

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Marika Konings  
December 6, 2010  
9:01 am CT**

Coordinator: Excuse me, this call is now being recorded. If you object you may disconnect at this time.

Marika Konings: Thank you Operator. The call is - the recording has started. I'll just explain that we're waiting for Michele to set up while we work through a technical issue. We'll now hear from - three updates from three of our working groups. The first one will be the IRTPB Inter Registrar Transfer Policy Part B working group, that update will be given by Michele Neylon and then we'll have the PDNR update from Alan Greenberg and we'll finish with the Internationalized Rate Registration Data working group, that will be Edmon giving that update.

So Michele, I believe you're ready? Please go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Good afternoon everybody, sorry for the delay with those technical issues of course. This is just a brief update on the IRTP Part B working group. IRTP refers to the Inter Registrar Transfer Policy. It's Part B of the series. Just the background, Inter Registrar Transfer Policy, straightforward process for

registrants to transfer domain names between registrars. It's currently under review to ensure improvements and clarification.

So the questions we've been asked to try and answer are first are, should there be a process or special provisions for (urgents) to return of high-jacked registration, inappropriate transfers, or change of registrants. We've also been asked to look at registrar lock statuses and looking at the standards best practices and also to clarify the denial Reason 7 in the current policy.

The working group put PDP with initiators in June 2009. We published our initial report back in the end of May of this year. And we had a public comments after the meeting in Brussels. We received 17 comments from the community and we have pretty much reviewed all of those comments to date. And we are currently debating and deliberating, finalizing our recommendations.

The next steps, meeting in Cartagena this week to review results of the survey we conducted within the working group and trying to work out basically which areas we need to work on further, which areas we need to discuss further. I mean we've had a lot of lengthy discussions to date.

For example, the one area which has brought up some interesting feedback has been a proposal that we put forward for an expedited transfer reverse policy. We felt that there weren't enough acronyms within the ICANN world so we thought we'd add a few of our own so we gave you the wonderful (ECHERP). And while this started out as one thing it's kind of mutated into something else and now we're trying to work out if we can bring it back to some level of sanity.

And then, of course, we can finalize our recommendations then we'll publish those for common comments. And we're hoping, I'm praying -- at least I'm praying -- to be able to get this put to bed by San Francisco. And if you want to read up any further on us our initial report is available there at the link up above. And if anybody has any questions please feel free.

Marika Konings: Are there any questions for Michele on that report?

(Mike): Yes.

Marika Konings: (Mike).

(Mike): Michele, I think it would be probably beneficial if you would just talk for another four or five minutes or three minutes or whatever about the ET - ERTTP with sort of some details about that, refer to the council that might not be familiar with it.

Michele Neylon: Yes, no problem. I mean, okay, basically one of the key questions that we've been asked to look at is in relation to high jacks of domains. I mean in the simplest terms you have a domain with a registrar and you wake up one morning and you discover that that domain is no longer with that registrar and possibly is no longer displaying the content that you expect it to display.

In the kind of more obvious cases would be, let's say, if an Amazon.com type website were suddenly to go offline because somebody had somehow managed to capture that domain name and was doing whatever with it.

Under the current policies there is an option for the - to escalate things back up to the registries. However, that can take quite a bit of time. The concern that people have is that if they - in the case of the Amazon scenario, while,

you know, sorting out your divorce or something it might be okay that it might take 60 days but if you're looking at a multi-million dollar website every hour that it's offline is going to cost that company thousands and thousands of dollars.

So how do you get it to get it back to a state that is, you know, what it was like previously. In the case - in what seems to happen in the current scenario is that registrars sort out the problem between themselves with a bit of assistance from the registries. So for example, if a registrar that you might work with might be talking with another registrar and they'd resolve it that way amicably and fair as quickly as they possibly could.

The problem, of course, is that if you are an intelligent highjacker you are going to choose to move the domain to a registrar that's either isn't that responsive or might be hard to track down, might have shortage of staff, any number of different scenarios.

So the group came up with the concept of this rapid return type process. The full details of what was put together and proposed is in the initial report but the basic idea being that if you were the original holder, registrant of the domain name that was purportedly highjacked, you would have an option to go back to the registrar you were dealing with originally and say, why the hell isn't my domain with you anymore, why is it pointing somewhere else, why is somebody else's details and WHOIS, etc., etc., etc. And that the domain would be reversed back to those original stakes very, very quickly.

