

**Transcription ICANN Dublin
Wednesday 21 October 2015
RySG-DNA Registry-Registrar Operations Working Group**

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.

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#oct>
The transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Man: Hi welcome everybody.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: He (unintelligible).

Man: Yes, thank you for coming. This is the Registry/Registrar Operations Discussion Group. If that's not the meeting that you think you're in then you're in the wrong room.

This group has been going through a bit of a change, a bit of an adjustment over the last few months. And before we get on to the presentation and the slide deck what I'd like to do is first of all - talk about what this group has been doing and where we collectively want this to go.

Over the last sort of six months this group started really strong with a lot of people interested and a lot of people indicating that they were willing to participate in the registry/registrar operations discussions.

And it very quickly dwindled over time to the point where there wasn't many people participating or contributing especially when it comes to volunteering to offer text or offer documents or even provide changes to documents and so forth.

So to that end, we only really sort of have one document that we're near finalizing. And that's the pricing documentation that we discussed in several sessions.

And to begin with I think in the L.A. GDD meeting for those that were there. There seemed to be an indication that we wanted to revitalize this group again. And perhaps refocus it a little bit.

Instead of talking about things that are really done and dusted even though there are, you know, lots of inconsistent implementations of how pricing is communicated using that as the example between registries and registrars out there.

Trying to work on standardization - or sorry, best practice for those really didn't seem to be as critical as first thought. Given that, we've now already dealt with the fact that those things out there are separate or are different.

And even if we were to come up with some sort of best practices for that it's highly unlikely that we're all going to go back and change. We might over time slowly evolve towards them.

But it's highly unlikely that we're going to do anything significant to change and align ourselves with those. The effort just doesn't seem to be justified.

So out of the GDD what we sort of decided is we need to refocus the group onto current now issues. Issues that are still in their early implementation phases or perhaps haven't even started implementation yet.

And the best example of those issues that we have is the real name validation happening for the Chinese requirements. We have the internationalization of contact data and who is data. That's going on at the moment.

And the ADA implementation, they're three good examples of things that are taking place at the moment where we actually have a chance of trying to get our best practices or trying to get our proposed methodologies consistent before we all begin our implementation.

So hopefully refocusing the group on issues that we have a chance of making changes, we'll reinvigorate participation. And hopefully you guys will be more likely to want to volunteer and help offer documents and so forth.

So I'd just like to get any comments from the room on those statements I've just made before we kick off.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Are you sure, okay.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: So thanks for that. And I agree that the timeliness of the efforts of the pricing work didn't seem to be quite right. And that, as you said, you know, for donuts we'd already rolled out hundreds of TLD's with our pricing established.

So, but I would be happy to meet weekly on the identity validation issue. I think that's very timely. And it's quite frustrating to not have some unity amongst the registry operators on that issue because it's the goal post change all the time.

And I think it would be really helpful if we talked to each other about that.

Richard Merdinger: Rich Merdinger, at GoDaddy. I just want to do two things. One, thank you for the effort that you guys have put into - those that have contributed to the pricing document up to this point because while I agree with (Elaine) that the animal was out of the barn a little bit.

But that's not the case necessarily for all TLD's and new ones that are still launching going forward. So I hope that we do see us bring that to fruition and put a knife in it if you will.

And secondarily the volume of people in this room I think speaks to the need that you identified out of the GDD. And I'm really looking forward to - helping to have the DNA bring this group of DNA members and nonmembers forward for this group. Thank you.

Man: Thank you, okay so working off what Richard said, the volume of people in the room certainly is more than we've had recently. And I will hopefully take that as an indication that we are going to be able to have some good discussion and get some work done and get some people to volunteer to actually put pen to paper and so forth.

So with that said, we'll kick off the agenda. And we'll give a go. Our new revamped registry/registrar operation group and look forward to hearing from you throughout the session. So let's...

(Roger): You bet. Just some of the admin pieces here, let's move the slide. Just to go through the intellectual property - this group has adopted the IATF and knows it well.

So just whatever you say here is part of this group. And it's public and open so just recognize that - so just your one notice. And again, submission, if you

do it in this group then it is public knowledge and everything. So it's available to everybody - next slide.

Say, know it well - so next slide please. So our first topic and something I think we've been drumming up all week and maybe why half of the people are here today - is real name verification. We wanted to get everybody together.

As a registrar we've noticed that there are several different approaches being created for real name verification. And we wanted to get ahead of this as much as possible so that we don't have to do 12 implementations.

You know, obviously we would like one but as few as possible is what we're going for. So I guess the discussion is the one piece that has been publicly known is VeriSign has created a model.

It listed here as a verification code extension proposal and the verification mapping. I don't know if Scott wants to step up and talk about any of this. Or we can individually do the VSP model first. Yes, okay.

So Scott's team (Jim Ghoul) did a lot of work on this already. And the model they've set up is an independent; third party VSP would do the real name verification.

And they would set in between the registrar and the registry in a way that it's actually service provided to the registrar. That then they actually take a sign code and provide to the registry as proof that either the domain itself or the registrant is, you know, been verified and can continue on through the process.

Again, this is the one standard that's been publicly noticed. Scott did mention to me the other day that they do have IP on this. I took a look at it. The licensing section is a little - needs to be updated a little.

And I don't know if Scott or someone from VeriSign can provide any impute on that, great.

Man: Excuse me, before Scott steps up, does the room have a good solid understanding of what (Roger) is talking about and if not could you please explain what the context is for this.

(Roger): Absolutely, let me explain even if everybody shook their head just a little. So real name verification is coming out of China. MI IT has. I don't know that it's actually. It's not required yet.

