ICANN San Francisco Meeting
IRD WG
TRANSCRIPTION
Saturday 12 March 2011 at 16:00 local

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is   incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is   posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Stephane Van Gelder: Okay, good. Welcome back everyone and we'll warp this Saturday up with the - an update on the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group, the IRD working group. We have both co-chairs of that group with us here today, Edmon Chung and Jim Galvin.

And Jim, I believe, we missed you this morning, you couldn't be here, is also SSAC Vice-Chair so it's good that - thanks for being here so that we can eventually talk about that if we need to. But I'll hand the proceedings over to you and the presentation that you have to update the Council on the working group that you co-chair. Thank you very much.

Jim Galvin: Thank you, so this is a - look at the agenda here and I think we'll just skip forward and get into the (unintelligible) and the presentation at this point. As you know there are standards that exist for internationalized domain names, labels and names already, but registration data includes a lot more information than just the domain name. And so this working group was, in fact, created with a specific objective at looking at what it would take to internationalize the submission and display of registration data.

A quick look at history, we were created in 2009. I should observe that Edmon here, who you all know, of course, has been co-chair for a quite a while with this group. I'm a recent edition from the SSAC side as co-chair

having started just this year in January. But we have a document, which is our - calling it our interim final report which came out in November which has been open for public comment for quite some time, which in fact closes on Monday.

The most important point from this interim report, it does cover a fair amount of detail and specifications about how to internationalize registration data but the interim report actually asks for comments from the community. And we've been wishing for a good deal more comments from the community about four particular models.

The working group itself has not formed a majority opinion about these four choices but they represent - each of them represent, you know, some specific recommendations for how we might proceed in internationalizing registration data. And there are four different models.

The first one is, for the most part, a status quo kind of model. We maintain the current situation whether requirements are that data must be presented in US ASCII. It has the additional suggestion that optionally additional data could be included if there is a particular script or language that one wants to use, and of course, the registrar and registry support it.

The second model is for registrants to provide the data in any form that the registrant - the registrar will accept it. And the registrar will continue to proceed in a way that the registry accepts but that the registrar has to provide a service. They have to provide a facility, and in particular, a point of contact for access to that facility to provide translation or transliteration services. So that's one potential way to go forward.

Another potential way to go forward is that we define a must-be present script. So rather than allowing the registrar to simply accept the data in whatever form is sensible for the community that they're providing a service to they also have to provide tools - if they do provide it to the community in

whatever form the community would like, they also have to provide a must-be present script and they have to provide the tools to get there. And they have to maintain that data and make that visible.

And then, of course, the model four is to take it in, again, in any way that's suitable for the community that the registrar is representing and the registrar has to provide translation tools for whatever the must-be present script might be.

We have not committed to what that must-be present script is likely to be but I think it's pretty safe to assume that it would continue to be US ASCII just as, you know, the situation - the system that we have today and what's actually required in model one.

So again, the report actually ends with these particular questions. And these are really important questions from the point of view of the working group. We really do need to understand what the community sees and what the community believes is, you know, its preference in how to proceed. Each of those models is different because they place a burden in a different place as far as the system is concerned.

And so obviously people are going to have, you know, opinions about that. And we'd really like to hear what those are. We'd really like to understand use cases, particular registrars and other registries might have their own use cases in mind, and that would also drive their selection of the model. And we'd very much like to understand those.

And we're not even suggesting that all of those models are the only way to do it. In fact, if we get into the next set of slides here - next slide.

Okay, well, I'll come back to the point. So on here, we've been doing a lot of outreach. Again, we're very focused on getting some community input on these four models and where we are. And so we have been - we've briefed

the (Unintelligible) in February. We're briefing the GNSO here. We had briefed the At Large Committee - staff actually conducted these couple of briefings. And in fact, there were two webinars that were done and staff had done those and they have been recorded and they are generally available for people to look at too. And so they've seen the summary reports.

So what we have so far are three comments that have come in during the public comment period. And what I wanted to get to before and go back was although we had four models described in the interim report, it turns out that one additional model has been proposed and has come in into comments. Now I don't really want to focus on all of these comments at the moment. I'm going to highlight just a couple of things that are in them that I think are interesting to report.

It's important to keep in mind - I mean these comments are out there. Anybody can go and look at them and study them. We have - these slides were prepared just to give some visibility to those comments but the working group itself has not actually begun to review these. So we're not trying to pass judgment or assess the comments in any way. But we had some particular comments about choosing something other than WHOIS.

So you can see here, someone actually pointed out that IRIS when this discussion has come up before was presented in the technical evolution of WHOIS workshop in Cartagena. This issue's going to come up again this week in another workshop there too but we got a particular comment from someone who was pointing out that IRIS has a protocol would be something to consider that would meet a lot of the issues that are raised in this interim report. Next.

