20130925_WHOISIRD_ID819438

Steve Sheng: Okay. Thank you. Good morning. Good evening. Everyone -- sorry, it's been very noisy. Welcome to today's 25th of September call on the Who Is Review Team Internationalized Registration Data implementation working group. On the call, we have Jung, Nishit, Dennis, Jody, Naoki, Sarmad, Edmund, Margie, Takao, and Jim, and myself. So we have everyone on the call. For the transcript purpose, when you speak, could you state your name first so that it's easier for the scribers to identify you. Let me -- we do not have audio in the Adobe Connect before we start, but we do have Adobe Connect room. It's sent in through the invite, if you haven't joined, the invite to do that.

For today's agenda, I think we'll spend some time talking about the self-nominate for the chair and selection of the chair. Then we'll do a presentation of the SSAC GNSO IRD (ph) report. I think Sarmad, and Edmund, and Jim both were on that working group and I think Sarmad will present the GNSO IRD report, because Edmund do not have good connection. And then we'll have a presentation of the SAC 54 SSAC report on registration data model by Jim (inaudible). Are there any other business people would like to raise before we get started?

Okay. I thought of one. Since last time, Margie and Edmund was not on the call and also Nishit, Margie and Nishit, would it be possible if you quickly introduce yourself to the working group? Margie?

Margie Ryland: Sure. This is Margie Ryland (ph). I'm with ITM (ph) staff in the strategy department and I'm responsible for overseeing the implementation of the various Who Is review team recommendations. And this work, in particular, is one of the recommendations as it relates to internationalized registration data. So I'm looking forward to working with you all and am here if you have any further questions on the role of this group, and the work that's being done with respect to the Who Is review team implementation efforts. Thank you.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Margie. Edmund? Edmund is in a bad reception area. Let's go to Nishit first and then when Edmund comes back, he can introduce himself. Nishit?

Nishit: Hi, this is Nishit from (inaudible). I have been involved in various projects (inaudible) language processing and also involved in various research and development activities. And I'm also working on Indian (inaudible) for internationalized domain names for 22 official languages of India.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Nishit. I think glad that you could join us. I think the perspective from Devanagari and Indic languages will be a great asset here. Edmund, have you joined back? Let me see. Edmund? Okay. I haven't heard Edmund yet. Okay. So let's move

	onto number two, nomination, self-nomination for the chair. In the last call, and this is from, and my apologies, I have not sent out the meeting notes yet. I've asked people to self-nominate. I haven't heard anyone on the mailing list, but on this call, are there people would like self-nominate or nominate others?
Jim Galvin:	So this is Jim Galvin for the transcript. I'll step up to be chair if no one objects.
Steve Sheng:	Thank you, Jim. You self-nominate yourself. Okay. Good. Anybody else?
Sarmad Hussain:	Hi. This is Sarmad. I'd like to second Jim for the chair because of his experience in this.
Steve Sheng:	Thank you, Sarmad, for the second. Okay. Anybody else wish to be -- to put their names in or nominate someone else? Okay, are there anyone -- okay, hearing none, are there anyone object to Jim being the chair?
Dennis Tan:	No objection. This is Dennis.
Steve Sheng:	Okay. Thank you, Dennis.
Jody Kolker:	This is Jody. No objection.
Steve Sheng:	Thank you, Jody.
Takao:	This is Takow. No objections. I think he'd be great.
Steve Sheng:	Thank you.
Takao:	No objection. Tuong.
Steve Sheng:	Thank you. Nishit? Go ahead.
Nishit:	No objection (inaudible), Nishit.
Unidentified Participant:	(Inaudible) no objections.
Steve Sheng:	Okay. Edmund, can you hear us? Okay. Edmund is on Adobe Connect. Let me just make sure of this. Okay. Let me just make sure to get Edmund respond. Okay. I saw Edmund wrote in the Adobe Connect, not at all, very supportive of Jim. So Jim, I think you have the vote from everybody. So congratulations for being the chair. Would you like to take over the call from here?
Jim Galvin:	Well, first, let me say thank you. I appreciate the support from everyone. I'm happy to take on the responsibility here. And no, Steve, I think you're doing a fine job and I'll let you proceed forward here. And we're just going to do some information here today to kind of level set and then you and I can work offline after this call to propose a work plan for the committee moving forward.
Steve Sheng:	Thank you, Jim.
Jim Galvin:	Happy to turn it back to you. Thanks.
Steve Sheng:	Thank you, Jim. Let's move onto presentation of the SSAC and GNSO IRD report. Sarmad, would you be able to present this? Let me just put the slide because Edmund doesn't have a good connection. Sarmad, would you be able to present the IRD report? Sorry, I think I was on mute earlier. Sarmad?