But they've posted their requirements of if you are a local TLD or a local registrar to China you have to do real name verification on domain sales. You can actually sale the domain and renew it if you want without real name verification.

It just will not resolve. So these rules are that yes you have to provide some documentation. Sorry, some documentation that gets verified by someone and again, there's different models of this.

And that documentation is stored for later reference and compliance. Hopefully that made since.

(Jeff): Thanks, it's (Jeff) (unintelligible) from Right Side. Just one quick clarification, when you're saying you can sell it as a registry but I don't - is that also as a registrar if you are a China based registrar.

You could sell it without the real name verification in them. I'm not sure that's true.

(Roger): Thanks (Jeff), I actually, I'm not sure if that rule is true, if a local registrar can sell and not resolve. I'm getting, no's as people have read that, okay.

Woman: (Roger).

(Roger): Yes.

Woman: So I actually investigated this. We looked at some domain registrations that were of Chinese registrants. And some of them did not resolve and others did.

So it kind of - I don't know who picks who gets to resolve or not. But there isn't consistency in the application of the rule.

This is (Fernando Finally) from the New Store - so quick clarification, the way that their requiring for the real name verification has been in place for that VN - the (unintelligible) of D4 over the past five years.

Now the new regulations are going to come out. There're others that know more about this than me. But the requirements at registries that want to sell in China - through Chinese registrars need to apply for a license.

And if the TLD does not have a license then their registrant - whether they register outside of China or within China, it's not going to be able to obtain an ICP number which allows them to have a host and a Web site hosted in China.

(Roger): Thanks (Fernando). I think we're already illustrating why it's important that we get together and discuss this particular issue.

And one of the first key steps that I'm pulling out of this is I think one of the things we need to try and do is get a team to volunteer to put together a consistent view on what the requirements actually are before we even bother talking about technical solutions or how we're going to make it work.

I think it would be really helpful if somebody wants to volunteer to put together a nice simple, plain English document on what's required. And I might just be bold and call for anyone to volunteer right now that would like to put their hand up and say, "I'm prepared to give that a go." (Jody)'s going to give that a go.

Man: I'll give it a go.

(Roger): And I feel like maybe (Fernando) and it seems maybe laying down the end of...

Man: Yes over here. If you guys could get together and help (Jody) on this process that would be really helpful. And I'm also going to volunteer (Geon) from OVD and S. I think I saw him.

Man: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Okay, yes.

Man: (Unintelligible), actually I read us through with the Chinese regulation how often (unintelligible) the English was.

Man: Okay, great.

Man: (Unintelligible) if I can. I think that we did (unintelligible) to make sure every word is correct...

Man: Could repeat to the mic or give him the mic.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: We have remote participants.

Man: Someone may notice that a couple of months ago have written an article in the server ID. It had some basic facts. But now if you see we want a full translation about the regulation. I would be more than happy to do that.

Man: That'd be great, thank you - so, Scott.

Scott Hollenbeck: Sure (Scott Hollenbeck), Verisign. And (Roger) noted Verisign has made an IPR disclosure to the IATF in the context of these two Internet drafts. They are IATF Internet draft documents.

The IATF has a note well policy that requires us to disclose IPR related to any contributions to the IATF process. As (Roger) also noted the section of the declaration on terms is deliberately - we declined to specify terms at this time.

And we may specify terms in the future. We've done that because we don't yet have a good measure of community acceptance of this approach. We don't have a good sense of what the community would find acceptable in terms of terms.

But I do need to say up front that our first goal - - our primary goal - - is that an approach like this be the one adopted by the community. And so we're interested in your feedback both on the approach and on possible licensing terms.

So are there any questions about the disclosures or what we're looking for?

(Brick False): Yes, (Brick False) from the registry. What do you mean by licensing terms?

Scott Hollenbeck: Okay, in the context of IATF IPR declarations this could be anything from a license is required. Come contact us and bring your wallet. To, you know, freely available to anyone wishing to implement this standard.

And so there is a range of possibilities. We are interested in your feedback on the possibilities.

(Brick False): Well the second one is clearly preferable.

Woman: Scott I only learned about the RFC this week. So has there been an opportunity for discussion from the community or could we arrange for that?

Scott Hollenbeck: Okay, when you say, "RFC" you mean these Internet draft documents, okay no. There has not been much disclosure or conversation yet. They were just recently published.

You know, typically disclosure of Internet draft documents happens on mailing list. And these two in particular, one of them is anticipated to be picked up by the EPP X working group.

Okay we have not had an opportunity to discuss that possibility on the mailing list. The ITF is meeting in two weeks in Yokohama. These two documents are on the agenda for discussion.

But like many Internet drafts people are very busy right now. They're not necessarily focused on getting into the details of, you know, discussing particular documents.

But I see anything coming out of this meeting room here as being a primer for getting that conversation started. And there will most definitely be conversation in the room in Yokohama in two weeks.

Man: Thanks Scott. I think it's important to note that the documentation that Scott's referring to is a very technical description about communications between registries and registrars.

And I'm not yet sure that the community is at the level yet with the understanding of exactly what's required here to be debating, you know, what goes in the protocol and so forth.

I think we're still at the stage of trying to identify who all the actors are and figure out who has to interact with who and what information has to flow around.

If somebody thinks otherwise, please speak up. But I think the majority of people in the room here are still sort of struggling with understanding what this model is and who the actor are and what's required.

Richard Merdinger: Richard Merdinger, again for the record. Even though we're at the early stages of understanding what the problem we're solving here is. The whole point of bringing it up at this early stage is so that we are coming together and trying to define solutions that will really be workable.

Rather than having solutions independently created as the requirements are becoming understood, leaving us with fragmented possibly even inconsistent implementations between registries and different registrars leaving to pain when we do transfers are pain when we try to do data modulation or, you know, et cetera.

