

20131009_WHOIS_IRD_ID823164.ZIP

Steve Sheng: Good morning. Good evening. Welcome to October 9, today's call on the IRD extra working group.

On the call I have Aoki, Jody, Sarmad, Jim, Nishit, myself, Steve. Anyone else on the line that I haven't called?

Takao Suzuki: I'm here. This is Takao.

Steve Sheng: Hi, Takao. How are you? Anybody else on the line?

Okay. So, over to you, Jim.

Jim Galvin: Thank you, Steve. This is Jim Galvin, for the transcript.

So, my question to the folks here-- I guess we had two actions left over from last week. And the action I want to focus on first here is discussion of our charter and what we're doing.

So Steve and I have actually spent some time chatting about this. Steve had pulled together the documents that you see in front of you here, both on the screen and, of course, if you go to the Google docs directly, you'll be able to see the same document there and you can actually edit it, too, while you're looking at it.

But one of the questions that I had, and, frankly, I got a little stuck on this question-- Steve and I kind of explored it for a while and decided that the right thing to do here is to open the dialogue here with the rest of the committee members. I was trying to distinguish-- in deciding what it is we're going to do in our scope, I was trying to distinguish us from the other groups that are actively doing things in this space, in this WHOIS-related space. And, frankly, I got a little stuck.

So let me just paint a certain picture here, and then I really am very interested in comments from others about where we should go. And, of course, if my picture isn't quite right-- if you had a different picture, you know, that would be very helpful to consider-- for us to talk about here.

We have this expert working group that's out there, and its role, by my understanding, and, again, perhaps your understanding is a little different, its job is defining the purpose of registration data, which, in my view, implicit in that is defining all of the elements that are relevant to registration data, and then, two, to come up with a new model for directory services and how those will be supported by gTLDs in particular, but, ideally, if it works, it will broaden and include some ccTLDs too. So that's one.

Two, we have the translation and transliteration working group and the GNSO, which is still in the formative stage. They themselves are drafting their charter at the moment and pulling that together. But there is a final issues report that was used as the basis for that.

And, of course, there is the recommendations from the joint GNSO SSAC internationalized registration data working group. And that was the group that caused this transliteration group to come into existence. So its purpose, as I understand it, is to define whether or not translation and transliteration will occur and, if so, where and when it will happen in the registration system.

And then you have us. And our role-- If you look at the words that are in the announcement, we're asked to define the requirements for internationalized registration data and then produce a data model for those requirements for directory services.

So what I'm wondering is: Where do we fit in the scheme of these other groups that are out there? What is our job, and how does it differ from the others? Frankly, to put a particular spin on it, maybe to be a bit provocative here for the purposes of discussion, I'm kind of wondering. Is there more work to be done than simply saying that all registration data elements simply need to include metadata; specifically, a language and a script that goes with it so that any operations that need to be formed on it have the proper context in which to do that?

So, with that as kind of an introduction, I'm interested in some discussion. What are other people's expectations about what we're doing? And how would you expand on that one single, provocative statement that I'm making about our role and what we have to say?

Anyone?

Jody Kolker: This is Jody. Say, could you make that statement again?

Jim Galvin: Okay. Again, I'm just sort of making this up as we go here for discussion purposes. But my statement is that all data elements that are important for the registration process are required to include metadata in the form of the language and script of the content of that element. That's what I'm saying.

Sarmad Hussain: It's Sarmad. I'd like to get in the line.

Jim Galvin: Please, Sarmad, go ahead.

Sarmad Hussain: So, actually, I would like to probably say that we probably (inaudible) more. So what you're saying is actually probably the bare minimum that we need to say that we need metadata, but we need to, for example, disclose what the metadata would contain-- (unintelligible) information, to report all elements (unintelligible) whether this information is data-element specific or (unintelligible) data defined at the same time.

What we want to perhaps-- if you start thinking about it, though we are not working on (unintelligible) models, we still need to, for example, think about which things are more important as far as (unintelligible) concerned, where transliteration would be a better option, where translation would be a better option. Even if we are giving both options, maybe (inaudible). That can be part of the (inaudible).

We also at some point, I think, need to (inaudible) translation and transliteration. Somehow (unintelligible) internal metrics in the data, for example, which stated what the (unintelligible) of that transliteration or translation is. So, for example, if I'm putting that

data on my (unintelligible) and I'm doing a very careful manual analysis (unintelligible), the confidence (ph) of that data versus the confidence of my data perhaps is going to be different. So are we going to (unintelligible)?

