Transcription ICANN Singapore
Registrars Stakeholder Group
Tuesday 25 March 2014
Afternoon Session (Part 3)

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.

Coordinator: Registry Stakeholder Group, can we please get started, and can we start the recording please?

I'd like to welcome Marika to provide the update on the GNSO - for the GNSO.

Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks, (unintelligible).

Hi everyone. Thanks for inviting me and others from my team who are not here today, to give you a brief update on the topic of our current discussion in the GNSO.

And (Jennifer), if you can move on to the next slide.

Basically, I've done the same thing as I've done for the last meeting, because as you know, there are a lot of topics under consideration at the moment. We have over - there we go. So there are over 15 net projects under way in you know different stages of their lifecycle. So you know I've just put the main ones here on the slide, and actually I just want to turn around to you and see if there's any of these that you want me to particularly talk about?

My plan is to actually, you know, just spend 10, 15 minutes on this and then actually hand over to Chris Dillon, who is here, who's one of the co-Chairs of the Translation and Transliteration working group so he can brief you a little

bit more about the work they do - they are doing and encourage you to actually participate and provide input into that policy development process, as that potentially has - it can have a huge impact on the requirements for registrars.

First of all, there are some other PDP's that are on their way. One on the Inter-registrar Transfer Policy. We're currently at Part D. We have a PDP on Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation.

There's a working group that's looking at data and metrics for policy making, and that's actually one as well where I really would like to encourage registrar participation. I think we currently have three registrars that have signed up for it. But, I think it's well an area where we could really benefit from the expertise and the experience from registrars, you know basically looking at how can we ensure we have you know, sufficient data to help inform policy development.

But also, you know, what metrics or data needs to be gathered to make sure that we can actually review and assess the success or lack of success of policies that would also then hopefully inform you know any kind of review or how policies need to be amended or adapted to ensure that we can achieve the goal that was set out.

So I don't know if there's any one in particular you would like to talk about?

Man: Privacy and proxy.

Marika Konings: Okay. Privacy and proxy. If we can then maybe move on to those slides. They're a bit further down in the queue.

So that's actually one that has recently kicked off, and actually, we have a lot of registrars participating in that one. Of course if you're interested, you're still more than welcome as well.

If you can go to the next slide.

So basically, this is one of the outcomes of the 2013 RAA negotiations as part of the process that was initiated. At the same time as negotiations commenced, it was also identified that any issues that were on the list that I think the negotiation team started with were not addressed as part of the RAA. That they should be pursued through a PDP process.

So one of those is that policy principles for an accreditation program.

I think as you all know, there's a temporary specification currently in the RAA - on a 2013 RAA that expires in 2017, so the idea is that you know this work will actually replace that specification and provide the framework for an accreditation program which ICANN will be working on in parallel.

So the group is actually looking at a whole host of questions dealing with these issues. For example, you know, should we distinguish between privacy and proxy services? You know, should there be - what should be the terms and conditions for registrars - or across privacy proxy customers and privacy proxy services? Are there any requirements that should be in place for a relay and reveal?

So the group, as I said, is just starting. They started off with gathering information from different sources. They'll now start looking as well at the (server) that the EWG did, where they had, I think feedback from 58 registrars, basically as well comparing what is the current marketplace and what are some of the current conditions that are being used?

And the way they're approaching it is they're already going question by question basically working their way through the information that's available. For example, from Whois studies. And based on that data, try to come to

preliminary conclusions. And hopefully at the end of the day, have a complete set of recommendations in relation to this issue.

As I said, the working group has just commenced. I think they have set as a target deadline for an initial report, January 2015. But if you're interested in this topic, there is a face-to-face working group meeting on Thursday morning from 9:00 to 10:30, so feel free to you know come along there. And if you have any specific questions about the topics they're looking at, feel free to either ask now or on the - on Thursday.

James Bladel: Can I weigh in on that, just - do you mind?

Okay, so this I James speaking for the record.

There's a couple of dangerous ideas I think being floated in this working group from a registrar perspective, like the first one being that - just for example, there are certain types of registrants or certain uses of Web pages that should not be eligible for privacy and proxy. So connecting content to privacy/proxy, connecting whether you're an individual or a commercial user I think are - you know, is concerning.