So I know it's early. But that's why we're bringing it up now, thanks.

Man: Great, thanks Rich. I think there's a question from the chatroom. And then we'll grab you.

Coordinator: We (Pahlavi) from India. The question, "Many times it seems that initially the registrant details are fine and more or less verified.

But in actuality during the tenure when the domain is already registered for five or ten years, if the details change, it's difficult to keep things up to date - any suggestions on that front other than sending reminders to the registrants?"

Man: Does anybody want to respond?

Man: (Unintelligible) I think it's not. The verification is not about like a huge detail. They just want to say in China (unintelligible) you have a national ID - - unique number.

So verification is that you check this number against a national authoritative source to say you are who you claim to be because there are (unintelligible) there.

And if you are a company, you have a corporation number. You'll also be checked against that database. And if you are a nonprofit organization, you have an organizational code.

There is also a national database. So basically every registrar of registry, just to check your number just to check the material you submit against that database to say you are who you claim to be. That's the meaning of verification, yes.

Man: Can somebody - and it's basically (unintelligible) who understands the requirement. Let us know. Does this have - is this done on the initial domain? Create early or is it expected to be repeated periodically?

Man: That's a good question. Ideally, it should be done just once, right. Otherwise you just be done repeatedly. It just cost money and time. But whether you

can do it just one time or repeatedly, we'll base on the business model.
Because if one registrar because (unintelligible) registrar, right.

If a registrar does verification end to the end, second day they transfer to the B registrar? So the B registrar was not necessarily agreed that your verification is totally correct.

So B registrar may want to do it again to be sure. The company will not while it's the law. So maybe one day the high level authority may find a model to say measure the inter registrar transfer or any activity about the domain name.

If the verification has been done one time from the beginning and maybe later it will not be done again. But it's based on - in a fuller development, yes.

Man: So it appears to me that there isn't really hard of fast rule based on that answer. So it's up to each individual registrar to decide how much verification they have to do to show their remaining...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Currently it is.

Man: Okay, at the mic please.

(Wesley): Yes this (Wesley) from ZBNS. Actually or presently I'm an engineer. So personally I'd like to appreciate (unintelligible) to have those drafts to do some EPP tension to allow the EPP command to solve this verification business model.

But according to our own business, you know, we already have, again a platform and have 22 TLD's. And there are certain TLD or belong to the Zodiac which register in Cayman Island.

Basically it is, you know, foreign registry. I think, yes. I agree with that gentleman's idea that maybe a (unintelligible) - not only an EPP tension tech new model would better describe how this verification will work. Because according to our own business, kind of, verification is kind of complicated.

I don't think the EPP command is. It could. But when if faced, you know, nine different ID documents and very different reason to refuse verification maybe we need a more specific clear description of the whole work process, instead of these EPP commands, thank you.

Man: Yes, thank you. That's hopefully what are newly formed real name verification group is going to deliver first to us is a great workflow of what our process flow of exactly what's required here.

Is there anybody that thinks they could do that on the fly right now just to try and help move the conversation along. I'm prepared to give it a go. But I'm sure lots of people are going to have to jump in and correct.

But my understanding is that it's something along the lines of this. A Chinese based registrant or soon to be registrant approaches a - I feel like I'm telling a joke - approaches a Chinese registrar to register a name in a TLD that's licensed to operate in China.

Now in theory, a Chinese registrar is not able to sell any TLD's that aren't licensed to operate in China. Or if they do sell them those domain names won't function in China.

There is a mechanism by which they could - make to function which is the ICP code. But that's outside the scope for now because we're just talking about registry/registrar interactions.

So the Chinese registrant approaches the registrar to register the name. The Chinese registrar has an obligation to do some validation on that registrant. Well I'm not exactly sure what that validation is. We've talked about the Chinese ID card or if it's a company.

We've got some Chinese company numbers to check. But presumably there's some volume of information that the registrant has to supply to the registrar that then has to be validated somehow.

I'm not sure that the requirement dictates who does this validation. I think the registrar could do it themselves. I think the registrar could outsource it somewhere else.

I think. I don't think that necessarily it's not dictated that there necessarily needs to be one entity responsible for all the validation. Every registrar could go and train themselves how to do it and get the validation done.

I'm looking and nobody's contradicting me. So I think that's - do you want to correct that?

(Ashley La-Wool): That was loud. I'm (Ashley La-Wool) from EPACT Demand Services. I just wanted to make a comment about - like the Chinese validation process as he described verses the validation process that we as a foreign registrar would go through.

Because the way he described it you have numbers that you can check directly against the national database. You push those numbers through. Obviously, they're correct or incorrect. And you're done.

From our perspective it's a totally different process because we don't have access to that database. So we have to submit documents that match the contact and the supplied in the contact.

And those documents are validated on our end and the registries end. So we're talking about a top down validation process that a contact that I validate will necessarily be validated at another registrar.

If that contact was transferred to that registrar. It's not. It's copied. So we're talking about like I think a different - a process that can't work for GTLD.

Like the registrants that we have at a different registrar when we move those to us we have to begin the validation process again even though the documents are already validated by the registry.

So I wanted to say something earlier but I feel like we're talking about a process where a country can validate people within their country pretty easily based on documentation a lot of times by electronic databases.

But once you get outside of that country it turns into a manual process that usually involves some sort of pause in the registration process before the domain can even be registered.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yes.

Man: (Fernando) you want to make some comments.

(Fernando Finally): Yes if I can make a quick clarification, the process that you're describing is true today for (unintelligible). It's a CCTLD. The new regulations that are coming out are for GTLD's.