Sarmad Hussain:	Yeah, sorry, it was on mute. So I can go through this and Jim, Edmund, please feel free to jump in, in case you want to add more details (inaudible) more background on this. Okay. So shall we get started?
Steve Sheng:	Yes, Sarmad. I gave you control of the slide. So you can advance it or would you like me to advance it?
Sarmad Hussain:	Let's see. Okay. All right. So the background of this work is that when IDN (ph) discussions are started again and IDNs were to be delegated at top level, there was discussion that the Who Is information also needs to be in local scripts. But there was -- the current standards were probably not supportive of having this data. And so basically, work started on -- there was a group formed, which was a joint group between SSAC and GNSO, which was to look at the feasibility and suitability of introducing internationalized registration data for IDNs.

So some of the questions, which were addressed by the working group included is it suitable to internationalized domain name registration data. If so, what data elements is suitable to be internationalized. A second question was, is it suitable to introduce (inaudible) specification to deal with the internationalization of legislation data. So the first one was more on storage and the second one was more on display.

Other questions included is the current two-way system capable of handling the (inaudible) and display of IRD. So this related more to the service rather than the content of (inaudible) of the system and is it feasible to introduce display specifications to deal with IRD. That seems to be similar to the one before. So as far as the response to these was concerned, so the first question was is it suitable to internationalize domain names for legislation data and the obvious answer was yes because IDNs are to be used for (inaudible) people who are mono -lingual, supposedly, and mono-lingual in possibly other scripts, not just Latin script. So if they are to represent themselves online, they would most likely be able to do so by providing the registration data in their own script.

So that was the motivation behind it. The group also looked at individual elements and there was need to and possibility for internationalizing some elements. There were other elements which were sometimes mostly (inaudible) and so on. So they didn't need to be internationalized in that context, but the Latin digits (ph) or some other mechanisms could be used. There were standards available for some of these fields, but these are things which are still need to be finalized. There was some determinations given. They're listed in the slide here for different elements within the registration data.

So for example, entity names and addresses, if you look at the last slide, needed to be internationalized in local languages. But for domain names, the standard both A label and B label was sufficient. One of the questions which came up and was debated upon was that if the main aim or motivation behind the registration data is that it gives visibility of who owns a domain name to the rest of the world. And one of the challenges of using local scripts is that even though people can specify that data in local script for themselves, if it's in a local language then the data is more visible, well it is visible but it's not easily interpretable by people around the globe. So is it that the data should be only in local script, or should it also be translated into another script?

And that is one of the questions which perhaps needs to be answered at some point. And then another associated issue with that was whether it should be translation or transliteration and then what would be -- how accurate would these transliterations or translations be and how accurate do they need to be. The second question is it suitable to reduce discipline specifications to deal with internationalized registration data and the answer was yes, it was needed. No standard format is required for elements of a domain name to registration (inaudible) such as contact information, first names, (inaudible), and domain name status. And therefore, the community would benefit from a standard registration data (inaudible). |

The next question was that is the current Who Is system capable of handling the quality and display of IRD. The short answer to that was that the current Who Is, is not internationalized. So some mechanism needs to be developed to enable this and there are some efforts, which are going on, to do this to address this. Next question was is it feasible to introduce display specifications to (inaudible) IRD. The answer was yes, most elements have existing standard that apply to them individually. It's still maybe up for debate because for some elements they may be more than one standards. And so one would need to see which one would apply.

So at the end, the study gives us a few recommendations. I'm just going to read through them. ICANN staff should develop in consultation with the community a data model for domain registration data. The data model should specify elements of registration data, the flow, the data flow, and the formal data (inaudible). The data model should also include tagging information from language and scripts. The second recommendation is that (inaudible) to develop any issues with both on translation and transliteration of the context information. The issues report should consider whether it is desirable to translate or take information to a single common language, or transliterate context information towards a new common script.

The third recommendations is the ICANN community should work to identify a directory service that meets the needs of internationalized (inaudible) and service requirements enumerated in (inaudible) service record. So basically, the recommendations call for defining a data model, a service for -- and a service for enabling this data model and the third and final recommendation was that some translation, transliteration mechanism is perhaps needed to make this data through these services available to larger global audience. So that's it. Thank you.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Sarmad. Edmund, do you want to chime in? Is there anything you want to add, Edmund or Jim, since you were co-chairs of the working group?

Jim Galvin: This is Jim. Not for me. Sarmad did a great job.

Steve Sheng: Thank you. Edmund?