The interim report does cover, excuse me, does cover a number of suggestions for how to internationalized some of the data. And there are, obviously, some specifications that are already out there. I mean rather than trying to reinvent ways in which data could be proposed to be standardized

we tried to reach out and find additional references for how this data could be represented and incorporated them in the report.

So some of the comments that came in are discussions about other documents and other references, which we had not covered, at least not identified in the interim report. So we'll have to take a look at those and include some discussion about them. Next slide.

One of the things, which is important there, and the working group has had some discussion about this but we haven't tried to make a specific recommendation is transliteration and translation tools are, obviously, generically an issue. I think the working group does recognize that but we haven't tried to make a specific recommendation in that space.

And so comments that we've gotten on the public comment period have also called us out and made a point of noticing this. I think it's important to get more community feedback on that if we're going to go down the path of suggesting that transliteration and translation are required, whoever - by whatever that they are required, I think it's important to have some recommendations about how that might be done. So that as well as this comment is calling that out for us too. Next.

This is the new model that was proposed. It's interesting. It's just another proposal, one of the things which was not included in the four models. It basically says in my view that you should be allowed to enter your registration data in whatever script or language is suitable to you in your local environment as a domain registrant.

Registrars that serve that community should provide that service. Registries should take that data in whatever form it comes in, presuming that it's been tagged to represent what it is, and, you know, all other access to that data. It takes the burden away from the registries and registrars. The current models

that we have there do put the burden somewhere in the registrar and registrar model.

This model proposes putting the burden on dealing with internationalized information on whoever wants access to it. So if you want the data you'd simply get it in whatever form it was entered and you have to figure out how to deal with it. So that's just a fifth model that's been proposed by someone from the community. Next slide.

So our next steps at this point are fairly obvious. I mean we have to go through these public comments. Honestly, I'm hoping that we get more comments from the community before Monday. Certainly very interested in any comments that, you know, come specifically from here that need to be considered and reviewed by the working group but the working group then needs to have a meeting.

We need to talk about what to do about those comments and incorporate all of that. Revise the document and then proceed to publish a final report. Next.

And that's it, thank you very much. And I have Edmon here and we're happy to answer any other questions that anyone might have.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, very much, sorry. Thanks very much for that. Do we have any questions? (James).

(James):   Thank you Chair and thanks Jim for the update. And just to keep you updated, the registrar constituency is working on to (unintelligible) so we'd be voting on a comment in just a few days. And, you know, to have our comment to (unintelligible).

But - and just a higher level question and probably you know the answer but just to perhaps you like to share with people here is about how do you see if we can learn any lesson from the IDNC ccTLD fast track. Is any data or any

information which can be shared from a cc side? And that could have been, in a sense, that could help us here to move forward with the model that you actually propose here?

Jim Galvin: We haven't explicitly done a survey in any kind of formal sense what ccTLDs are doing. We do know that there are several ccTLDs which have made their own choices about how to provide information. And even among registrars, there are some registrars that have provided and made some enhancements in order to, you know, serve the needs of their community.

And I think that those issues and concepts did factor into the choice of the four models that we have here but not in any formal sense, just in discussions.

Edmon Chung: Just adding to that, we - in the group actually we do have participation from ccTLDs as well especially from - well, where you saw the discussion on variance, that's also part of the experience from ccTLDs. So they are in the loop and I think earlier on in the group staff, especially (Steve Shin) here did do a - I shouldn't say a very formal survey but did look into the implementations at various ccTLDs.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you. Any further questions? Yes, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stephane, Chuck Gomes. Just a quick question, is it too early with the ccTLD implementations to get any lessons learned from them? Have we just surveyed what they've done? Do they have - have they learned any pros and cons of the solutions that they've implemented?

Jim Galvin: This working group is not really looking at implementations per say, right. I mean it's about the requirements simply for display. So it's about looking at the standards for what it means to display the information, how you would standardize the data itself. So I - that doesn't really - I mean I think you're asking a question which is out of scope for the working group I guess.

Chuck Gomes: Well, I'm not sure it is so I'm not sure we're communicating because you're looking - you've got now five solutions on the table, right. I'm guessing that maybe ccTLDs have implemented some of those because you designed these five from them. So what I'm asking is have any of them been using them long enough to learn some lessons on the specific solutions that would help make the decision on which one might be best?

Jim Galvin: Okay, thank you, now I understand your question better and I don't have an answer for you but certainly that's something that we can make sure we reach out for and get what we can as part of our review process. So, yes, thank you for that.

Stephane Van Gelder: Anything further? Okay, well, I guess - Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Just a quick note that this is also one of those cross community working groups that we talked about earlier.

Stephane Van Gelder: So we were just about to finish early and - okay, thank you very much, gentlemen. And because we are early, perhaps, (Jeff), are you ready to move into the next part of our day? And if you are we'll just take five seconds to disconnect and reconnect on the recording.

END