And it's only going to apply for registrars that are located in China. So for this regulation re-verification is not a requirement for foreign registrars.

Man: Yes, correct me if I'm wrong because English is just my second language. Validation is different from verification. What I'm thinking is more like a formal chair to say you have number.

You have addressed right. And that formally it looks right. It's okay. By verification means you have to check against the database to say that's really - you're claiming you are. So that's a different thing there.

(Ashley La-Wool): So I can't speak to the GTLD model. Sorry about that - for Chinese domains that we don't offer those. I'm talking about - I'm going back to the dot CN process.

We do verification and a validation. So we're getting documents from the client. We're checking that that is the registrant listed on the domain, making sure that it's a valid document and making sure that, you know that everything matches up all the way through the chain.

So I'd say it's a validation and a verification that we're talking about for to CN. Again, I don't know what you guys are doing for the GTLD's.

Man: But basically, foreign registrar they don't have access to the national database. So basically I think is a new revelation. They don't require a foreign registrar to do verification just apply to Chinese registrar - registrar of minutes through a Chinese registrar.

Man: Chinese registrar.

Man: Yes that's the case.

Man: Yes.

Woman: And just for my understanding that with the CN what they do is when you submit information they would make distinction whether this person is located in china or not.

If it's location China it maybe goes to start up the validation if it's not. And then there was sort of the process going through. So they would sort of look at the documents and see what they're going to do with.

So they're not requiring in foreign registrar to make the distinction, yes thank you.

Man: Thank you - the mic.

(Christine): Hi, hello this is (Christine) from GoDaddy. A couple of points and questions in this discussion, from the GoDaddy perspective, I feel like there're three layers to this discussion.

There's the technical, you know, integration discussion that you folks are having here. But I also feel like there's a very strong legal and policy discussion that needs to be layered on top of this. Because we can all speculate all day long about what we think technically will work.

But tying that to a legal interpretation that is then verified by the MIIT or the governing bodies, to me, is an incredibly important part of this discussion.

And I would like to suggest that whatever working group comes out of this has a strong legal and correct connection to the folks that in China are making these decisions.

And I'm not about to prescribe who that should be in this room. I just want to make that suggestion. Next for me is the product layer. As I look at the GoDaddy experience and as I think about what we have to design and implement.

And as I look at, frankly four different implementation IDO's right now, it ranges widely from verification having to happen at the sharper level verses the TLD level at the registration part or activation which are very, very different experiences for our customers.

So first of all I applaud this group for having this discussion. I thank you for having it. But I encourage you that we cannot just think about technically how do we make this work? We have to be looking at what the customer experience is, what we are required to do.

And so if I can add support from both the product and the legal layer to make this a more well-rounded discussion, I'm happy to participate. But please bring those folks into the discussion.

And please make sure we're connecting this discussion to the folks within China that are going to ultimately bless what we all think we're going to implement. Because we can speculate all day long and I'm worried that we're not connecting all the layers that need to be connected, so, thank you.

Man: Thank you. There're fair points there. I should clarify that this group definitely isn't a technical group. And it never has the intention of being a technical group.

And we're going to leave all that technical stuff today at TS where it belongs. This is going to be about operational processes and certainly, obviously, legal and product is going to impact that or fall into that.

So definitely this group may eventually produce a best practice or a recommended approach I might say for any verification it might reference, some technical documents written by the ITF.

But this group itself isn't going to try and offer those documents. So I think we do have to make the distinction. I think the important part of that conversation just before. Recognize that there is a distinction between the new requirements for TLD's or anyone seeking a license to sell names in China.

As opposed to the existing requirements that are in place for Dot CN. They are distinctly different. It might be possible later that the approach that we come up with works for both. Or it might not be possible. I don't know.

But I think for now, in the interest of moving this along what we want to focus on is the new license to TLD requirements and the CN requirements at this point in time.

We can of course spin up another group to look at that if we that that's important. But for now, let's focus on the TLD's.

Man: I'll just add one thing; just a question really is a new GTLD that is a Chinese TLD that is hosted in Mainland. Do they have different rules then new GTLD's in the Cayman's or wherever?

Man: Not to my understanding.

Man: No.

Man: Same rule.

Man: Yes.

Man: So if we go back to the process of what we're talking about before. Our registrant - or our potential registrant has communicated with the registrar. It's provided some information that needs to be validated.

How that gets validated is something that we need to discuss. And each - as we said, you know, the registrar could validate themselves. They could outsource that validation to somewhere else. How that outsourcing arrangement works from a process perspective.

Does the documentation flow via the registrar to the validation agent? Is the validation agent a separate entity kind of like the trademark clearing house model that we have at the moment where you submit the validation information to a validation entity that then provides the registrant some digital identity that proves that...

Chris Dillon: be invalidated, but then they can just give that to the registrar and we're done.

Does the registry have to revalidate or is there a way that the registrar can let the registry know that the validation has been done and so forth and so on?

There's going to be a lot of business impact here and I think it's going to be challenging at the least to try and get every registry to sort of agree to do this the same way -- at least in the detail. We might be able to have an overarching process that's a process for it that's similar.

But every registry is going to have a different level of legal risk; they want to expose themselves to a different level of operational risk that they want to expose themselves to. The registrar is the same.

And particularly I know that the requirements that exist are very vague and very open to interpretation. So I think it's going to be really interesting to see if we can come together and at least agree on, you know, a high level approach that we want to take here.

I'm very clear on after the registrant and registry is validated and the name is registered, if that's the end of it or if come renewal time it has to happen

again, I'm unclear on that. I'm unclear on if the name is transferred somewhere, what's supposed to happen then.