Unfortunately, of course, the world is not a simple place so there are a lot of - I'm trying to think of the diplomatic way of putting this. There are a lot of complications with the entire scenario. The kinds of things that we're struggling with are things like, say for example, if I have a domain name that I

would consider to be, you know, a nice domain and you came along and you said, Michele, would you sell me that domain?

I'll give you \$1,000, let's say hypothetically; let's say \$10,000, make it more interesting. I go, cool, that's really nice, excellent. I can pay for a nice holiday this Christmas. So I give you the domain for \$10,000 and then a couple days later somebody else comes along and offers me 50. And I'm, like, oh God, what have I done? You know, I've given this - I've sold him this domain. Damn, what can I do? I know what I can do. I can use this little tool here that ICANN has created and I can abuse the living (beejesus) out of it and get that domain back and then sell it off to somebody else.

This kind of scenario is one of the problems we're facing. But it still doesn't solve the actual problem of the high value domain name being highjacked.

And then, of course, people (unintelligible) complications, think registries versus thin registries. You know, was the registrant listed in WHOIS at the time of the transfer, sort of legitimate domain holder or was that already the highjacker? The whole range of other things with this. And it's something that we've been deliberating at length, on detail, and quite excited I suppose. There's been a lot of passion brought in to it from various different parties.

But ultimately the thing is that we have to try and - we recognize that there is an issue but whether we can find a clean and sane way to deal with it or not is the problem.

Marika Konings: That okay (Mike)? Any other questions for Michele before we move on?

Looks like your explanations were perfectly clear. Thanks very much Michele for doing that. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Thank you.

Marika Konings: So next is Alan please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Wait before we get this presentation up? No, you go ahead. Thank you.

The first thing you see about our group is we weren't smart enough to come up with an acronym with a really nice pronounceable - or rather a name which has a really nice pronounceable acronym. PEDNR somehow sounds illegal or immoral or something, I don't know.

All right, for those who are new to the game the EDP is looking at to what extent registrants have the opportunity and knowledge to reclaim domain names if they let them expire. The EDP group was the working group formed July of last year. We're examining five specific questions associated with this that were defined by Council. And in an usual move Council also put into the charter what the outcomes would be, that is either consensus policy or best practices. Next.

An interim report was published, I believe for the Brussels meeting if I remember correctly. It included one of - our first part of the task was to survey the largest registrars, which I think existed of about nine or ten of ICANN's largest registrars to try to understand what their existing practices were. And that was published in the report.

One of the more interesting results of that was to find that the existing practices were not particularly bad but typically did not correspond to what the contract said at all.

And we summarized working group deliberations. We looked at some compliance information. We had down two different surveys of the working group and identified what positions were taken by working group members. And although it was called an initial report there were no recommendations included. We weren't at that stage but we did want an opportunity to talk to the public. Next.

As is common with any report, we did a public comment field and we got a number of - public comment forum and we got a number of comments that we have addressed and will be addressing in future recommendations. We also did something a little bit unusual; we did a survey. And the survey was aimed not at people in the working group, although one or two did answer, but at the user public or the general public. Those that read ICANN websites.

We got over 400 responses and the results were interesting I think to say the least. And we are now looking at where we're going from now in terms of the - all right, I was on the wrong slide on my own screen.

And we reviewed both the formal comments and the user survey. If we can go on to the next one please.

This is an example of the survey that was done within the workgroup. And you'll notice that the group is split. Top-half are essentially users of various forms, bottom-half are registrars and our one registry participant. And the shaded blue ones identify essentially the user perspective, which predominates.

The first column was one on asking, should registrars take some action to try to make sure that registrants know that if they let domains expire - if they don't have good contact information domains will expire or may expire. And

you can see users generally said it should be a consensus policy requiring registrars take some actions. Registrars said, no status quo or best practice.

The one item that we did have almost complete unanimity on was a change to WHOIS. Right now, because of the auto-renew grace period where the registry for .org, .com, .net and a number of other registries will automatically extend the registration for a year from the point of view of them and the registrar. And WHOIS is updated immediately.

So if your domain name has expired, you go into WHOIS, it will have an expiration a year from now. You say, I don't remember paying but I guess I did and walk away. But at this point you still don't have the domain name. So that user certainly felt that it should be changed and registrars are awful annoyed at customers complaining, saying, it says I renewed it, why did I really now. We'll come back to that one in a minute. Next screen.