Edmund: This is Edmund. I don't know whether you (inaudible). I know (inaudible) for this noisy background. No, I don't have anything much to add. I thank you so much for (inaudible) pretty good background of what has been discussed before as a basis for where we're going to (inaudible).

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Edmund. Working group members, do you have questions for Sarmad, or Jim, or Edmund on this report?

Jim Galvin: Steve, if I may just for a moment?

Steve Sheng: Oh, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. It just occurred to me, it might be useful just to point out to people that all of these recommendations, or the last two anyway are actually in progress. I mean the first recommendation for the data model was not the first time that recommendation had been put forth to the community. But that's the reason why we are now in existence is to look at that. The translation and transliteration of contact information recommendation is also in progress. The issues report has done and there's a PDP that's now in progress to look at this issue and the directory service recommendation is already active work in the IETF. You're going to love the name, people who have heard the name Weird (ph), yours is the name of the working group in the IETF, which is looking at a new directory service protocol that should be able to replace Who Is. So I just wanted to make sure that everyone was up to date on all those activities too.

Steve Sheng:	Thank you, Jim, for that update. Any questions for Sarmad or Jim on the IRD report? Okay. Hearing no questions, let's move onto the next presentation, asset report on registration data model. If you still have questions for the IRD report, you can type it in the chat room so that we can come back to it at the end. But let me load up the slide for the data model. And Jim, would you be represented?
Jim Galvin:	Yes, I can do that but you have to give me a moment here. I just lost my internet connectivity and I've got to get it back. While you're bringing it up, maybe I can pull (inaudible) very quickly. I think I'm back in the room, right?
Steve Sheng:	Go ahead, Jim. Now you have the control of the slides.
Jim Galvin:	Okay. Give me minute to, oh, I see. Just got to figure out -- there we go. Make this thing work. Okay. So slide 54. There were multiple activities and documents that were occurring at the same time. This document was actually immediately followed stack (ph) 51, which was a document which proposed a taxonomy for quiz discussions, trying to divide the term Who Is up into three parts, something which spoke about the data model, the protocol, and the directory services separately. And immediately following that, SSAC undertook this document, which was focused on the data representation, domain name registration data part of the taxonomy. At recommendation 51, we had suggested that we should have a data model. What SSAC did in stack 54 was to propose a data model, in fact, for community discussion.

And then as we just saw in the IRD report, there was a repeat recommendation to the community to develop a data model and SSAC has actually recommended multiple times in a couple of other documents the need for a data model. So actually, quite enthused and energized about having this working group and being able to get into this activity.

One of the issues that SSAC first ran into was trying to figure out what was the basis for the data model for domain name registration data. It's interesting to note that the current data requirements is -- exist in multiple places in the ICANN community. I mean there are specifications in registrar and registry agreements, escrow agreements have a different set of rules, and of course internationalized registration data is bringing new requirements to bear on the data that needs to be present for a domain name.

So it was one of our first challenge in trying to propose this data model was to come up with a basis for how to hold the data together, how to hold the model together, what was its theme. So what we came up with was realizing that the requirement was to be able to support structured and extensible data. One of the other things that's' interesting is different registries have additional requirements. As you look at all of the various places, their specifications, the data elements are included. There are certain registries that have particular requirements that are different from others. So there would be a base set of data elements, ideally, that all would have to have. But you'd have to allow for the option for different registries with particular communities that they serve and having particular needs to also be able to include data elements in their model, so that they could manage the data registration.

And I'm sorry, who joined? Is somebody rejoining maybe? All right, moving on. So what we decided, and this is just a starting point for discussion, was that the model for domain name registration data could in fact be based on documenting the life cycle of a domain name from the moment that that domain name is registered, the registration is first created, until the moment that it is released and available for someone else to grab the registration. And within that model, the purpose of collecting data would be to manage (inaudible) that happen for a domain name during that life cycle. And with that as a starting point, we came up with the life cycle of a typical domain name.   And you can see here as you start as a registrant, the first question that one always asks is, is a name available. |

As the transaction gets past the registrar up to the registry, it comes back and then as part of the registration process, essentially have conceptually three categories of information that are stored about a domain name registration. You've got your contact information stored as the Who Is record. You've got your DNS information, which makes the name usable and useful to the community at large. And then you've got the rest of the stuff that the registry needs in order to manage the registration. So the data model that we were proposing her is simply an enumeration of data elements. It's intended to be a descriptive model, not prescriptive. And what's most important to include the attributes of each of those data elements. And then, of course, some appropriate parameters, and in this discussion we care a great deal about the encoding, the language that's used. But there are other things that might be relevant to a particular data element.