I'm unclear on what happens if it transfers from a registrar based in China to a registrar not based in China and the other way around. What happens if it transfers from a foreign registry into a China registry?

I have lots and lots of questions and I imagine the rest of the room does as well. So this group that we put together before is going to have to start cataloging those questions and trying to get answers.

But, please.

(Robbie): I'm (Robbie) here for (1API). I would be very interested in this group coming up with, you know, the documents of - its simplified here the requirements, but broken down into three categories. One is the requirements for a TLD registry operating and wanting to sell that TLD in China; the second one, requirement for registrar in China wanting to sell domains in China.

And of course for another document -- a third document -- a registrar outside of China selling either directly to Chinese registrants, if that impacts us or by resellers.

And so we have - we're a wholesale registrar and we have a ton of resellers in China. How is that going to impact my business?

So I simplified - say simplified three documents, possibly work together in collaboration with MIIT to get clarity on this would be a fantastic outcome of this group.

Chris Dillon: Great, thank you. And I'm just wondering if any more conversation on this at this point in time is valuable until we have that understanding.

We have some other items on the agenda we can move to, but I'm happy to open it to the room if you want to keep talking about this or do we want to move on and have a look at our other items.

Rich.

Rich Merdinger: This is Rich. It's not so much I want to keep going, but I'd like to make sure that these document sets that we're creating have layered onto them somehow the impact on the customer experience as they're attempting to procure the domain names, get them live, renew them, et cetera, so that we don't fall into the trap of focusing on one element of this and leave - we don't do it just for the customer and leave the technical out, if you will, or implementation out and vice versa, so having that layer there as well.

Chris Dillon: Yes. So that's what we've got here are the framework requirements, but even here also the common business requirements that we want in terms of customer experience and so forth. I assume Jody is taking notes.

Please, (unintelligible).

John McCabe: A comment and a question. John McCabe; Dot Whois Registry.

And I was very interested to hear about the validation requirements in China because they're a lot simpler than outside of China because everybody has got an identification number, every company has an ID, et cetera. So it's very straightforward I think.

I think that I would like to volunteer to work on the community, the group, to do this. And I think that, you know, I think it's presumptuous to assume that the Government of China is going to give a definitive answer because we asked for it. And, you know, as Comrade (Don Sha Ping) said, "It doesn't matter if a cat is black or white as long as it catches mice."

So, you know, the Government of China is going to do what meets their long-term objectives. They're not going to lock themselves into giving you, you know, what would be called a ruling, you know, that you can work under. So it's really going to be what works for them.

And I think I have one question and that is if a Chinese language IDN at the domain level is registered to a company outside of China who has not been verified, will it resolve in China? Can you tell me that?

Chris Dillon: Somebody?

Man 2: Absolutely. In the main level, our foreign registrant registering through (unintelligible). Yes, it works.

John McCabe: A foreign registrant registering for a foreign...

Man 2: Through a foreign registrar.

John McCabe: ...a foreign registrar; right.

Man 2: It's okay.

John McCabe: It's okay, right.

Man 2: Yes, so another story is we can (unintelligible) that. If we want to establish the Web site (unintelligible) that's in our story because you have got ICP liking some.

John McCabe: Okay. Okay, so the ICP like...

Man 2: Yes, so that's the layer -- the administration -- and ICP.

John McCabe: Thank you.

Man 3: Is that if the Web site if hosted in China?

Man 2: Absolutely, yes. Hosted in China; yes.

Woman: Sorry, two more questions. So is your understanding that both the shopper and the SLD/TLD are verified, and is that at registration or is that at activation, or is it just the shoppers is verified or the TLD is verified? Or do we not have clarity around those two particular pieces?

Man 2: So what do you mean by shopper (unintelligible)?

Woman: So is the registrant pilot, is the registrant verified in addition to the SLD that they're trying to register? And is that at registration or is that when they actually try to activate the (unintelligible)?

Man 2: Both. When we say (unintelligible), it's actually including two parts. One is a name itself, right.

Woman: Yes.

Man 2: You cannot against the Chinese law.

Woman: Right.

Man 2: The other part is registrant's information...

Woman: Okay.

Man 2: ...to say you are who you claim to be.

Woman: That's consistent with what I've understood. But is that at registration or is that at activation? Or is that not clear at this time?

Man 4: Full registration, its first verification.

Woman: For registration.

Man 4: For activation the second. I mean you can have a name if you - when you don't pass the verification. You know, present identity certification. But you can still hold domain name, but it's not activated; it doesn't work.

Woman: Right. So I'm interpreting you as saying I can still register the domain without verification, but if I want to use it I have to verify it. Is that correct?

Man 4: Yes.

Woman: Okay.

Man 4: Actually a second verification; you're personal identity.

Woman: All right. You know what? Maybe we'll figure that out as part of the group. But as a registrar, that's a pretty important question for us to just to be clear.

Man 4: I just want to make a quick clarification. The real name verification requirements from the regulations is for registries, and then registrars also have a requirement for MIIT when they obtain their license from MIIT as a registrar...

Woman: Yes.

Man 4: ...to the real name verification at the registrar level.

Woman: I understand that, but what I'm trying to understand from the shopper perspective is do I go through the purchase flow and register the domain and have to do verification at that time, or is that a delayed action that I can do

post-purchase when I want to activate and use the domain? Those are two different experiences potentially from a registrar channel.

So again, don't need to have that necessarily solved today. But if we have registries that are interpreting that differently and come to us and want two different experiences within our purchase flow, that's a significantly different thing that we have to come to terms on and I ask that that be part of your work.

My second question is how do we, the larger community, understand progress against this issue, and is there any sort of timing, (Jodi), that you figured out in the last five minutes in terms of when you're going to have this figured out.