Another example of the complete split in the working group between the two classes. And I'm highlighting the split for a reason, I'll go on to it in a minute. And this is what should happen, for instance, with the website. Should it keep on working for the whole expiration period or stop working. And there was a feeling among users that it should stop working and policy should say that. Not necessarily a belief by the registrars. Next screen.

The user survey had - said there was a large number of answers and it gave us a nice distribution of answers. This particular graph says how many warnings should there be prior to expiration. Now the current RIA - in a sort of backwards way implies that there should be two notices. It doesn't really say that but it sort of implies it. As you can see the typical user answer said three, some were more than three, some said two, a few said one. There were always

a small number of people, of course, who didn't answer the question. Next slide.

This was a question on - for what period of time after expiration should a user be able to renew the domain name. And one of the critical timings that you should know is that the auto-renew grace period has a maximum of 45 days. Under the EDDP consensus policy passed several years ago, it's limited to that. And typically registrars give about 30 days, it varies. And the answers, I think quite according to what we expected, centered around 30 days; some people said less, some people said more. Next screen.

All right. Where we are right now. We have compiled a set of recommendations, and they came from both registrars and the user community, and we are working our way through the list. The remarkable thing, and I say remarkable - if you look at the previous charts I had where there was a virtual complete split between registrars and users, I won't say we have full consensus but we're coming to agreement on almost of the issues.

There are a still ones which are thorny and it's not clear how we're going to resolve them. We may end up coming up with a final report with a majority and a minority report in it on a recommendation and report in a number of particular issues. But most of them we seem to be coming to closure on and I think that's a remarkable shift over the last couple of months. And I'm very optimistic whereas before I don't think I was nearly this optimistic.

The kinds of things we're looking at in terms of recommendations, and we're talking about recommendations for consensus policy, is a proposal to guarantee that registrants have a certain amount of time which to recover a domain name. The times we're talking about range from five days up to 30 or

so where we end up in the middle or if we end up with two different versions remains to be seen, though that's still certainly a thorny one.

We are looking at requirements on how many notices be sent and when they are sent. It's quite clear that a notice sent for a one-year registration that's sent two weeks after you buy the domain is not a practical way of reminding the registrant. On the other hand, sending it the day before expiration probably isn't practical either. So we're looking at a number of recommendations.

How domains behave post expiration, the general wisdom is that if you ignored all the messages - I say ignored, in many cases you may not have gotten them. They went into spam filters, they went to an email address you no longer use, or you just ignored them. The way to get someone's attention is ultimately have the domain stop working. This is a difficult one because if a domain is being used for a business you don't really want to stop the business's actions.

On the other hand, there is some strong evidence that people will not renew until you hit them over the head. And having something go black or not work - function well is hitting them over the head. It gets more interesting because a large number of domains are used only for email. So redirecting a website doesn't help wake them up in that case. The only thing that you could wake them up with is stop sending them email and hope they notice, not everyone does apparently based on the articles you see in newspapers occasionally.

But again, it's contentious because some people don't want to stop things from functioning but there is evidence that it may be the only way.

When the RGP was invented almost a decade ago, there was assumption among some of the people involved at that point that it would become a

consensus policy. However, Council never did it. It never, I guess, rose to a level of priority and we are now considering seriously that the RGP be made a consensus policy for all registrars and for most registries.

There appear to be some registries for which it just does not fit and we're looking at how and word exceptions around that. The real concern, however, is if you look at what happened I think when the RGP was invented there was only .org, .com, and .net. No? You were around it? Okay, so the (unintelligible) later. Info and biz also support it. None of the sponsored GTLD support it and none of the other news, unsponsored ones, support it either. The general belief is if it's not in the contract as a requirement probably none of the new GTLDs will support it either.

And the only way to make sure that's fixed is either put it in - make it a consensus policy or, of course, ICANN could willingly put it in the agreement for new GTLDs. But the (unintelligible) agreements have not included it so it looks like consensus policy is probably the way to force the issue.

We are talking about an exception process for registrars for some of the requirements. It would appear that this business practices around the world are sufficiently different that some of the policies that we think make sense completely in the Western market for instance may not work in other places.

An example is the case of making the web and email stop working shortly after expiration. There are registrars around who say no, we want to keep it going and we will take all means to try to make sure our customers know about it. We'll make phone calls. We'll go knock on their door. We'll wake up them up one way or another.