I'm not sure that all this (unintelligible), but these are some of the things which we need to really-- work needs to go in. (Unintelligible) language would, as I said, be something relevant that we would need to have more details.

So the transliteration and translation group is probably (unintelligible) of different levels of translation, but they may now (ph) still tell us which data to transliterate and which data to translate and how to best (unintelligible) translation and transliteration, whether that needs to be captured or not (unintelligible), for example.

So I think there is (unintelligible). I think there is a significant overlap. But the level of detail we are going to go in vis-à-vis (unintelligible) for IDN (unintelligible). They're going to probably look at more (unintelligible). So I think there is (unintelligible).

That's all from me for now.

Jim Galvin: Thank you, Sarmad. You said an awful lot there. And I was trying to take some notes here, and I got a couple of things out of that. I guess I have a question for you. At one point, you did talk about there being a lot of overlap with the translation and transliteration working group. Did I hear that correctly? You did say that. Right?

Sarmad Hussain: (Unintelligible) some overlap. Basically, I think, from what (unintelligible), is that they are saying what are translation opportunities, what are transliteration opportunities, looking for (unintelligible) and more looking at the quality of that content. What we are looking at is not the quality of the content but how to capture that content (inaudible).

Jim Galvin: So, I'm sorry. Say the last sentence again. We're looking not just at the property of the content but what?

Sarmad Hussain: No, no, no. So I'm saying that, from what I understand, the transliteration and translation group is looking at the quality of the content. And what we are looking at is not the content's quality but its representation inside the (inaudible).

Jim Galvin: Okay. So that's an important distinction. Let me just say that back and make sure I have that right.

So you're suggesting that the translation and transliteration working group is concerned with the quality of the content, and our role is to be concerned about the representation of the content.

Sarmad Hussain: Right. The transliteration and translation (inaudible).

Steve Sheng: This is Steve. There's (inaudible) hand, just to let you know.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Thank you. Yes. I want to clarify. I noticed that Edmund (ph) -- I want to clarify one other thing here. I'm sorry. I lost my train of thought. But that's okay. So let's go to Edmund. Edmund, please, go ahead.

Edmund: Can people hear?

Jim Galvin: Yes. Now we can hear you.

Edmund: Sorry. I was on mute.

So I guess I was listening into your sort of, I guess, statement to get the discussion started. I think it's a good point to get some starting thinking. I guess I agree with Sarmad. At least we-- I guess you tried to stimulate our thought, and you probably succeeded in that.

And I think there was probably a little-- a few more things that we probably should do. As to exactly what, I'm thinking about myself as well. But perhaps one of the ways is to reverse your particular statement or turn it in a question and ask what the others-- what we think the others would produce and then how ours would fit into it. One of the things is that-- What I'm seeing in sort of the name of what we do is, at least from requirements and also the data model for the internationalized registration data-- and one of the first things that comes to mind is to-- perhaps we need to think about which data elements need internationalization and what it will really mean and how the data model would work.

You mentioned adding metadata for the language and script. But it is possible that, even, let's say, an address field could have multiple addresses. Is that a kind of data model that we need to hint on in terms of if we think that that is something that is useful? Is that a model that we need to identify and provide in our report?

So I guess my question is perhaps for us to think about what other guys do-- what we think other groups would be doing, and then the gap might become more apparent.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Thank you. Let me-- I believe I heard two distinct things there. I want to play them back and see if I got this right here.

One question that you were suggesting that we look at here and consider is which data elements need internationalization.

And the second is-- you didn't actually say this explicitly. I'm kind of inferring this from what you said. But would multi-valued elements have separate metadata for each of the elements?

You also put a question up in front, which is we should ask ourselves what are the other groups going to produce. And then we can consider how we can add to that.

So I guess that's actually three things. Do you agree with those three things?

Edmund: That's a good summary.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Thanks. That tees me back to the question that I had for Sarmad because, Sarmad, you were suggesting that we're looking at the representation. And I guess what I wanted to follow up with that is: What is the next step from that? I mean, my provocative statement was of the form that, yes, we care about the representation, and our concern is that all elements have to have metadata associated with it. So what's the next step after saying that? What's the next thing that we would need to do, given that you have that kind of requirement?