From I guess from a timing perspective, it would be helpful to understand the output of this and how we're going to charge forward as a community to try to come together, and how we stay in touch on updates.

Jody Kolker: All I was going to mention is if you'd like to be part of this group, please send me an email or drop your card off to me. Well, talk to me after this meeting and we'll get a meeting set up next week or in two weeks, and after we have the documentation we could discuss it and come up with something that's hopefully usable relatively soon I hope.

Chris Dillon: We recognize the urgency of this and there's a lot more work to come after we sort of define the process flow and so forth. So we're going to get that done as fast as possible.

I'll give Jody a chance to get a list of his participants and so forth, but I'll ask that one of the first things is I'll just figure out a timeline. But it's going to be as fast as you can please.

Jody Kolker: And to help (Christine) the communication plan that you'll be, you know, sending out notes weekly by weekly or monthly, whatever, so that people can stay abreast.

Crystal Peterson: This is Crystal Peterson from Neustar. I just wanted to make one comment about the working which I'm very excited to have started.

I'm concerned that there's - we have (Jian) from ZDNS here but other Chinese registrars, there are some TLDs that have been licensed in China currently under the regulation which means that there are registrars that are implementing and have view to the regulations and looked at all of these implementations.

So, you know, I know they may not be members of the DNA, but can we have them potentially in as guests? Of course we can't, you know, force them to be part of the group, but to invite them in as guests to have Chinese registrars as part of this working.

Chris Dillon: Yes, so this working group is not a DNA working group, so we need to make that clear. It's facilitated by the DNA, so DNA helps us organize calls and provide mailing lists and so forth, but it's not a DNA working group.

So - you're right, no worries. So Jody will try and help them get, you know, that those registrars that you've mentioned, if you can get those contact details to Jody and then he'll be able to reach out and ask them and say, "Hey, you did this, how about you tell us how you saw it?"

Woman 2: Yes, I think I agree with you Crystal that it's important for (Sun), you know, (Big China), Chinese registrar for example, HiChina, GNet, if they want to participate, and would be happy to coordinate as well and follow-up.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Okay, so we - sorry, someone else? All right, we have half an hour left.

Man 6: I just wanted to follow-up with one more thing. (Robbie) mentioned three scenarios. I don't know if anybody else had other ideas that they were looking for; did they see other paths that need to be documented.

Man 2: I'd like to see maybe there are four. Another scenario is that if for a registrar, for example, (Unintelligible), have interest into going to a Chinese market to become a Chinese local registrar. It also has proof follow the (unintelligible).

Man 6: Yes, but then they would be a Chinese registrar then, right; that would be considered a Chinese registrar which would already be covered.

Chris Dillon: Okay, great. So we have half an hour left. We're going to move onto our next topic now, so the Whois internationalization efforts. So who would like to volunteer to give us an overview of where we're at with this at the moment?

((Crosstalk))

Jody Kolker: I'm sorry. International Registration Data was a working group that I was on and it was basically covering how to store international data. So as I'm sure everyone knows is that most data is stored in ASCII right now. And in order to provide a great customer experience for CN registrants, the data is going to have to be stored in the UTF-8.

So basically what we were - one of the goals we were assigned to I guess was to try to review how it's stored or how we can store this and be able to display it I guess.

What we came to, which I think really effects registrars and registries, is that if the data is to be stored in a UTF-8, the language and script should also go with it or be tagged on each one of those fields because a customer may have a Latin name and then postal information that is in China or will have.

Now part of the problems that we see with that is that EPP is not set up to do a tag on different elements on the postal info; there's only a lock and an it. And so adding that information on each tag line or on each element of the postal info is going to cause issues for registries and registrars because we'll have to send that information in.

Now one of the proposals or the proposal that came out in the working group was that that information would be - if a person says that they're from China, then that information that's stored in that postal information should be stored in a local script and language of that region.

That poses another problem in that there's no ISO list of local regions or local scripts and languages for a region, and that would pose a huge problem I'm guessing for us because it will be very difficult to do that.

Chris Dillon: Okay, so Jody, if the Registry/Registrar Operations Group was to form a working group around this, what would you say - what would you like to see as the outputs eventually of that working group?

Jody Kolker: Well I think that we would have to help define the EPP for that to be able to send in that information. I think we should also have a best practice of something to do with, for instance, can you store a localized contact and an internationalized contact on the same (Roid)? If you do, which one is the registrant? Is it the localized version or is it the international version?

And just to have some kind of, I guess, some kind of recommendation for ICANN on what it is and how we would like it to be done.

Chris Dillon: Okay, thank you.

Man 6: Yes Chris, just to add onto this that one of the goals - the second bullet here was a transformation working group that came to the conclusion - they were

tasked to say, "Okay, should transformation be mandatory, and if so, you know, who pays for it?"

The conclusion was and it's been accepted by ICANN Board that no, transformation is not mandatory and the second point is mute because it's not mandatory. So if you want it you pay for it.

I think the big issue and why, you know, I suggested this topic was (Jody's) working group that he sat on the IRD and this group kind of went to different questions. But I'm not sure that they can be reconciled or they're not reconciled today.

And I think the bigger question here is how do you reconcile those Whois recommendations that are out there. And I think the IRD made it in their next steps saying, "Hey GNSO, you know, how do we try to pull in what's required by all the current policies that the new transformation policy and what they've come up with?"

So to me the biggest outcome is is how can we help the GNSO get to that next step of pulling all these together and making one statement instead of 12 different ones.

Chris Dillon: So if I'm understanding correctly, there's eventually going to a consensus policy on this? Is that what's going to happen?

Man 6: Yes.