I think that there's another idea that somehow that the privacy service should validate the Whois information that's provide to it, even if that's not what's displayed in the public Whois. And there are some that are suggesting that that go even further, beyond the 2013 RAA requirements, which we know have been just a fantastic, smashing success.

And so, you know, there's just a number of things being floated around that could - if you operate a privacy service, could be a very significant disruption to how you provide those services currently today with - currently, anyway, to my satisfaction, no demonstrable benefit or harm that will be cured by adopting some of these changes.

So - and (Graham) by the way is Vice-Chair of Tucows. (Graham), did you want to weigh in on this one?

(Graham):   No.

Marika Konings: Yes, sorry. (Graham), I didn't even see you (unintelligible)...

(Graham):   I just got in. Sorry. I missed the beginning of this discussion. Apologies.

I would also just add to that that there's a lot of loud voices from other constituencies within the community, and it would be really good to have some more loud voices from our own in there.

Marika Konings: I think there's quite a few loud registrars there too.

But that's good. That's good.

(Graham):   The more the merrier.

Marika Konings: So again, I think this is one where we'll probably come back, you know, over the next couple of meetings with more updates and as more of your progress is being done.

And also I hope that (Jennifer) will share these slides after this meeting because in all the slides, there's as well more links to further information. Like if you want to follow the conversations. The working group is posting the templates that they're using in which they try to capture basically the data that they've looked at. And on the basis of which, you know, they had the discussions and then resulted in a preliminary recommendation. So it will really give you a chance as well in between to check where things are at, and you know if you have any significant concerns, either you know raise them directly with the working group or go through some of you know the registrar reps that are in the working group.

Man: Yes. If you have questions, just come to talk myself, James, or Michele, and Volker are all in there, so we're happy to tell you more about what's going on in there.

Marika Konings: And maybe one thing to add is that the group did reach out to all the stakeholder groups and constituencies asking for input, and I don't think we actually received anything from the registrar stakeholder group. I think we've received input from the IPC and the NCSG, so if there are any comments or input you want to provide as a stakeholder group, I think that would be very welcome.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Marika.

No, sorry, I mean thank you in general. We should all thank Marika for being Marika, since she does a fantastic job and works so very, very hard.

No, just actually a follow-up to the comments that the others have made with respect to this group.

Sorry, it's Michele Neylon speaking for the record.

There seems to be some rather strong views from some parties that are in that particular working group that validation and verification of registrants wish to avail of a privacy or proxy services which go way, way, way beyond anything that is in the 2013 RAA.

Now considering that in some jurisdictions privacy is a right and not a kind of little add-on or a benefit, and the fact that ICANN has forced us into this ridiculous position of being obliged to publish people's data - personal details in publically available Whois, then we would expect people to go off and to validate themselves in ridiculously high level is nuts, being perfectly honest. But that's just a comment.

Marika Konings: Yes. And this is Marika.

And I know those discussions are still ongoing, but I think where I think at least things currently stand is that there wouldn't be additional requirements and there's even a provision that if the data has already been verified and validated by the registrar because there's an affiliation that that same data would not need to be again verified or validated, only reverification case, and among similar conditions, I think what is currently in the 2013 RAA.

But again, that's you know preliminary recommendations at this stage.

You have a question?

Go ahead.

(Giermo):   Good day. (Giermo) speaking.

Just you mentioned generally 2015 are the first report, so that means that then the program will be active in what - in 2016? 2017?

Marika Konings: I can't comment on that yet. But I mean January is really the initial report. And again, we'll need to see how quick or how slow it can go. Because I mean if we can make progress, of course, the working group is you know aiming to do this as, you know, quickly as they can.

As a target deadline, they have now initial for it on January, but that would mean proper comment forum that would follow, so that gives you, you know, at least two or three months until you then - you know, review of comments. So you know, if that would all go - agreement and work out, you know, I think you're looking more at possible approval end of 2015.

And then it's looking at the colleagues here from the (GBD) team, they would then of course be implementing, so it all depends as well on how quickly that goes.

It may be worth mentioning that in parallel, we are starting to work on a framework for that accreditation program itself, because of course, the policy questions that we're dealing with, but there are also certain elements that - you know, as part of the registrar accreditation program, you know what forms you use, what kind of information you should be provided, then my colleagues will start working on a parallel.