Sarmad Hussain: This is Sarmad again. Basically, as I said, I think (unintelligible). We need a starting point (unintelligible). And, even though we probably (unintelligible), that's okay. But we can at least start the work based on what we actually already have. So we start from the latest model of RA (ph) (unintelligible). And this is an exercise (unintelligible) earlier as

well. But I think that would be still a good place to start. We take each element in that-- (unintelligible), and we go-- for each data, we see what our internationalization requirements for the data-- do we need to have different levels of internationalization (unintelligible) data? For example, one could have yes or no, or one could have a three-level thing which says that, definitely, yes, maybe and not require (inaudible).

So we need to, for example, formulate (unintelligible) requirement of a particular data in global language. (Unintelligible) that data will be required in the local language in the international domain.

So we need to look at those details. Then we need to also, perhaps, see (unintelligible) something required in a global language. If that's something critical enough, then there must be, for example, very highly (unintelligible) quality. (Inaudible) there could be elements which are (unintelligible), high quality, (unintelligible).

So, again, I think that is something (unintelligible) analysis, talking about some of the details and see how different elements evolve on top of it. So I would probably (unintelligible) exercise on some of these things (unintelligible). And, once we do start doing some of these things, we keep asking ourselves (unintelligible) working group, if it's what we need to do or if we don't need to do, then we stop there (unintelligible) on something else. So that's one possible (inaudible).

Jim Galvin:

So, Sarmad, one of the questions that Edmund had put out there was that we should explore is: Which data elements need internationalization? So a question that I would ask back Edmund and to you, if I understand what you were just suggesting, is: Isn't that question and isn't what you were just talking about, Sarmad--? Isn't that what the internationalized registration data working group did? I mean the GNSO SSAC report. We did look at common data elements and observe that-- which ones could have internationalization and which ones should and, in fact, identified the standards that might define how those elements would work if they were internationalized.

So my question is: Are we repeating that work? Or could you say more about how we're extending that work?

And, Edmund, I notice you still have your hand up. I don't know if you had a new comment to make. Let me put those questions to you first.

Edmund:

Sorry. This is Edmund. Sorry. I forgot to put my hand down.

But I guess, in response, I think you're quite right that the report already has a lot of that, but I think it leads to scrutiny to probably (ph) confirm that. I'm getting a little bit confused with all these (unintelligible) anyway. This is the expert working group. Right? Is this the-- The idea of this working group is to provide some expert opinion on these items. Did I get it correct? Or is this just a GNSO working group? I just want to clarify and make sure this is (inaudible).

Jim Galvin:

You're correct. This is an expert working group. And, yeah, now you're kind of getting to the same place that I was in about exactly what we're supposed to be doing in this space.

Edmund:

Right. So I guess what we probably should do is use the report as a starting point. And we can always just agree to it. And I believe there are certain elements that were left relatively open ended. And I guess, from there, we probably need to weigh in based on the discussion around this group and also to consider what the requirements of that data field and how we think the data model should sort of-- at a high level, look like.

That's sort of-- Again, I'm thinking loud here. And I'm ready to be corrected or moderated. As an initial feeling, I think that's probably the direction we could take.

Jim Galvin: Okay. So let me play that back a little bit here. And then let's try and get an opportunity if there's others who would like to speak. If you can put your hand up here in the Adobe Connect room, I'd like to hear what others think too.

I think what I heard you suggest, Edmund, was this is an expert working group. So one possible interpretation here is that what the GNSO SSAC report did was make a particular proposal about what it thought about data elements. And so one approach that we could take is we should go back over that report, confirm that they had an appropriate list of data elements, and then actually go back and confirm for each of those elements the proposal that was made by that working group, and then either agree or disagree with it. And that would be a useful and important contribution to this process.

Did I correctly summarize what you were saying?

Edmund: Yes. But I would probably add a little bit to the latter part and to probably talk about-- it's been a while since I went to the report. But I don't believe there were actual sort of data model concepts in the report. So we should probably come up with that. What type of requirements?

Looking at it, it's talking about the requirements and the model. And so what the GNSO SSAC working group created was sort of a look at-- on the policy level, what might be required. And I guess our job is to take a look at it at a slightly more technical level and say, hey, these are the policies that you want to put in. Then, these are the technical requirements that need to be in place.