And we feel that we need to accommodate different business practices and that there somehow must be a process by which a registrar can say, we will not - we don't want to do what is in the detailed policy but we want to follow the intent. And we're still discussing how we can do that. It's an ugly issue that we prefer to not get into but we don't see any way of avoiding it.

And I think that is about all. References and open to any questions.

Marika Konings: Thanks Alan. Can I ask just about the mix that where you feel - what timeline you feel the group will reach the objectives and the next steps that you've just outlined?

Alan Greenberg: If this meeting was being held about six weeks ago I would have given a far more negative report than I am today. We were hoping the workgroup would have an opportunity to meet. The only time we were assigned was Thursday morning where we had - some members of the workgroup had as many as four conflicts. Some only had one. But it was clear the working group could not meet.

We tried finding another alternative, including 7:00 AM breakfast and things like that and we did not succeed. So we are not formally meeting. Some of us are talking in the halls, things like that. So I had hoped to come out of this meeting almost a signed agreement, at least among the people in the workgroup but that won't happen. But I'm optimistic within some number of weeks into the new year we will be able to come to closure on all or almost all of the issues and be able to start drafting a final report. I'm optimistic. But Marika knows better so let her speak.

Marika Konings: Just to add maybe because as the initial report didn't have any recommendations or draft recommendations in it, the idea would be as well

that there was probably a draft on the report, or whatever we called it, would be put out for public comment before there is a final report to make sure that everyone has an opportunity to comment on the recommendations.

Alan Greenberg: My apologies. Marika keeps on reminding me to say that and I sort of assume it's a given that when we make recommendations we have to go out for comment but, yes, we do have to go out for comments.

Marika Konings: Thanks. Any questions for Alan. Okay. Alan, thank you very much.

Alan Greenberg: You're welcome.

Marika Konings: And we'll now move on to Edmon for the Internationalized Registration Data working group.

Edmon Chung: Thank you (unintelligible).

Marika Konings: Just need one second for (Judy), please.

Edmon Chung: As that's coming up I guess I'll start by saying that a lot of the work - and just take this opportunity to thank (Julie) and (Steve) for the tremendous staff support on this to make, you know - to guide us, well, to help us through the process. Up, okay.

So the - sorry, no. We have more time than we're - okay. So we're - anyway. It shouldn't take too long I hope but, okay, let's get started then.

This is the Internationalized Registration Data working group, otherwise known as IRD. It's a joint - actually it's joint working group from the GNSO and the SVAC. And it's looking into the internationalized registration data.

We often talk about it as sort of WHOIS data that I'll jump into that in a bit. So just as IDNs are being deployed and we're talking about IDN TLDs now as well so that's - this is the sort of work that the working group is tasked to do.

So we'll talk about what we were discussing, just an update. And then we did have a set of - a report out with some preliminary recommendations. I'll go through that and I think that's a more important part of it. We need some more input from the community now. We did put out some preliminary recommendations. So next slide.

Before we started we quickly realized that when we talked about WHOIS, this word WHOIS, there are very different - you know, there are a few different things that we're really talking about. And we sort of identified three so that we have a common terminology as we go through the discussion so we don't confuse ourselves too much.

The first one is what we call WHOIS protocol is the protocol itself and what's in the RFCs. And then the second one is the service, whether it's - you're using a text-base client or you're using web-based client, the actual directory service that you get WHOIS data from. And then the third part when sometimes we call WHOIS is the data itself. So the protocol, the service, and the data; three different things that we sometimes just lump into calling WHOIS.

And then we also - there is a particular terminology that we use, what we call must be present script. I'll come back to this but it essentially means the ASCII representation of certain things and that's just to - in terms of the terminology that we use. Thanks.

So when we started we know that there's the IDN guidelines from ICANN and, of course, the IDN standards stuff but for the WHOIS side of things, the service, both the data and the WHOIS and the service, the WHOIS service itself, there are no standards at this point. Next slide.

And so really the objectives of the IRD working group was to identify the, you know, what we need to do to internationalize the domain registration data and also how to come up with a set of requirements for the WHOIS protocol for the internationalized. I think we - from the ICANN community point of view, we're probably not - may not be specifying exactly the WHOIS protocol but - the requirements for what needs to be internationalized in the WHOIS protocol.