So the hope is that by the time we come to agreement and have recommendations that wouldn't - there won't be a huge delay in actually (unintelligible) the program.

(Giermo): Okay.

So in a diplomatic way, nothing pragmatic to be done between - before two years?

Marika Konings: Well you know, I think that the real deadline is, you know, 1st of January, 2017, because I think that's the moment it expires. So I think you know ideally, or at the latest, it would be in place by that.

(Giermo): It's okay. We've got enough to do at the moment, so...

Marika Konings: Nothing immediate.

Before I hand over to Chris, maybe then just briefly mention I think two other projects where we're actually currently looking for input on when is the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part D. They have a public comment forum open at the moment. There are a number of recommendations that relate to the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy.

Again, you know, it is a policy that affects registrars, so please have a look at the recommendations that are in there. I don't know, James, if you want to mention, do you think maybe of most interest or biggest concern to registrars?

James Bladel: Thanks, Marika.

So this interim report is now our - our initial report is now out for comment. I think that most of it is fairly non-controversial. There are a couple of points that we would direct registrars to take a look at, particularly as it revolves around transfer disputes.

We have issued a recommendation that the length of time - the minimum length of time allowed between a transfer - a failed transfer and the ability to file a dispute be increased from 6 months to 12 months. It could have an impact on certain functions of various registrars, so I'd encourage you to give us some feedback on that.

I think there was another one regarding removal of registries from the transfer dispute layer, which is - you know, like the VeriSign RFE, and skipping directly to the dispute resolution providers, like the National Arbitration Forum. And, I think that that could have also - could also have some implications, particularly because the fee structures are so different.

So, I think that those two recommendations in general are something that we wanted to highlight in this report, and ask registrar - or actually, just as anyone in the community to weigh on those, because they could have the most immediate impact.

I think it's one more slide up was the 6 to 12 month - yes, there's that one. Recommendation 3 is probably going to attract some attention.

And the rest of it's fairly non-controversial. I mean if you think about TDRP's, there have been 70 of them over the last decade, so we're not talking about a policy that's common knowledge or effecting registrars on a daily basis. It's unlikely that you have staff dedicated to fielding TDRP's. They're exceedingly rare. But, you know, it is still an important part of the transfer policy, and we're recommending some important changes to it.

Marika Konings: Thanks, James.

And maybe just go on down and you can also see the other recommendations that are in there.

So there's a workshop tomorrow from 10:30 to 12:00 in Sophia, so if you want to hear more about that, or you have specific input that you already want to provide to the working group, you know, please feel free to join.

And then another one where we have a public comment forum open is on the preliminary issue report on considering (unintelligible) advice for IGO's and INGO's by amending the UDRP and URI's, so it's currently open for public comment. So if you have, you know, any information that you feel is missing from the issue report or any specific views on whether or not a PDP should be initiated, you know please feel free to share that in the public comment forum.

I don't know if there are any other specific questions at this stage, otherwise, I would like to hand it over to Chris so he can talk to you about Translation and Transliteration. And if that's - you know, the slides will be shared. There's a lot more information in there. A lot of links as well to further background information.

And you know, if you have any further questions, you know, feel free to reach out to me or to any of my colleagues I think that you have seen in several of the meetings here this week.

Thank you.

Woman: Thanks, Marika.

Chris?

Chris Dillon: Hello. Okay, thank you. That looks familiar.

Actually, two over. Thank you.

Thank you for coming - you know, and - well, rather, thank you for letting me give the presentation on this subject. And also, thank you to those of you who have already been involved with the working group for various input views given.

Could I have the next slide please?

Okay. This is a PDP, and the two basic questions that we're looking at are these two you see before you. So whether it is desirable - I stress that word because that's a really key word. Whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language, for example English, or transliterate contact information to a single common script, for example ASCII.

And the other main question is who should decide? Who should bear the burden - the financial burden of doing what we tend to call transformation, because translation and transliteration is quite a mouthful.

I should also say that apart from - you know, because we've got the word desirable in there, it may be - you know, there - all sorts of things are possible here. It may be that it ends up - and it isn't desirable at all, or it may be that

it's desirable to go with transliteration or with translation, or with some combination of the two of them.

Next slide please.