Jim Galvin: I see. So I'll phrase that back a little differently again here. Yes. We should-- to the extent the GNSO SSAC report was looking at technical requirements, we should in fact confirm that and propose the policies that should go around that for some policy development work.

Edmund: You could phrase it that way as well. I'm good with that.

Jim Galvin: Okay. I'm going to do a little bit of a roll call, going around asking others to speak. So you should expect your name to get called out here. But I'm going to start with Sarmad. I want Sarmad to speak to the question that I started with Edmund here.

To re-characterize the question, distinguish our work from what was done by the GNSO SSAC joint report. I mean, it did actually look at data elements and what could be internationalized about them. And it sounded like you were suggesting that, Sarmad-- and so I just want to clarify if that's what you meant or how we could extend the work of the GNSO SSAC report.

Sarmad Hussain: So, this is Sarmad speaking. So one possibility, for example, that I was taking was-- (unintelligible) the transliteration and translation phase. That was not covered in the report. The earlier report actually laid that out as a question mark and left it there. And it really did not make any recommendations to that. Definitely, (unintelligible) needs to be addressed. And this working group (unintelligible). So I think that's one complete thing that we need to do beyond the report.

The second thing was--

Jim Galvin: Sarmad, I'm sorry to interrupt. But, before you go on to the second thing, if you're suggesting that we should look at translation and transliteration, then the next question that I would ask is how we would distinguish that work from the translation and transliteration working group that's going to be looking at that.

Sarmad Hussain: No. I'm not suggesting that we look at translation or transliteration. What I am suggesting is we specify which and when needs to be translated or transliterated. Our working group is looking at-- it's my understanding that our working group is looking at the quality of how it should be done rather than which elements need to be done. And, if I am wrong in my understanding, please, I think I need to make that clear on my end.

So my understanding--

Jim Galvin: Let me try and play that back here. So, if the other group is focused on the quality of the translation and transliteration, we could focus on which elements should be translated or transliterated.

Sarmad Hussain: Exactly.

Jim Galvin: Okay. All right. Thank you. And so I interrupted you before you were (unintelligible) two things that we could do to extend. What was your second thing?

Sarmad Hussain: Right. So that was the first thing.

And then, definitely, the second thing-- The first thing, actually, is that the (unintelligible) needs to be developed (inaudible). So the first step is we need to define which data-- how that data-- which (unintelligible) data elements and how they need to be-- how they need to be represented. This work obviously was done in the previous report.

But I think that there's probably some more work that needs to be done. So one example is that earlier reports suggested that a particular element should be (unintelligible) protocol or standard. What I would probably, for example, suggest is that we look at other possible standards. I know we looked at (unintelligible). And perhaps one possibility is (unintelligible), which says that, instead of (unintelligible) should be in the standards, we have a more generic model which says (unintelligible) that satisfies the standard (unintelligible). And we'll leave that open to other people to decide which standard they want to follow.

So I guess I go back to what Edmund has said-- is that, even though some of that work was done, I think it's useful we open that discussion again and see if we can make a more generic model or (unintelligible) model, whichever is more appropriate, or at least have that discussion (inaudible). Thank you.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Thank you. So I believe what I heard is you were agreeing with Edmund that we should go back and review the work that was done, especially in the GNSO SSAC joint report, and we should confirm that we do agree with that. We should also check that the data elements listed there match the data elements that are now specified as part of the applicant guide book and the various agreements. And we should confirm that we agree with that work or perhaps explore other options and include that too if that's appropriate.

Would that be fair?

Sarmad Hussain: Yes.