So we jumped into - the discussion that we had is, you know, starting with whether the fixing US (unintelligible) protocol is capable of supporting internationalized registration data, how the querying on the display of internationalized registration data, along with variance, is I think - by now you've heard of IDN variance, especially for Chinese and some of the language, what that needs to be done - what needs to be done in the WHOIS side of things.

And then of course the capabilities needed in the directory services side. How to accommodate users because user, as we go into an IDN world, there are users in this world where English or ASC-based system really isn't the way they communicate and isn't the way they write their address or contact information.

So how do we accommodate for that? So what we have done is that we came up with a few models for dealing with internationalized registration product

data at a policy level and also some preliminary (reservations) for consideration.

Next slide. So we, you know, quite quickly realized that the who is protocol itself as it is right now is really, there really isn't a mechanism to, well at least not a standardized mechanism to support internationalized data.

So, you know, there is no particular mechanism to indicate the character set and, you know, there's basically WHOIS is a fairly would you say freestyle type of protocol.

Next, and so in terms - one of the things that the group quickly started tackling was the issue of variant. And we're looking to IDN variants. This is one of the things that is sort of specific to IDN, which is different from regular ASC registration.

So however, beyond the who is implications, what and how variants are defined, how variant should be handled in terms of policy, that we have decided, you know, that's sort of outside of the scope of the IRD working group.

However, what is in scope is that if a name is in the zone, in the DNS, then it should be reflected in who is services. And that's sort of the distinction we're making.

So and what we've identified is that there are two, sort of two types of variant. There's variants which are in the zone, along with the primary IDN. And there are variants who are just reserved.

And basically our current recommendation would be that the, for what is called activated variant, which are the variants that are in the zone, in the DNS, along with this primary IDN.

Those variants should also have information through - you should be able to get the who is information through the who is service. So and in terms of reserved variants, that would be somewhat of a matter of the local policy.

Just to illustrate that a little bit more, what we really mean is that reserved variants, we sort of treat them sort of like reserved names. We do have reserved names so to speak in the TLB.

But, you know, if you go to the IANA who is right now, you won't see them. But if you - there are reserved names in certain registries. And if you go to the who is in say dot Asia, then you would see some response.

So in terms of reserved variants, that's sort of a decis - that's sort of a recommendation so far. And to illustrate that, next slide. Wasn't there a slide to illustrate the who is (it might)?

So, oh actually going on along with the variant issue, what we're saying is that the who is clients should be able to sub-query and the who is (part) should be able to display information in what is called the U Label, as well as the A label.

U label is the sort of the native form of the IDN. And A label is the ASC form of the IDN. So both should be supported by who I clients, and then - the clients and servers.

And for the variants, they should be, sorry, I'm just, on that particular point and also that the U Label is sort of the native form as well as the ASC form should be returned together so that, you know, whoever is querying it can see both forms.

And I think the next one is the example. There you go. So this is a sort of example of what we're recommending. So you see that when you query for a particular IDN name, you could query it in either the U Label form, which is the native language, or the A Label form, the ASC label form.

And then when you get the response, both the domain in U Label and the domain in the A Label would be returned so you can see both. And also you would see the variant that are activated.

So the - you would also see in the who is response displayed the variant that is also in the DNS zone, along with the primary domain. So this is the - an example of what we mean.

Next, and then there were a number of items in the who is data that we find we sort of cruised through some of the things that could be internationalized. So we talked about the domain name side, which we said both the U Label and the A Label should be there.

And somewhat similarly the name servers because you would have in the who is response name server names. And what the recommendation right now is to have that the A Label must be there. And you should be able to present the U Label optionally.

We also identified in terms of the sponsoring registrar, we feel that the, it should at least have an ASC representation. So, you know, if people want to figure out which registrar, that's what it is right now.

So we sort of recommended that to remain. And (cell phone) we'd follow the international standards basically. And then the email - emails is also going through an internationalization.

And we're referring to the RSV for the email address internationalization. So basically following that standard for the collection of email if they're in an internationalized format.

And then for the registration status, that should, the EPP code should continue to be published exactly, you know, what the (root) code is and what the actual status, description of the status, that might be up to the registry and registrants.

In terms of dates we haven't quite come to discussion about the dates, but how the dates should be formatted. But I think that shouldn't be a big issue - point. So next slide.

What we - the, sort of the meat of the discussion was in terms of the four - we came up with four models to represent registration date - registrant contact data.

