we're not really if we don't have several models what we're really talking about is what our requirements that we feel we can agree on across the board. And so you had gone through those giving us a very helpful background and I think it would be useful for you and I and staff to list what we think would be agreed upon requirements and send those around to the list and ask specifically for those in the group to comment on them and to say whether or not they agree with them to help us to see if we really are actually perhaps at a point where we can make a recommendation.

And I should point out that this if we can say well, we are in general agreement on this particular set of requirements, I think that before we put these down in a report format I think we need to get a little broader dialogue. I mean this is a group of fairly good representation but we really do want to make sure we're fully engaging the community, which is why if we could put these ideas out into a brief presentation and get community participation at Brussels and see if there are some things we haven't thought of, I think as Edmon had pointed out in a previous call, that could be quite helpful to help us get to a stage of requirements.

But I'm wondering what others think who are on this call. I mean at the very least as staff, we could write down what we think are our agreed upon requirements and send those around. And would that be a good initial approach? Jeremy, what do you think?

Jeremy Hitchcock: Yes. Unless we need further discussions I mean it sounds like we're kind of at a point of impasse of just trying to come to consensus around a particular issue and certainly with the addition of a couple other topics and some discussion with staff would be useful and also some discussion with the community would also be useful.

James Galvin: I think that the charter for this group right, says that we're supposed to study the feasibility and suitability of introducing display specifications, right? I think that we have actually come to a number of potential consensus points here.

We have sort of discussed and come around to a consensus about translation and transliteration that it shouldn't be part of registry and registrar things. I think that's a point worth discussing and mentioning. We agree - maybe it's a foregone conclusion or a premise in starting but obviously we want this to store local languages and let registrants use the local language.

Registrars should be able to support a local language. And Whois data should be displayed in that local format, so whatever data is input by the registrant. And so then the third thing is that we are proposing that ICANN seek to have the Whois protocol itself as the technical specification be made to allow for registrants to use their local language.

We have to find the right way to say that. I would say it as a technical person it's making 8-bit clean.

Steve Sheng: But Jim, I thought if you agree on Model 1, the model that requires registrants provide a must be present language in Whois, the registrant today would be inputting US asking. So they wouldn't - they are required to input US asking although they have the option of providing local information. So the local information is not a requirement but an option.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Steve. So do we want to require?

Avri Doria: Yes. I certainly am at the point of saying I'm not in consensus with what Jim just listed as being what we have decided on. So because I think that Model 1 does provide that must be included and the option.

And also I think that the issue of the registrar's requirements is not quite as absolute. It's that there is no technical requirement in Whois that forces the registrars that this is placing on them but the others may want to. And I don't think that this group has the sort of charge with deciding what policy wise needs to be done by registrars, just what the technology needs to support being done. So I'm not sure that I would agree with Jim's list of things we agree on. The third one I do.

James Galvin: So Audrey, if I can just to try and make sure I understand, I think what you're saying is you believe that there needs to be a baseline language in which everything appears.

So you like the fact that everything has to at least appear in US asking.  
Would that be true?

Avri Doria: Yes. In some version of asking whether it could appear in extended asking or not may be an issue, but yes, that everything needs to appear in some form in asking as well as the possibility of it appearing in I think the baseline for the technical if we go back to the definitions that were read earlier, that the baseline of technically who do you reach, that in that technical community that is worldwide and is international that some form of asking is I'll say it, the lingua franca of communication and that if that is still a requirement, a base level requirement for Whois then that has to be there.

I think it's wonderful and should be encouraged and supported in every way possible to also have a local language that supports the local user communities and other needs. But I think that the other has to be there, yes. And I think that's the Model 1 as it was stated.

Steve Sheng: Right. So do people agree with Model 1 or what about others I guess?

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. I don't want to drive the discussion to a close but we're kind of at the top of the hour. I think that there are a number of points and maybe the distinction of the models isn't exactly a good place because we're trying to agree on models.

But I think that there are nuances of each model that kind of as we have talked about, the implications I think may have shifted our feelings on whether or not some agree that all of Model 1 is accurate, a different model is accurate and certainly trying to not straddle the technical and policy implications is something that is important that we need to do.

And that it probably is coming down to a couple fundamental questions about things that Jim has been mentioning about essentially is there a character encoding and backwards compatibility? But at the same time we don't want to do the protocol work necessarily to make those implications, even though they have policy implications.

Julie Hedlund: Right. Thank you Jeremy and I don't think we - that isn't in our remit. I mean the policy aspect when we make a technical recommendation and then the policy aspect can flow from there.

Since we do need to close up I'm going to suggest that we as staff try to put down what we think are some areas of agreement and perhaps point out some areas where there is not agreement. I think that we haven't always had the full group on all of these calls so I'm really going to try to see if we can get people participating on the list to comment on what we send around.

And I think that there is the important component of using the Brussels meeting to try to get a little more discussion on some of these tricky areas but

I feel like we're getting close and so we'll try to see if we can get some information around to help and see if we can move even closer.

So anyway, thank you for this very, very helpful discussion. Jeremy, is there anything else you want to add?

Jeremy Hitchcock:Nope.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Anything anybody else wants to add before we adjourn?

James Galvin: No. Just thank you Julie.

Ram Mohan: Yes. Julie, are you going to put together a short description of where we are and float that on the list for us to comment? Is that your next step?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Steve and I will work together on that. I'll produce some notes from this call and then based on that I'll ask Steve to take the first cut and we'll see if we can come up with something. And of course we'll ask all of you to comment and maybe point out areas that we don't have quite right. But we'll get that around to the list for everybody to comment on.

James Galvin: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Well, thank you everyone very much. A very helpful discussion and I hope you all have good mornings, evenings, nights wherever you are.

Avri Doria: Thanks. You, too. Bye-bye.

((Crosstalk))

END