And so we're also thinking of benefits to the community. And in fact that word desirable effectively breaks down into a matrix where you've got the various stakeholders in the communities of which the registrars are one, or at least one. And then there are the various purposes for which this contact information should be used.

So, you just have to imagine that matrix. It doesn't (unintelligible) yet, but it will do quite soon.

Another question that comes out of it, just sort of a smaller question is should it be mandatory? Should transformation be mandatory for all gTLD's?

And then down there at the bottom, should it be mandatory for all registrants or only those based in certain countries or using specific non-ASCII script? It could be Chinese or Arabic, or something like that.

Then you get again some questions about validation. What kind of effect this is going to have on the 23rd RAA, and future RAA's?

Should also explain that this applies to - so it applies possibly to the present Whois system, and any future system, which is likely to be enabled for the support of non-Roman script. So it could apply to any Whois-like system.

But the likelihood is that a Whois replacement system would have the non-Roman form functionality, so that's why this translation and transliteration issue comes up.

When should the - sorry, I'm not quite done with it.

When should this policy come into effect? Some legal aspects to that.

Yes. And then it's just back to burden/costs.

Okay, thank you. Next slide.

On this slide, this is an attempt showing you what's going on in this area, because obviously it connects with several other things going on at the moment, and I think a decision was taken to conduct work in parallel rather than one after the other, basically to save time. So the important thing is that the people who are doing the work are actually talking to each other, and that is the communication that's happening quite often.

We have weekly calls a Thursday afternoon, and we typically have members of a working groups joining us on those occasions, including expert working groups.

Okay, thank you for that.

Okay, so officially the input request closes at the end of this month, but actually we're interested in input whenever it comes. I should say that input really is the key, so initial and final reports will be written based on written input. So obviously if somebody comes up to me and formally infers something in this area, I will try and make sure that we actually get it written down. But, it's really better to - it is better not to rely on human error, so send it in written input.

The URL for - we've got the charter. We've also got that Wiki page.

Now I should explain about the Wiki page, that we have worked hard to keep that up-to-date. So basically, even if you've never listened to any of our sessions, even if you know very little about this, it is all systematically there in

a hierarchy, and we will try to keep that system up-to-date so at least people can look at it, see what's happening, what input there has been. Where are the holes? Where are the problems? So, that's really what we're doing.

There's also an issue report down at the bottom there.

Next slide please.

Yes. Any questions?

(Yoav):   Actually, it's not more questions. I really want to talk about this for a couple of minutes with the group. I am a member of this working - I think Volker is also, right?

You are also a member?

No?

Oh, okay. So - oh, you were in the previous one.

Michele Neylon: Would you please ask your question or make the comment? Sorry. It's just we're tight on time.

(Yoav):   I know. Very good point.

It's not a question. It's just to make people understand that we've been talking previously about problems with the new things we have as a result of the RAA, like the verification and the validation, and changes in compliance, and things like that.

This thing is hundreds time more complicated.

Now it is important - and I'm coming from the IDN community, and you need to understand why is this important, because - and there's some basic notion that is not said in these slides that needs to be understood.

Translating and transliteration - transliterating to a single script means that there's going to be Whois, there's going to be multilingual Whois. Internationalized Whois, like IDN, so people from China are - will put their data in Chinese, Japan in Japanese, Israeli in Hebrew, and then it would either stay like that or be translated and transliterated to ASCII. That's generally the idea.

Now we can choose to say no, it's not desirable, meaning there's going to be Whois - we all need to support Whois in multilingual - in multiple languages.

Just think about validation, verification in those languages, okay. This is - the - a lot, lot of issues that can really affect our business. So I would be happy to draft a paper from the group, but it's really important that there's going to be some input from others about this. And if you can put it in - either send it to me or put it into at least - it'd be great if we put it in the list so we can actually give some - a serious input on this because it is really a big thing for us.

Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, (Yoav).

Volker?

Volker Greimann: Volker Greimann for the transcript.

Just one question. There is no question about this - accepting - international registration data not being implemented by registrars being in violation of anything. So registrars are not forced to accept international registration data. That is not being contemplated here, right?

Man: No.

Michele Neylon: I'm confused by the question. What are you saying or asking?

Volker Greimann: I mean, this only becomes an issue if a registrar accepts registration data in a foreign script. If you do not choose to support that...