Chris Dillon: Okay so we want to form a group to help guide that consensus policy to essentially avoid a trademark clearinghouse, right. A policy that they may have to implement that is very...

Man 6: Or if we want a trademark clearinghouse.

Chris Dillon: Yes. Okay, great. Any other comments on this? Jim?

Jim Galvin: Yes, thank you. Jim Galvin from Afilias. And thank you Jody. Jody and I worked together on this IRD working group. I was Chair of that working group, and actually also participated in the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Data Working Group over its lifetime.

I want to add a little bit of color to the discussions and what these work products actually mean in all of this.

I would phrase and shape the output of the IRD working group as representing, you know, the model that we should try to get too. So in other words, the observation here is registrants, you know, should be allowed to use - in the IRD group we called this our user capability principles in what we produced. A registrant should be able to use whatever script or language in which they are most ordinarily skilled, and there should be no obligations on them.

And if you start with that as a premise and everything else, you know, flows relatively naturally and you run into this issue of you have to be able to support multiple languages and scripts, and what does that really mean to you as a registrar, what does it mean to a registry.

To a registry it's more straightforward to the extent that you just have to be able to take anything in, okay, and store it.

But the issue that Jody was referring to, the issue that you run into is, from the translation and transliteration side or the transformation side, the term that Roger was using, the T and T working group used the more general term of transformation to, you know, describe all the various options that one might use there.

So if you want to be able to transform data and be able to do this in a consistent way where consistent means I can turn it into one form and get it back and always have the data, in fact you can't do that today with today's tools; there are no standard tools that make that happen for a number of reasons, one of which Jody talked about.

There are no standard list of languages and scripts for countries and locations and things like that, so there are practical limitations aside from tools that don't do this effectively.

But the data needs to be identified; you need to understand the data. This is the tagging or the marking that is referred to in the IRD stuff and the transformation work product. You need to know what script belongs to the data; you need to know what language belongs to the data if you want to solve the general problem.

And today, that information is not generally available. What we highlight in the IRD group is although EPP has facilities for identifying script and language that could be adopted and used; they are at the object level, okay. They are not at the element level. And that's really the issue.

You can have people who can have, you know, names in one language and script, your address information is in a different language and script. Okay, you can also have mixed scripts in those elements. I can have, you know, my name could be in two different scripts; address information.

And address information, the canonical example is you could be using Arabic numerals zero to nine, and they're commonly used in most of the languages and scripts and you mix those things.

So there are some operational issues down the road if we want to get this place of fully supporting internationalization.

So Chris, you asked the question in what could this group do to facilitate some of this. Before I answer that, let me just come back and remind people, if you missed it, you should go back to Sunday afternoon. There was a 2:00 pm meeting which I think it was called Whois Review Team Internationalization. It was in many ways kind of misnamed in my opinion.

But in that group, the IRD Working Group and the Translation and Transliteration Working Groups each presented their work product. And in fact, there was some very good discussion at the end of that group.

So if you're interested in this topic, I would really encourage people to go listen to the audio and listen to that discussion. But go back and get those presentations and get some background material in that space if you're looking for an update.

But a question that was in that group and you're asking here too is what is the next step.

From the T&T side, they were PDP. So their next step now is implementation, but in fact there is no implementation because they said that there would not be a standard transformation. So the work product there is kind of done and that was a very nice outcome to have come too.

In the IRD group, you're left with this question of how do I get from where we are today to this ideal model of actually supporting internationalization. And what we had specified in the work product was a list of the requirements for what internationalization would look like on the submission and display side.

And it's an open question as to now how do you turn that into exactly, you know, the things that you want to do and want to implement and move in that direction?

So Staff had taken back as an action, when that report gets to the Board and the Board accepts it and then they push down onto the Staff to begin to act on the recommendations, you have to figure out what exactly are the questions you want to answer and what PDP actions will come out of that. You know, so there are implementation questions about how you achieve internationalization.

So what could this group do? You want a set of people put together who could think about and in fact registrars in particular because they're most directly affected on the submission side. You want to have a discussion about what do you want to implement, what can you implement, what is reasonable to implement.

And in fact, one of the answers that we had in that meeting on Sunday afternoon was put out there this idea that in this discussion what you'll ultimately probably find is the clique 80/20 kind of rule, right. We can probably only solve 80% of the problem here in a reasonable way. And there's just going to be some places and some parts of the world that there's really just nothing you can do about it right now; the tools aren't there, you know. I mean they're just not; a fundamental problem.

And having that discussion and providing that input to Staff when they take this on once the work product is accepted and tasked down to Staff to follow, if we could have some thoughts here about that, that would be a good thing. And I apologize for talking so long but I'll stop now.

Chris Dillon: Thanks Jim.

So what I'm sort of seeing here is interested parties getting together, forming a working group to try and get in front of what is going to eventually become a PDP, and guide that in a way where, when hopefully, when that PDP is approved, all of us are ready to go with an implementation that will meet that that we're all happy to do and we feel it's justified and so forth.

Rich, what do you have to add?

Rich Merdinger: Two things. Thank you for that detailed description though because not all of us are following it as closely as some.

And just as we kicked off today with real name validation and I think validation and verification, what have you, not everybody knew what it was. So it's good into the depth when we're going to kick these things off.

You made a comment that the registrar is most affected by submission. And I understand that within the context of registry/registrar interactions. But it's really the registrant that is impacted by the submission because they're submitting the information to the registrar et cetera, et cetera.

And I just want to make sure that I reinforce something (Christine) said which is that we are considering the impact on the individuals whose information that we're trying to collect and share amongst registrars during transfers and things along that nature so we don't end up with data definitions that are going to be painful to meet from a submission standpoint.