And these, the four approaches that we wanted to get more input from the community on what the policy should be. Model 1 is essentially somewhat like I would say, you know, sort of like a status quo that we would require a registrant to provide contact data in a must be present strips like in ASC.

And that being the requirement. And then optionally they can provide their contact information. That's the address information in their own local script. That's Model 1.

Model 2 is that the registrant would provide it in their own local script only. And so the who is will not contain contact information in ASC or English form.

But the registrar contact, there will be a registrar point of contact. And that registrar point of contact needs to be able to deal with transliteration of translation.

And so Model 3 is that registrants, Model 3 would be for registrants to provide, again provide their information in their own language, in their local language.

But the registrars are being tasked to create a transliteration of that data and present it in the list.

Model 4 is similar to Model 3 except, you know, except that it's instead of providing - the registrar providing just a transliteration, would be providing a translated version.

I'll come to an example so to get better illustrated. So next slide. So Model 1, as you see, you know, there's a Russian example and an Chinese example. What it is is that the registrant itself must provide information in a must be present format, essentially in ASC.

So the registrant is tasked to provide the information in ASC. That's Model Number 1. That's sort of like status quo, not quite, but sort of like status quo.

Model 2, Model 2 is that the registrant data would only be in their local language. So as you see in this example here, the Russian example or the Chinese example then the address and the contact name, they only exist in their own local language.

However, there at the top you can see a registrar point of contact. And that - there needs to be a registrar point of contact where people who want to contact the registrant would go to. That's Model 2.

Model 3, here you see that Model 3 is that the registrant provides the information in their own local language. But the registrar then needs to transliterate the information into a must be present strip, basically transliterate into ASC.

And this is Model 3. And I wanted to point out Model 4, yes. Model 4 is similar except that you can see that in the let's say for the Chinese example you can see (Sen Gen) Guang Dong Province and apartment whatever (Loudon) Village.

And that's the translation. So the registrar is tasked to translate what is - what they received into English essentially. So when we go back to the Model 3, you can see that the difference is that right now you see (Loudon) (Trend 13) (Dong) whatever.

And then (Sen Gen) Guang Dong Sheng which means (Sen Gen) Province. And the address (Jong Wog) is (Chi), or Peoples Republic of China. So this is the difference between Model 3 and Model 4.

In Model 3 it's a transliteration provided the registrar which may or may not be able to actually be used. And Model 4 is to require a translation so.

And then just to reiterate some of the preliminary recommendations that we have come out with. In terms of the who is protocol clients and the client and the server, as I mentioned, what we're recommending is that the, both the U Label and A Label will be able to be submitted.

And also displayed together in the display results. And then also in terms of the variant, that should also be presented as well if the variant is in the zone and is activated.

And in terms of the data itself, there - the, again it's sort of similar for the data, the A Label and U Label should be, could be sort of, must be included. Both of which both in the query and also for the name server names.

As well for if the name server names are in IDN format then both the A Label and the U Label. Also for the as I mentioned the registrar information we are recommending that it stay in US ASC format so that a lot of people, it's sort of like existing work, so you can contact the registrar.

And then for the EPP status code, that for the registration status, that needs to be in the EPP standards status code format.

So basically it boils down to there, I mentioned about the four models in terms of the who is information - internationalized registration data for contact and contact name and contact address.

We need input from the community on which direction to take. And then also on the preliminary recommendations, whether you, you know, people think

there - they make sense. And whether we missed out some things that needs to be internationalized and we haven't considered.

So I think that's the end of the presentation.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Edmon. Does anybody have a question?

Man: Edmon is there a - has any thought been given to where this data resides in? Or are you implying that it all, it resides with the registrars, thinking in context of a thick registry?

Or do both the registrar and the registry maintain that data? So if it is given say in Model 4 and both in the registrar translation, does all that data go to the registry?

Or any - or is there any assumption as to who is the authoritative in that thick registry model who is authoritative till the registry?

Edmon Chung: I think it was the discussion, the intention was that it was, you know, sort of (act not), it doesn't really matter what is a thin registry or thick registry, regis - thin or thick registry.

And right now, at least the intention is for the registrar who has the relationship with the contact, regardless of whether it's a thin registry or thick registry, it's the registrar that has the relationship with the registrant and the contact to provide the information.

Whether it's Model 3 or 4 where some transliteration or translation would take place.