- Jim Galvin: Okay. Thank you. And, Steve Sheng, I just got some weird error message from the Adobe Connect room. Let me go around the room here and ask for others who-- to comment on this discussion. Everyone's been kind of quiet here. I'm just going to go down the list as it's listed here in the Adobe Connect room for me. So, Jody, you're up next.
- Jody Kolker: My comments were that-- my understanding, and I'm not sure that this is right-- that we were going to be determining how to store the data and the presentation of the data. So I wasn't as much concerned about the transliteration or the translation of the data but actually how it was stored and how it would be presented to the user through a Web interface or through Port 43 WHOIS. That was my understanding. And I'm happy to do whatever we need to finish, but that was my understanding what we were going to be doing.
- Jim Galvin: So that's fine. Let me ask the following question. With respect to the presentation of the data, how would you distinguish this work, our work, from what the expert working group on new directory services is going to be doing?
- Jody Kolker: That's a good question. I thought that new directory services was more of storing the data to be searchable and the way that they were going to present it was being able to take all the data from all the registries. And I'm not sure that I understand that quite correctly. So it seems to me that we may be working very closely with that group as far as the presentation of the data and what would be presented.
- Jim Galvin: Interesting. I agree that it sure seems like their initial draft report sure seemed to focus on that.
- Jody Kolker: I haven't read that report. But, from the descriptions that you've been giving, it sure sounds like it's very similar.
- Jim Galvin: I mean, it is. I had always thought that the expert working group, again, you know-- it's really about trying to define a new-- well, replacing the WHOIS protocol. And they're starting with a clean slate in figuring out what it means to do that. And so, yeah, they kind of went down this path of a centralized server and something different for display.
- Well, and then again, to another detailed question about your store the data and presentation of the data, to some extent, the GNSO SSAC joint report actually weighed in on some of these issues. Specifically, with storing the data, it talked about the standards that might be relevant for the syntax of the data. And, with respect to presentation, same thing, there were some standards that might be relevant, as well as speaking to the issue of using a local representation where appropriate for the user.
- Can you say anything about how you would see our working distinguished from that? (Inaudible) to think about that?
- Jody Kolker: I need a little more time to think about that, James.
- Jim Galvin: Okay. That's fine. So, let's move on down to the next on the list here. I have Aoki.
- Aoki: Yes.
- Jim Galvin: Yes. Aoki is still with us. So any comments or questions from you with respect to our charter, our work, and what we're going to be doing?

Aoki: Currently, I have no appreciation (ph) to that (unintelligible). I (unintelligible) working group (unintelligible), which is explained. There's a model on JP domain name (ph). I tried to explain the data model by using (unintelligible). And, if you have any conclusions and comments, please, (unintelligible).

That's all.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Yes. Thank you. I did appreciate that you sent an explanation of what JPRS does with respect to WHOIS now.

In respect to the presentation, I observe you make the distinction about having both English and Japanese formats. Do you know--? Do you actually store it in both formats? Or is it translated in some way prior to display?

Aoki: Both data always stored in our institution (unintelligible).

Jim Galvin: Okay. That's helpful. Thank you.

So that leaves us with Nishit, I believe. Right?

Nishit Jain: Hi, Jim. This is Nishit here.

As of now, I don't have anything (unintelligible). But I'm going to be looking forward to (unintelligible). So that's it.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Thank you. I guess it's up to me to try and summarize this and create this into-- direct this into something actionable.

Steve Sheng: Hi, Jim. This is Steve. I think Takao is also on the line.

Jim Galvin: Oh. My apologies.

Takao Suzuki: No problem at all.

Jim Galvin: Please, go ahead.

Takao Suzuki: Before I phrase (ph) my question, I want to add to (unintelligible)'s answer about the Japanese data. So, actually, a question.

So, Jim, you asked him whether that gets translated or entered. And I believe those are entered manually. Can I have the clarification?

Jim Galvin: Yes, please. Aoki?

Aoki: I couldn't understand that.

Jim Galvin: The question, as I understood it was-- I had asked you about the Japanese and the English-- if they are stored that way or if there was a translation or transliteration that occurs. You had indicated that they are stored together. But I believe the question that Takao is asking here is: When does that translation occur? Does the user enter it in both forms, or is there a translation step before it gets stored in both forms?

Aoki: When I accept data from registrar, the data is translated already. We (unintelligible) translated data to another language. We do not translate it. Probably-- maybe (unintelligible) translate their data when they maybe start. I mean--

Jim Galvin: So you're suggesting that the registrant provides both forms that even the registrar does not do the translation or transliteration. Is that correct?

Aoki: Yes. That's correct.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Takao, does that answer your question?

Takao Suzuki: Yes. A little bit different from what I understood, because, for instance, when I do use Japanese services as well on my own (inaudible)-- when I use Japanese one, I believe that there are entries that I have to enter both in Japanese and in ASCII. So that didn't (ph) give an impression that they are actually doing any translation or transliteration except for some fields, such as like state names and stuff like that. Those are drop-down lists that are-- we just pick. And then that gets picked automatically. But, otherwise, like street names and stuff like that are in both-- have to be entered in both ASCII and in Japanese.

Am I right?

Jim Galvin: I believe that was the answer that he gave. But Aoki?

