GNSO/SSAC
International Registration Data Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 20 September 2010 at 15:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO/SSAC International Registration Data Workign Group on 20 September 2010 at 15:00 UTC. 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. The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ird-20100920.mp3

 All recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO calendar page:
 http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/

Participants:
Edmon Chung -- GNSO Registry Stakeholder Group, .ASIA
Rafik Dammak -- GNSO Non-Commercial Users Stakeholder Group, Tunisia
Bob Hutchinson, GNSO Commercial Stakeholder Group
Yao Jiankang, GNSO Registry Stakeholder Group, CNNIC
Andrei Kolesnikov -- Nominating Committee Appointee, .RU
Steven Metalitz -- GNSO Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial Stakeholder Group
Owen Smigelski, Sunrider International, Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial Stakeholder Group

Staff:
 Steve Sheng
Dave Piscitello
Julie Hedlund

Coordinator: Thank you, the recordings have been started; please go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Great, thank you everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening.

                   And I see that - is that Andrei Kolesnikov that just joined?

Andrei Kolesnikov: That's me.

Julie Hedlund: Andrei. So this is the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group call

                   on the 20th of September. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening

                   to everyone.

I will do a roll call. On this call we have our co-chair Edmon Chung. We have Rafik Dammak, Steve Metalitz, Andrei Kolesnikov and Owen Smigelski from the Working Group. And from staff we have Steve Shang, Dave Piscitello: and Julie Hedlund.

And Edmon if it's okay with you perhaps I can turn it over to Steve Shang and he can give us a very brief summary of perhaps what we discussed at the last meeting and maybe set up some thoughts for today's discussion. Thanks, go ahead Steve.

Steve Shang: Sure. Good morning or good afternoon, good evening everyone. In our last call we spent about 30 minutes wrapping up the discussion on variance. And the kind of - where we are at this seems we arrive at several points. So the first point is that there is really no uniform definition of variance. And so there's different definition that exists. And it's not really the Working Group's role or - to define what is a variant and what is not.

Rather in general I think the Working Group acknowledged that the variance can be categorized as, you know, activated variance and reserved variance. So activated variance are the variance of a domain name that are put into the DNS zone file so, you know, it's resolvable to a normal DNS locale.

A reserved variance are variance, you know, reserved for a specific domain name and cannot be registered but otherwise are not in the DNS zone file. So I think those are the kind of two categories and the Working Group acknowledged that.

They can take this as given so for example, you know, some entity defines their policy of what is a reserved variance and what is not and what is an activated variance. And then we take the definitions they have as given and discuss some policy around that.

So the two things the Working Group had some rough agreement on is a query of the activated variant; that means the variant that is in the DNS should return the Whois results of the original domain, it's a variant of. And also indication that the label queried is a variance.

And as for the reserved variance there are two options; one is option is we treat the reserve variance the same way as a activated variance in terms of Whois. That means when a user queries it, you know, he gets the exact domain, the original domain; it's a variant of.

And the second way to handle that is to produce some sort of message saying this is a variant of certain domain and this is that registrar's variant policy. Edmon suggested that, you know, for this we gave people options and let registrars or registries decide how they want to handle that.

So I think that's where we are on variance, pretty much (unintelligible) discussion. So...

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. Yeah, I want to let you know that Bob Hutchinson has joined. Welcome Bob.

Steve Shang: Okay. Good morning Bob.

Julie Hedlund: And I would like (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Bob Hutchinson: Good morning.

Julie Hedlund: ...provided.

Steve Shang: I'm sorry, Julie, is that a question for me or...

Julie Hedlund: No I was asking the Working Group members if they had any questions concerning the summary that you just provided.

Steve Shang: Okay.

Andrei Kolesnikov: Yes, whose dog is barking? That's a question.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, yeah, whoever's dog is barking, thank you Andrei. Tell the dog to be quiet or contribute in a constructive way to the discussion.

Dave Piscitello: My apologies, I thought he was on his way out with my family so.

Julie Hedlund: That's okay. If you've got any comments concerning variants they're welcome. So Steve how do you suggest we proceed then with the - with variants? Is that pretty much wrapped up the discussion do you think so we can move on to some of the other issues?

Steve Shang: Yeah, I think so. What I can do - one of the difficulties we may not have, you know, all the working parties seen the discussion. What I can do is to provide a document specific to variance and send it to the email list. Hopefully it will get more comment then.

But in terms of discussions, you know, maybe now is a good time to move to the email list.

Julie Hedlund: Does anybody have any questions or concerns about that suggestion from Steve?

Bob Hutchinson: Yeah, this is Bob Hutchinson. I would like to have Steve or somebody who's going to send this out make some proposals as to what you mean by not only the variant appears in the DNS, I think that's fairly straightforward, but how it appears in the DNS and how it's treated relative to other names in the same variance sequence, okay. In other words do you get - when you query for one

do you get the fact that it is a variant and a listing of all the other variants of that name? Synonyms I guess we would call them.

Steve Shang: Bob, you mean in DNS or in Whois?