Man: Okay so well my question was is that the translated data for example, or the transliterated data, is that getting passed to the registry in a thick model then?

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Michele Neylon: (Mike).

(Mike): Forgive me if I missed this. So the initial report is done. Is it out for public comment now? Or what's the next steps for the council if any?

Edmon Chung: It is out for public comments. It was originally going to close in mid January. But because it's about internationalized data, we did a translation of the report into different various languages.

And I think now it's, Julie, it's...

Julie Hedlund: Yes, it's March 14 we had it translated into, it was originally in English. And we translated it into the other five UN languages and extended the time period for comment to ensure that those languages have the same amount of time to view the document.

But the work group will continue to meet and consider other questions that they have not yet addressed and also any comments coming out of that period while it's open.

Edmon Chung: So to answer your question, there's really no council action at this time. Just an update and trying to get more people to participate and give us the feedback through the comment period.

Man: Can I just ask Edmon, did you see during your work on the actual format of the who is, did anyone ever suggest that you have a language tag? Because it may not be obvious to some what the language is. Do you understand what I mean?

Edmon Chung: That's a good point. I think the language tag issue did come up at one point. I think we sort of missed it when we, but the language tag on the domain name, that was...

Man: Yes.

Edmon Chung: But then you're talking about language tag on the contact information as well?

Man: No, I'm talking about lan - I mean I presume that the contact information would be the same, in the same language as the domain name if it's shown in - and that may not be a fair assumption actually. In which case you'd need some on both.

Edmon Chung: But that's really good input. I think we probably missed that. And so it's a good thing. We should look into that.

Michele Neylon: Yes, Adrian was next actually and then Philip and then (Jeff).

Man: And Stefan will probably jump in any time in between those guys. Just be...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Actually, sorry, I've got it actually wrong. It was Philip next and.

Adrian Kinderis: Keep it up laughing boy. Edmon, I'm just going to go out on a limb here. I don't get a lot of what you're talking about.

And I just feel like there is a fear that we're going to get to turn something, and it's just either I will require a lot of bandwidth to get up to speed. And I hope I'm speaking for some others here otherwise, you know, I really am as stupid as I think.

Avri's confirmed that. So, yes so in other words it's going to take a lot of bandwidth. Or I'm going to end up voting on something I know nothing about.

And I know that it's not necessarily your fault. But this sounds like it's very, very technical. But at the same time, as Avri has just been helping me out, it's a policy. It's not an idea thing. It's a policy decision around something that is incredibly technical.

And at that, I'm struggling to keep up with this. So, you know, what - maybe the end question is is there a fear here or do you even care that this will come across with the next steps whether we vote on the recommendations that you believe the councils will be voting on something that they don't know?

Or I mean is, am I alone here? Maybe that's the better way to ask the question. If so, you don't even need to answer it. Are there any other councilors here that are very comfortable with this?

Mike Rodenbaugh: I don't understand what you mean, I'm sorry, this is Mike Rodenbaugh. I don't understand what you mean by the super-complicated technical issues here Adrian.

You know, I'm certainly could barely spell DNS. But I don't really, I don't see any issues.

Adrian Kinderis: I like that. And I'm using that. More around the recommendations themselves with respect to how they impact the character sets in the variant.

Stefan Van Gelder: This is on the report that you've obviously read I hope.

Adrian Kinderis: I beg your pardon?

Stefan Van Gelder: You've obviously read the reports so you understand more.

Adrian Kinderis: No, I haven't read the reports Stefan, okay.

((Crosstalk))

Adrian Kinderis: So maybe that's what I'm saying. I admitted that it would take a lot of bandwidth for me to get up to speed. You know, I can't read every report on every topic. That's why there's three councilors here.

And I'll take their advice on some. I'm talking about from the stakeholder groups.

((Crosstalk))

Adrian Kinderis: If the short answer is you just want me to shut up and read it all and get up to speed, then that's it. I'll take that on board but.

Edmon Chung: No, no. I think I should take part of the blame. I probably presented it in not very - in a very friendly way. There are certain parts of it which is a little bit more technical like the variants issues.

But there are certain parts where clearly it's fairly simple. And in terms of the four models, like what should registrars require registrants to - what information you should collect.

Adrian Kinderis: Yes.

Edmon Chung: So...

Adrian Kinderis: So it's not so much that that I'm having trouble with as I said.