Takao Suzuki: I'm sorry. Yeah.

Aoki: I believe we accept two language of data, an English one and a Japanese one. We automatically-- we don't automatically translate one language to another language.

Jody Kolker: This is Jody. Takao, I wonder if it was the registrar that forced you to enter in both English and Japanese and not the registree.

Takao Suzuki: Okay. Let me take this offline. I do some investigation and then get back to that. I don't want to talk too much on this subject. Sorry about that.

So let me just go back to the original (unintelligible). Okay?

Jody Kolker: Yes, please. That's fine. Thank you.

Takao Suzuki: Yeah. I'm in agreement with, actually, Edmund and Jody. The only part that I was just wanting to add is I had thought that our job was more towards getting to like a realization once we have this-- the (unintelligible) or recommendations come in. And our job also is to make sure that our recommendations are really like actually actionable recommendations so that they're-- people like ourselves can also start being ready for implementation. That's kind of what I understood, if it makes any sense.

Jim Galvin: Okay. So, I mean, I'll be honest. I'm not sure if I understood correctly (inaudible) what you were saying there. I think maybe you were suggesting that, I think, going back to what I think Edmund was focused on, was we should be reviewing the work that was done by others and making a commitment and a specific recommendation to either support those or, if we need to, update them in some way, then we should do that too.

Would that be fair? Or were you saying something different?

Takao Suzuki: Yes. That's fair. And then I actually-- in the review, I want to ask to weigh in so-- in the sense that (unintelligible) realization. That's the part (inaudible).

Jim Galvin: Right. So whatever recommendations we make we just need to make sure that those are actionable and reasonable for all parties concerned.

Takao Suzuki: Yep.

Jim Galvin: Okay. So, with that, let me-- I think I want to think about this a little bit. But I guess the path that I'm headed down in trying to write some words around the role of this working group and our scope and what we're doing, trying to expand a little bit on the idea that we've been asked for two deliverables, essentially, which is the requirements for internationalized data and, of course, producing a data model to go with those requirements-- the data model for presentation for those requirements.

I believe what I heard here today is that we want to go back and review all of the various inputs that are available to us, a primary focus on the GNSO SSAC report because it really had some detailed requirements about internationalizing registration data. We should go back and review those, confirm that they are complete, and, also, that they match what we believe should be the current expectations. That report was done a couple of years ago. And, of course, the world has changed a little bit in the last couple of years. So reviewing that work and confirming that we still agree with it is an appropriate thing to do.

Then there's the issue of completeness of what was in that report because we now have an applicant guidebook, which has some specifications about elements in it. And we also have registry agreements and registrar agreements that have some notes in there about data elements. So we should just confirm that the GNSO SSAC joint report was complete in its review of elements.

With respect to a data model for the directory services, I admit that I'm still a little bit stuck on what to say there. SSAC, of course, had proposed a data model in its SAC-54 (ph), but its data model was focused more on registration data at the core, at the base. That work is work that I'm expecting the expert working group on new directory services to be focused on. That is the purpose of registration data and, thus, it gets to define what data elements are important for registration data, which means it would be updating-- assuming that it does complete that task, it would be updating the set of data elements that we're looking at.

I'm still struggling with whether there's more to say on the directory services data model side than the fact that data has to have-- all data elements have to have metadata associated with it so that clients can make an appropriate choice about how to display the information. I speaking specifically about language and script information.

That's probably a lot to take in here because I think I just tried to rattle that off in a couple of minutes here.

Anyone have any reaction to that? I mean, I'll do my best to work with Steve to try to craft this into some words. And so you'll have a chance to look at it, and we can comment on it. But let me ask here. Anyone want to comment at all here? Any hands?

Steve Sheng: Jim, this is Steve. I'd like to join the queue.

Jim Galvin: Please, Steve, go ahead.

Steve Sheng: I think going through the IRD report is a very good suggestion. One thing I note that this working group also-- by reviewing and updating those requirements, this working group can also be a vehicle of implementation for some of those recommendations because, as far as I can tell, the only outcome coming out of the IRD report is the translation and transliteration PDP. So I think that (unintelligible) anything that is up to date and we update in this working group that can be a vehicle of implementation for to recommend to the ICANN board and the community. So that's one point.