Bob Hutchinson: In Whois.

Steve Shang: Oh okay. I think I can - see what you want is examples, is that right?

Bob Hutchinson: Yes in order to push the discussion forward quicker, okay?

Steve Shang: Yeah, sure. Yeah I can definitely provide some examples. My knowledge is limited to Chinese though so that's my limitation. Maybe Andrei...

Andrei Kolesnikov: Yeah?

Steve Shang: Could you help on some variants in Russian or...

Andrei Kolesnikov: No, not at all. I'm also not very familiar with this issue because...

Steve Shang: Oh okay.

Andrei Kolesnikov: ...we are straightforward, you know, Greek-like alphabet.

Steve Shang: Yeah.

Andrei Kolesnikov: It's pretty much like Latin script, you know, just looks a little bit differently. So...

((Crosstalk))

Andrei Kolesnikov: ...I really can't help with this one.

Steve Shang: Okay that's fine but thanks for letting me know. All right...

Owen Smigelski: Edmon, this is Owen. I do not - or sorry, Steve, this is Owen. There are some variants in German that I'm aware of...

Steve Shang: Okay.

Owen Smigelski: ...might be able to contribute as examples.

Steve Shang: Okay sure. So maybe Owen, I will send you - maybe I'll send you something that you can provide some examples in German that'll be good.

Owen Smigelski: Okay.

Steve Shang: Thanks. Okay so shall we move on?

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, Steve, this is Julie. Why don't you go ahead and then proceed with the issues perhaps we haven't touched on in sort of the summary of the - or the staff summary document that you provided a few weeks back?

Steve Shang: Sure. So we spent the second half of last - the last time's call going through the document. And we primarily stopped at - I think on Page - let me see which page was that - Page 3; we primarily stopped on Page 3.

And the discussion was - I think we spent almost two calls on that. It's basically calling attention that the existing Whois protocol has no mechanism for indicating the preferred character set for query input and the display of the results of a query.

So basically, you know, it does not have (in these) to support internationalized registration data. You know, something needs to be done at a protocol level to be able - for Whois to support IRD.

And, you know, we've been discussing what to do. The original recommendation that was there is, you know, we recommend interested parties to submit a proposal to resolve this issue at the IETF for consideration at - a standard track RFC.

So as I understand there are various ways to do that. You know, one way is to simply require, you know, all the Whois input and output to the UTF-8 so that's one option.

The other option is to provide some kind of a signaling mechanism in Whois. So for example some way for the client to be able to tell the server what encoding I'm going to send the text in. And then, you know, give the server the opportunity to say yes we can accept, you know, such encoding or no we cannot accept such encoding. So that, you know, that's kind of some kind of a signaling mechanism for Whois.

And the last one is really, you know, to move beyond the simple Whois, for example, moving to protocols like IRIS or more recent ones like (RAS) for Whois.

So those are a couple of options, you know, that could be available. I don't know how - one thing I'm not sure is how much does this Working Group want to do in terms of that issue. So for that I would like to hear your thoughts.

Now to begin with will you be comfortable with, you know, what the language currently is in the summary document? That is basically the Working Group's role is to call out this issue and recommend, you know, interest parties to submit a proposal to IETF to resolve this.

Is that something you feel comfortable with or, you know, should we recommend something otherwise?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. Could I just clarify which document are we referring to? Is this on the wiki? Is this the July 30 working - staff summary or is there a later one?

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, this is Julie. And it is the July 30 document that is on the wiki; you're absolutely right.

Steve Shang: Yeah, we're on Page 3, the bottom part of Page 3. Any thoughts? No? Okay.

Bob Hutchinson: Yes, Steve, this is Bob Hutchinson. It's not clear from this comment whether you - what you're talking about is the query string for the Whois to begin the Whois conversation. And I believe that in some cases today there are parameters in that query string already supported, is that not correct?

Steve Shang: Yes. So in some Whois the signaling mechanism is done - it's for the client to include a command line like sometimes usually the -C or -(charset) and then it specify the encoding.

Bob Hutchinson: Yeah.

Steve Shang: The problem with that is not all client honor that.

Bob Hutchinson: Right.

Steve Shang: So, you know, you have some clients that may support, some clients doesn't and that also there's no uniform backend support for server, right? So each, you know, each Whois operators can decide their own like signaling mechanism.

                    That, you know, I think - that's not where we want to go. I mean, otherwise...

((Crosstalk))

Bob Hutchinson: I guess what one of my comments here is the use of the term character set. Just - is that a correct use in your - I mean, are we really referring to a language designation?

Steve Shang: Well character set is really the encoding that is used to represent the characters in a particular language into computer recognizable languages so character...

Bob Hutchinson: So UTF-8, okay.

Steve Shang: Yeah, UTF-8 would be one.

Bob Hutchinson: Okay. So I guess the way I look at the current standards is that the most obvious thing that we should be looking at is supporting UTF-8 using (torque) 43 on the existing protocols, okay? And in that case your mechanism here for a character set would always be UTF-8 is not the correct - then it goes away, there's no...