Jim Galvin: I want to add one point of clarity to that I think to make sure I understand what you're saying. I mean I appreciate that the registrant is most affected because they're the ones that have to enter the data.

But the work product, the principles, were not intended to be prescriptive in that way. In fact, the whole point of the user capability principle is that the user, they just type, okay. It really is - the responsibility is on the part of the registrar to, you know, pull the rest of that information out.

And we actually say in so many words in the document that you wouldn't expect your registrar to tell you the script - your registrant, sorry. You wouldn't expect your registrant to tell you the script and language in use. You kind of

have to intuit that and figure it out from context, and that's where things get complicated and interesting.

So I mean if you can expand a bit on why the registrant is most affected, I'm very interested in that point.

Rich Merdinger: The registrant - thank you. The registrant is affected because when they go to transfer their domain from Registrar A to Registrar B, if those two systems intuit the interpretation differently, individuals could enter information, have a correct, you know, registration in place, and then end up with invalid Whois information if the data is interpreted differently in a thin Whois model and the data goes over to the other side.

So it's that type of thing - and I know that what you're doing is guarding against it with what you're trying to accomplish and with what Jody was talking about to us finding all these problems.

So I'm more thanking you and pointing out registrants are part of this too.

Jim Galvin: Right. More generally, the issue is about registrars that might support these whole features in different ways. And even DSNSEC has this problem, right, so you sort of have this. You don't have, you know, comparable services, then sure, you run into issues.

Chris Dillon: Okay, so it goes who wants to volunteer to chair a working group to look into these issues?

Roger: I will chair that; I will volunteer that.

Chris Dillon: Thank you Roger.

Roger: You bet.

Chris Dillon: So anybody that wants to participate in that working please see Roger. Actually, anyone can raise your hand now if you want to. Yes, so Jim. So we'll get a hold of Roger at some point either at the end of the meeting or so forth and we'll get together and get a chart going on that and figure out exactly what we're going to do.

Yes, Jeff?

Jeff Eckhaus: Thanks; Jeff Eckhaus. I'm clearly not volunteering for this but what I would suggest is for some of us, some of the folks in our organizations might not be in this room. So if we could send out - I don't know what's the best way to send out an email - maybe to the members who are - I hate to - the members that are in the DNA, we could send it out to DNA members and they can make it public or we can make it public another way that we could discuss what working groups have been formed and what the details are.

And then who the head is of that working group so that those people could contact them because I know from ourselves, we have a lot of people who would be interested but are not in this room. So I'd love to be able to disseminate the information to people in my company and other people I know might be interested. So hopefully we can get that out after this meeting. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Yes, good idea Jeff. We'll work on how we're going to do that, but we'll definitely make that happen.

Roger: Is that something we can hit the constituency groups up for, the registry (unintelligible)?

Jim Galvin: Yes, actually we could do that as well, yes. I'll offer to send that out to the registrar. I can probably do both; the Registrar and Registry Stakeholder Group; advantages of vertical integration.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Okay, so we have 12 minutes left. We'll open the floor now to any other business or anybody that wants to raise other things that you think this group should be taking on, or if anybody just wants to speak to Rich; whatever you like.

Rich Merdinger: It's still Rich from GoDaddy. I am unashamedly one of the Vice-Chairs of the Universal Acceptance Steering Group. And that Steering Group has been charged by ICANN and is funded a little bit by ICANN, but then with community involvement, in helping to ensure that the products that we are creating and selling and providing will actually function in the wild; emails will be delivered, EAI or Email Address Internationalization is a big focus for the group, et cetera.

There is another component of this that really fits squarely into this room though, is we are looking at what does it mean to be UA ready or Universal Acceptance Ready? And we are taking the approach that we are running businesses as registrars and registries. The fact that we happen to sell domain names makes it so we're really familiar with these issues, but we're looking to come up with what does UA Ready mean for registry/registrar interactions.

And if anyone is interested in participating in that, we would greatly appreciate some input so that we don't end up figuring out what it means for Vendor B and Registrar B, but that we come up with a holistic view, you know, is EPP done? Yes, check; it supports it -- if you will.

How about ICANN verification of registrant email information when it is an international email address, et cetera?

So this is just a plug to - it's a topic we could have talked about in this area, but we have a working group set up under the UASG and I'd appreciate volunteers. Rich@GoDaddy.com is an email address that will get me and I can help get you engaged. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thanks Richard. Anybody else? Nice, nothing from the room? No.

Okay, well, so just a quick recap. So we're going to form two working group out of this meeting.

The first working group is going to be lead by Jody and that's going to tackle - well initially, the first thing it's going to tackle is helping us map out the workflow interclimates for the real-name verification requirements coming out of China. And then hopefully we'll be able to talk about those requirements, circulate them and then work out what the next steps will be from there on that one.

And the second working group Roger is going to take care of, and that's going to be looking at the internationalization outcomes from the ICANN working group that have put them forward and start looking at how they're going to operationally impact registries and registrars, and help us provide informed input into the upcoming PDP process.

We'll get a summary out to you; the mailing list is there. The people that are not on the mailing list, please feel free to join us. Remember that this is not a DNA group, just facilitated by the DNA so you're all welcome to join the mailing list.

We'll get a summary out to the mailing list of what's going to happen. We'll include Roger and Jody's details. So if you want to circulate internally to your group or anybody interested in joining these working groups, you can get in touch with either of those. And we'll also get a timeline around once we have a chance to sit down and figure that out, especially on the real-name verification requirements.

Did I miss anything? No?

All right, well thank you all for coming. It's great to see the group growing large again and I hope we get a good participation in the working groups that were formed today. And I look forward to seeing you all at the next ICANN.

Woman: We can stop the recording now.

END