Also, it seems that we made some assumptions. What I'm hearing is we made some assumptions about what the actual working group does, what does translation and transliteration working group does. Maybe one thing to suggest is to have a phone call with these working groups to kind of confirm what they are doing or whether we think what they're doing they're actually doing. So doing so at the beginning would avoid surprises later on.

On an administrative note, I share the working group (unintelligible) to you all, so you can all view. And, if you have a chance, maybe you want to put-- working group members want to put some facts as well, but that's just a suggestion.

Thank, Jim.

Jim Galvin: So, thank you for that, Steve. Yes. Folks should certainly feel free to edit the proposed charter here on Google docs, and Steve and I will take an action to try to fill that out based on the discussion that we've had here today.

With respect to meeting with the other groups, I'm not opposed. But I think this brings us, actually, to the second action that we had from last week. Maybe in the last couple of minutes here, Steve, if you were able to find out if you could speak to this question of confidentiality and the rules under which we work, what are options are?

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Jim. I apologize. I have not had time to work on it. But I will send an e-mail shortly and copy the list. Thank you.

Jim Galvin: Okay.

Steve Sheng: Our models should be similar. What the EWG is their model of disclosure and confidentiality. That's my current best thinking.

Jim Galvin: Yes. Well, as we had said last week, I think, in general, we would prefer to operate in a closed room. And, ultimately, the expectation would be that all of our work products and interim work products would be available for review. But, while we're trying to get our work done, we would maintain just a closed-room view about our work, which brings me, really, to the only question that I had about meeting with the other groups.

Well, the translation and transliteration group-- I don't think it's an option to meet with them. They're still drafting their charter. So I'm not even sure that they know what they're doing yet.

Meeting with the expert working group is an interesting suggestion though.

I'm sorry. Someone wanted to speak?

Steve Sheng: Jim, the translation and transliteration working group-- they don't have the working group yet, but they have a draft CT, and they have a chair. Maybe-- this is just a suggestion--

like a call between you and the chair of the other working group members interested in that call. That's just a suggestion.

Jim Galvin: Yeah. I'm okay with that if no on objects, at least maybe just sort of opening the dialogue with the chair over there and just say that we're interested in coordinating. Obviously, we don't want to duplicate work. Since we're kind of formative at the moment, as are they, this would be a good opportunity to do that. Does anyone have any objections to my reaching out to the chair of that drafting party just to see where they're headed?

I'm sorry. Go ahead.

Unidentified Participant: I said not at all. Sounds good.

Jim Galvin: Okay. So I take away from today's meeting two actions, one that I'll work with Steve to try to put into words the discussion that we had here today. I want to thank everyone for jumping in and contributing. It was helpful. And I'll do my best to try to convert this into something we can work with in our charter.

And I will reach out to the translation and transliteration chair to discuss-- just to open the dialogue, just so they know that we want to be careful not to overlap work. And we'll figure out what we want to do about meeting or staying in touch with each other.

Steve still has the action carried forward from last week about finding out what our options are for working confidentially, at least within ourselves for now.

Steve Sheng: Yes, Jim.

Jim Galvin: And then so those are the three things.

I guess I don't want to get ahead of things. I was thinking I might have a suggestion for what the next steps are. But I guess the primary focus needs to be on getting the charter done. So I don't want to jump into anything else just yet.

I believe that where we are is we do want to review all of the things that are in the GNSO SSAC joint report (unintelligible) registration data report. So let me suggest that there is a fourth action here, and that is that that's going to be our primary starting point, to review the data elements that are discussed there and what was said about them. So let me just ask that folks prepare for our next meeting by reviewing that document so that you're in a place where we can begin to discuss it if we can get past this charter quickly between now and next week or, at least, early next week. Any objections to that?

Okay. With that, I believe that we are right at the top of the hour here. So let me turn it back over to Steve to adjourn the meeting.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Jim. The action items that I see are for me to check the confidentiality options for Jim and Steve to take the input received and revise the charter and, for everyone else, if you have ideas to contribute to the text directly as well and then for Jim to reach out to the translation and transliteration drafting team chair to open up the dialogue. Those are the action items I see.

With that--

Jim Galvin: Number four. There was a fourth action to ask people to review the IRD report from two years ago.

Steve Sheng:

All right. So everyone to review the IRD report. I will send the link of that report shortly.

Did I mischaracterize anything?

Okay, here and now, the meeting is adjourned. Thank you, and have a good morning, good evening, wherever you are. Thank you. Bye-bye.