**Internationalized Registration Data Working Group**
**Meeting Notes**
**11 October 2010**

**Attendees:** Edmon Chung, Jim Galvin, Jeremy Hitchcock, Robert Hutchinson, Steve Metalitz, Owen Smigelzki; from staff: Julie Hedlund, Dave Piscitello, and Steve Sheng

The Working Group (WG) continued discussion of the Staff Summary of Issues 30 July 2010.  Refer to the MP3 for the detailed discussion.

**Preliminary Report**

Julie noted that the staff will prepare for Working Group review a draft preliminary report to be presented at the ICANN meeting in Cartagena in December.  The report will have three primary sections: 1) a description of what the Working Group discovered; 2) preliminary findings; and 3) recommendations for future work.

**General Discussion on the Staff Summary Document**

Ram noted that the models at the end of the document are very good and should be included in the preliminary report up front with some specific examples.  Steve Metalitz emphasized that the report should include the correct language: script or ASCII, not English language.  Ram pointed out many areas in the Summary Document that were no longer accurate based on the recent discussions.  Julie noted that the report will reflect recent discussions.

**Discussion of the Models**

Jim wondered which model the Working Group should and how to make a decision on the models.  Ram said the Working Group could recommend the formation of an additional Working Group to address future work.  Dave noted that each model should be explained so that people can understand the issues the Working Group is addressing.  Edmon emphasized that there does not necessarily have to be another Working Group; instead of the charter of this Working Group could be extended.   Jim asked again how the Working Group would decide on which model to choose.  Julie noted that the Working Group Charter provides guidelines for decision making and sent the link to the charter.  Bob noted that there is a fourth model – translation into a major language – that should be included.  This model could include the option for computer assisted automated translation.  Edmon agreed that this model needed to be included for the sake of completeness and to reflect the Working Group's discussions.  However, he added that any recommendations should distinguish between recommendations for technical solutions and a policy mandate.  Bob emphasized that the report should provide enough information to give people a reasonable understanding of each model and that there should be a mechanism to obtain community comments.  Edmon agreed and said that there should be a report to the GNSO Council.  Julie said that the report will be scheduled

for the weekend before the ICANN meeting and that there would also be a public session to provide the report and get community feedback during the ICANN meeting.  Edmon noted that it would be helpful if the public session could be coordinated to correspond with a session on WHOIS.  Steve Metalitz said that it was okay to present other models to reflect the Working Group's discussion and comments on the models.  Bob asked whether there could be a public survey to get comments on the models, as opposed to a public comment period.  Steve Metalitz said that he would prefer to present the models in a public comment forum.  Jim Galvin said that a survey would be a better way to get comments from the community.  Edmon agreed that a survey would be good, but that the Working Group should do both, ideally prior to the meeting in Cartagena: 1) preliminary report and 2) survey.   Julie agreed that the staff would provide a draft preliminary report for the Working Group to consider and explore the possibility of conducting a survey.