

Julie Hedlund:

Welcome to the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group and I would like to introduce Jim Galvin from Afilias, and also the SSAC Chair who is a Co-Chair for the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group. Edmon Chung from the GNSO Council is the other Co-Chair and unfortunately can't be with us at this time for this meeting.

So I'd like to turn over the meeting to Jim Galvin. Jim?

Jim Galvin:

Thank you, Julie, and thank you to everyone who's coming. And for those who are sitting in the back please do join us at the table – it's a public meeting and we're not trying to provide a peanut gallery if you want to come up and participate.

I'm just going to give a very short update on what we've been up to, so where we are now and then open the floor for any questions or discussion that folks want to have. So we can move on to the next slide here, yes, and I guess we'll just jump right in here so we'll move to the next slide.

So just quickly to level set so that we all know what we are talking about, we know that internationalized domain name guidelines exist but there are in fact no standards for the submission and display of internationalized registration data. Next slide.

So the purpose of this group was in fact to study precisely the feasibility and suitability of introducing submission and display specifications for internationalized registration data. This is a

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

quick summary of four of the major events over the last couple of years that this group has been active. We started in 2009; we did some work in studying our specific charter directive and then we published an interim report last November. And now we have been reconsidering that report at that time.

That report at that time actually proposed four specific models that the group might recommend; it might pick one of those models and suggest that this is the path forward for submission and display of internationalized registration data. After having put that out there and gotten a number of public comments, not very many, unfortunately, but we did get a few which were very insightful comments; and the discussions that we had in San Francisco we've taken a somewhat different approach on what to do with the final report.

Can you click to the next slide actually and forget what's on that slide? Okay, so we have as I started to say, as we've been looking at those comments and actually considering what happened, and we have only just begun the process of drafting and outline for that final report, what we have come around to is that we're not actually going to recommend one of these four models specifically that we had put forth before. We realized that instead we've been able to identify the specific issues that we think should be brought back to the joint bodies – GNSO and SSAC, probably more primarily the GNSO: some specific questions that we think deserve further consideration and study and that would help speak to the issue of what is the right way forward in submission and display of



---

internationalized registration data? And so we consider that a successful outcome of having put our interim report out there.

So we're actively looking to create that outline, get that document out there. I don't think there's another slide here, right; isn't that the last one? Oh, just the last – so we're creating the final report. Our target is actually to produce this final report in time for this fall, before the end of the year; and obviously to put it out there for the GNSO and SSAC approval and for public comment. And I believe that is the last slide... That is the last slide, okay.

So that's the status report and I'm happy to entertain any questions or discussion. Actually, I would welcome some discussion, too, if people have a particular thing they want to bring up and talk about. We're welcome to have that.

Male:

Thanks, Jim. The question I have, you mentioned that you've come up with a set of questions primarily for the GNSO. Are they questions that possibly will involve policy development or just clarification questions? And can you give me any feel for what those might look like?

Jim Galvin:

I would say right now that the answer is "It could be both." Since we have not actually written down in black and white and had an opportunity in the group to review them, I'm hesitant to suggest that it would be one or the other. I don't want to prejudge what the



---

group itself might decide as part of its discussions. But it is the potential that it could just be either.

Male: One more question: is it too early, premature to set a target that you're shooting for for the final report?

Jim Galvin: Our target actually was this meeting but given the volume of work of staff we actually chose this item to reduce the priority of. So we expect it to pick up as soon as this meeting is over and we get back from this, so I would say that we really do want to be done in time for Dakar through the process here. That's the target, but we'll know better once we have a draft report within the Working Group and we see where the discussion takes us. If the discussion progresses very quickly then there'll be no issue with meeting the fall deadline.

Any questions from behind me? I'm guessing not. Actually, if there are no other questions... Okay, this is going to be a very short meeting then. I can give you back all 45 minutes of your day. Thank you very much, and let me turn it back over to Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Jim, and thank you all of you for being here. And I'm sure we'll have a much more exciting session for you in Dakar, and in any case thanks again. And to anyone who might have joined remotely.



[End of Transcript]