And then the way to manage -- the proposed way to manage different registries that might have differences in their data models is you create a list of data elements and you have one model, which is simply a menu of those elements and all of the parameters and attributes about that. And you draw from that to create a profile. And if you (inaudible) in a technical way using a language such as XML, for example, then you create a way in which you can conveniently extend your profile to include those data elements that are important to you, and in fact, everyone can interoperate because you have a single set of enumeration of elements that everyone can understand because it's defined.

So the particular recommendation that we made here was we sort of proposed this model and described it in detail in the document. And we're asking people, at the time, to look at this data model and comment on its completeness and whether or not it actually is suitable for its purpose. We have not actually -- it wasn't a formal commentary or anything like that. SSAC just kind of published the recommendation and put it out there. And so this working group, this is an opportunity to really look at this and consider whether or not this is an appropriate starting point, or if we should look for something different. Maybe there are new considerations, especially now that we have much better knowledge about all of the new TLDs that have been proposed. None of that existed when this work was done.

I believe that's it for the slides, right? Yeah, so there's only one recommendation in this particular report.

Steve Sheng:	Thank you, Jim. Are there questions for Jim on this report from the expert group members? Okay, with that, thank you, Jim, again. We are still -- we still have 25 minutes. I don't have any additional agenda items. What does the working group think we want to use this time? Should we stop? Should we discuss something? Suggestions?
Sarmad Hussain:	Steve, this is Sarmad.
Steve Sheng:	Go ahead, Sarmad.
Sarmad Hussain:	So I think probably one of the first things we should look at is start defining the scope of our work, I guess, in more detail or a problem, more than just a problem statement, but what we need to eventually get to. And I guess everybody probably come on the same page on this. I'm not sure we can do that here, but just perhaps some discussion around it.
Steve Sheng:	And Sarmad, do you think that that happens on the mailing list first and then take it into the meeting for our -- our next discussion will have, like, a straw man?
Sarmad Hussain:	Sure.
Steve Sheng:	Okay.

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. For the queue.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Go ahead, Jim.

Jim Galvin: So I mean I like that, Sarmad. I think that's exactly right. I would like to see us put some words, our own words around what it is we think they're trying to accomplish, what is our goal that we ultimately want to achieve. And I think it would be very helpful if we could have some discussion about that on the mailing list between now and next week, so that next week we can ideally come to closure on our call and come to some agreement as to exactly what it is we're looking to produce. Then we can focus on a path and a plan for how to get there. Would that be -- would that match what you're suggesting Sarmad?

Sarmad Hussain: Yes.

Jody Kolker: This is Jody for the queue.

Steve Sheng: Go ahead, Jody.

Jody Kolker: I disagree with Jim -- I mean I agree with Jim and Sarmad. I'd like to get to a point of what we're trying to produce and what the scope of that is. And the sooner we can figure out what that is, the sooner we can start addressing it.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Jody. Any others who would like to chime in?

Takow: This is Takow. I agree.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Takow. So -- I'm sorry, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: Jim again for the transcript. So let me suggest, Steve, at this point that I certainly will take as an action to try and draft something from my point of view. But it would be ideal if anyone who has some ideas and has some thoughts about what our work product should look like, should send a note to the mailing list and see (inaudible) get a discussion started with respect to that. And let me propose then, if no one has any objections, we can end our call here today a little bit early. The agenda for next time is to settle on the scope of our work product.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Jim. That sounds like a good suggestion. Okay. I saw Edmund type in the Adobe Connect. Edmund said, I just have a minor point on the SSAC report. I suggest we take care on the use of the term life cycle for domains in our context of discussions, unless it is consistent with the domain life cycle in the GNSO context.

Jim Galvin: This is Jim. I have a question to Edmund. I actually was not aware -- you seem to be suggesting there's a definition of life cycle, the GNSO context. Or is this just an understood term? Defined in the agreements. Okay. Then we definitely need to pull that out, that reference and use that. I agree with Edmund. Certainly if a definition exists, (inaudible) lose that. I mean, Edmund, would you be able to grab that and send it to the list, reference to the list for us? Thank you. That would be excellent. For the transcript, Edmund is saying sure, in the chat room .

Steve Sheng: Okay. Any other input, questions, thoughts? This is Steve. Okay. With that, I think, Jim, let's adopt your suggestion that work party members, if you have (inaudible) thoughts on the working group deliverable, please send it to the mailing list to get discussion started. And Jim will think through this issue and with the input with all of you, and come back, and draft with a set of deliverables for our next call discussion. The aim is to discuss and try to finalize in the next call. Is that what -- did I character that correctly?

Jim Galvin: Yes, Steve. This is Jim. Excellent.

Steve Sheng: Okay. With that -- (recording ends).