Man: That might be...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: That may be an outcome. If - there may be an outcome that says registrars have to accept...

Volker Greimann: Okay, I'll join this group.

Michele Neylon: Okay. I'm just - just to - could somebody clarify where this entire thing came from, Marika? Because I'm confused.

James Bladel: You know, if you would go to the queue, maybe...

Marika Konings: This a part from the IRD working group - work that has been done on the internationalized domain name registration. It's also a part I think of the more broader discussion of your globalization in multiple language. And I think it's in the context of that overall discussion. But, a lot of work has already been going on on this topic in previous working groups. It's not out of the blue, but there is a history.

James Bladel: So that was my question is where did it come from? Who's driving this? What problem are we trying to solve?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think the problem we're trying to solve is should - do you have to require a person in China registering their domain name to register their information in ASCII, or is it a requirement if they register it in Chinese to have that translated or transliterated in ASCII so others can view that information too?

                  So I think that...

James Bladel: So currently, most - particularly (unintelligible) TLD's where we have to have a Port 43 response - Port 43 is not defined outside of ASCII, so that's not really a choice. That's a technical limitation. For the interactive Web Whois requirement, we can display different languages.

                  I think - my question is this sure sounds like one of those areas where Chinese registrars might really innovate to serve Chinese markets, and Israeli registrars might serve Hebrew markets, and you know, and a US registrar looking to crack those markets is going to have to get smarter. But trying to force a competitive marketplace to adopt a single language standard is - well, I can tell you first of all there's no bottom to that hole. You know, there's - I think it's the City of Los Angeles - I think I read a statistic that the City of Los Angeles has to publish its official documents in like 130-some languages anyway. I mean, there's just no end to that.

                  So be very careful I think where we're going with this, and I'm trying to understand particularly, is there a particular problem that we're trying to address? Is it that people in the US are faking Whois that can't be verified because they're using Chinese characters? Is it like the tattoo of, you know, chicken soup or something? I mean, what are we doing here?

(Yoav):   Can I comment on that?

James Bladel: Yes, sure. Yes.

(Yoav):   There is a problem is that for non-English speakers, language is a barrier for everything, including putting their data in English in the Whois. So in - generally in some countries, allowing the registrants to put in their data in their own language will increase the - will allow them to register domain names and so on, so that's where it's coming from.

                 (Unintelligible).

James Bladel: Allowing is one thing. Mandating is a different thing.

Woman: I'm sorry. We're going to have to cut it off after Ben.

                 Ben?

Ben Anderson: Cool. Ben Anderson. (Net Names).

                 I'd like to take (Yoav) up on his offer to summarize this to the group because we spoke about this yesterday briefly, and it suddenly hit me that registrant verification, that will be nothing compared to this. This is going to be serious - it's going to have a serious impact for registrars.

                 And if we've got until the 31st, I think we'd like the summary. And if we can find any kind of general consensus amongst (everybody), I think we should make a formal statement to that page, because I think this has got serious implications.

                 Thanks.

Woman: I've noted that as an action item.

Ben Anderson: Yes. Unless ICANN wants to pay for it all, that's cool.

Marika Konings: So this is Marika. There is a question in there. I mean, if the group decides that it is desirable to translate or transliterate, who should pay? So - I mean, that's an open question. So again, I would really like to encourage you to participate in the working group. And I know the group is working through a number of questions that they're trying to gather information on that data.

                 Also, indeed, looking at is it indeed desirable? So what is the problem that we're trying to solve or address?

                 So, I think any information or feedback you have in that regard will be really helpful and it'll - if Chris has anything else that he would like to add?

Chris Dillon: Yes, thank you.

                 I should've made it clear that - clearer that these issues come up really as a result of the linguistic internationalization of the Internet. I mean if you have a Whois system that cannot display - you know, if you have an implementation that cannot display this data - these data, then you know then these issues don't come up.

                 But you know, the likelihood is that at some point, there will be a replacement to Whois which is able to display internationalized contact data, and then you have to make a pure - you know, you have to make a decision as to what will happen. You know, whether there will be some sort of translation or transliteration or not, and that's what we're addressing.

                 Thank you.

Woman: And thank you for your time.

The registrars, we will be relocating to Sophia to meet with the registry. If we could go directly there because we're about seven minutes behind. Thank you.

END