Edmon Chung: So I think our job probably is to try to, for the parts where it's a little bit more technical, try to crystallize it a little better for the council as we move forward.

But I think overall, the - there are few major policy decisions that need to be made. And at this point, because it's still sort of an interim report, there - we branched out a few things. So that sort of made it more complicated.

Once we can up, you know, we end up with a final set of recommendations, it might be better crystallized for you.

Michele Neylon: Okay. I have, so Philip, (Jeff) and Tim.

Philip Sheppard: Hi (Jim), it's Philip Sheppard. In the report, have you gone down those options yet and done analysis in terms of strengths and weaknesses of some of them?

Edmon Chung: Yes. Well actually there are, in the report there is, you know, some of the discussion, the actual discussion that took place, you know, like Model 1, Model 2 and Model 3 and Model 4 of what, you know, the participants thought.

For example Model 3 and Model 4 requires the registrar to do some extra work. Is that going to cost more? So yes. In the report it actually says that. I haven't put out the (unintelligible). But there is some but.

Philip Sheppard: And in that analysis, I mean I was curious to see the suggestion of what some of it could be translations and transliterations done at the registrar level? Because, I mean both those things are more awesome than science and there's often options in terms of the way you do them.

And without determining in advance a one method and standardized method in that exists all of our scripts to do it. You will end up with variations in translation and transliterations based on the same script. Which just strikes me as being not a good way to go. Was that discussed?

Edmon Chung: I think that was discussed to a certain extent. And that's exactly why it's left to the registrar which has the contact with the registrant. And also have the local context within which transliterations or translations are being done.

And that's sort of the idea. And I don't quite get what, you know, let's say there are Registrant A, Registrant B. They live in let's say China, different parts of China.

They might have, well let's say in Hong Kong versus in Mainland China versus in Taiwan. Then they probab - we do have different transliteration sort of conventions.

And so the registrant would have different ways of presenting it. And I don't think that would be an issue. I don't know whether Julie or Steve wants to add to that.

Steve Shang: At the beginning the issue about translation is the cost I think. This is Steve Shang, one of the staff supporting the working group. The issue with translation is the cost implications to registrants. And that's being signaled as a major barrier.

There were some suggestions about automated translations. And actually, you know, if you are using Google's translation service, they've done a pretty good job.

But to what extent that technologies can be leveraged in registration systems, that question we don't know. (Unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: The, but one more thing just quickly is we also considered whether the information ultimately is usable in a way that let's say the postal address.

And when it's transliterated, I don't think we expect that you could actually write on a, you know, an envelope and send it. But it does allow certain mechanism like lack of a better word, harvesting to figure out some data about certain registrations.

And for example I understand that even IPR lawyers or law enforcement sometimes take a look at who is in due pattern matching. That would help, you know, certain tools if certain transliteration is done.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, (Jeff).

(Jeff): Actually it's a really good segway to the question I have. In the new version of the applicant guide book there's a, there used to be a version, locked version that said that each registry had to have a searchable who is and pretty much define everything that's searchable.

They removed that sort of. But said that they're setting up a board committee, not GNSO, but a board committee that's going to look at this. And the board committee could re-introduce it.

Putting aside the very large policy problem of having a board committee that determines top down to policy. If there is a requirement that's put back in to make everything searchable, is that even going to be possible under this?

And what kind of - if all of these have to be searchable, whether it's the A or the U, that's a tremendous requirement on registry. It would just be incredible.

So, and I doubt the group's considered it. But I think it's something that the group may want to flag for the board of directors before they unilaterally make a decision as to what should be searchable and not for new GTLDs.

Edmon Chung: Yes, that, we're actually out of time. So can I, sorry. I mean (Mike) I know you've got your hand up but Tim was next. And we're over time as it is. So can I just go to Tim and then cut this short?

Okay in that case, (Mike) do you want to (unintelligible).

Man: Just to explain it a little bit further, why it is such a burden on a registry to make a few extra fields searchable, I don't get it?

(Jeff): Take a look at the SLAs. Take a look at the language they've added then we can talk about it off line. But it's a large - much larger - the more data you have, the more searchability you have, the burden it is on the registry system and registrar system.

Man: Okay thanks. Thanks Edmon, thanks Edmon, Alan, Adam and Michele. And we'll go straight into the next session which will be chaired by Olga. It's the (rap abuse), the (rap), not abuse.

END