Steve Shang: Yeah.

Bob Hutchinson: There's no...

Steve Shang: The problem with that is Whois is really a political issue, you know. We're talking about a very simple technical way which I agree with you would solve the majority of the problem.

So the issue here is in gTLDs probably there will be less of a problem but in terms of ccTLDs they really want to decide what encoding they prefer to use. So for example in some of the European gTLDs they don't use UTF-8 and, you know, and they will probably continue to use their local encodings.

So - so a solution requiring UTF-8 may work for the gTLDs but it will have some difficulty in ccTLDs. That's how I understand it. Of course my understanding could be incorrect.

Dave Piscitello: So this is Dave. I'm not certain that we have any influence over what a client chooses to implement. And, you know, so the only thing I would be careful of is when we talk about this we're actually talking about imposing a requirement on servers that at least in the ICANN context would be offered by, you know, ICANN contracted partners.

And we would be encouraging others to do that. But, you know, we really don't, you know, we can't go to Ubuntu, we can't go to Microsoft or anyone who writes third-party applications and say here's the convention we want you to impose no matter what we think is right. Am I correct?

Steve Shang: Yes. So, Bob, I think if we want to go to the UTF-8 route then maybe the way to go is to go back and - go back to IETF and ask them - not ask them - and propose to include that in the Whois spec. That will probably have a, you know, because people on the IETF's technical work and have a discussion there maybe.

Bob Hutchinson: I guess I don't see the - I don't see the difficulty in specifying that the encoding has to be in UTF-8 for Whois that's, you know, I just don't see from a technical standpoint or from a political standpoint why anyone cares.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Shang: Well for the technical standpoint people may not use UTF-8 so are we going to tell them that I'm sorry your Whois it's just not going to work? Is that the message we want to tell them? I think that's the issue. Can we go to Microsoft and say, well, you know, no matte what language versions your Windows is in, you know, you have to, you know, have UTF-8?

Bob Hutchinson: So this isn't Microsoft this is whoever is writing a Whois server...

Steve Shang: Yeah.

Bob Hutchinson: ...needs to support as a default UTF-8?

Steve Shang: Right. But again, I mean, this is also application issue as well because some of these Whois clients are going to run, you know, on these operating systems like, you know, Microsoft Windows, Ubuntu, you know, various Linux distributions. And they may prefer it to be in other than UTF-8.

Dave Piscitello: Steve, this is Dave again. I mean, generally speaking the clients will implement, you know, implement what the server specifies because the users will complain that they can't access the servers.

Steve Shang: Okay.

Dave Piscitello: So in the typical client server - or inoperability issue, you know, it's a standard set then, yeah, and the client wants to be as, you know, widely usable as possible then the client application developer typically goes and tries to satisfy the standards.

The issue would be whether, you know, if there were conflicting standards. So if ICANN were to say the default is UTF-8 and you can also, you know, and if you can't support UTF-8 the server will rollover onto ASCII 7 as an example and somebody else like, you know, some ccTLDs decided exactly the opposite we would have a problem.

Steve Shang: Yeah.

Dave Piscitello: But, you know, but trying to lay forward a general convention or a general practice, you know, is something that we can do. And that doesn't necessarily require IETF. No, you don't like that, right?

Steve Shang: Doesn't like that.

Dave Piscitello: He doesn't like my proposal. I'm going to go on mute to try to take care of
                   him.

Steve Shang: Okay. Thanks Dave. Any other thoughts? Okay.

Bob Hutchinson: Hello?

Steve Shang: Go ahead.

Bob Hutchinson: Yeah, I guess that I see limited future - I think Avri pointed it out that, you
                   know, tossing this back over the fence to the IETF when we can solve this
                   ourselves I don't see that, you know, that's a path that is going to bear fruit,
                   okay, having been involved with the IETF before and the standard setting
                   process there.

                   So I guess I would much prefer to try to solve this at ICANN and under the
                   GNSO of fixing internationalized Whois rather than, you know, kicking the can
                   down the road; that's my preference anyway.

Steve Shang: So what's the proposal?

Bob Hutchinson: Servers run in UTF-8...

Steve Shang: Okay and is this a - written down into contracts?

Bob Hutchinson: Maybe the ICANN people can...

((Crosstalk))

Bob Hutchinson: ...illuminate for us, you know, what - what is in contracts about Whois today
and any restrictions or implementation language. I thought we had at one
point - they pulled out a section from a gTLD registry agreement...

Steve Shang: Yeah for registries definitely but there's nothing for registrar.

Bob Hutchinson: Right. And I guess, you know, I don't know, I'd love to hear from the ICANN
folks as to, you know, how they view what we're doing and how it would
actually get implemented in the different TLDs.

Steve Shang: Yeah. Okay.

Bob Hutchinson: Because server implementations are at the registry level except for .com,
okay?

Steve Shang: Right, except for .com.

Steve Metalitz: Well, this is Steve Metalitz. And in terms of future registries there's, well, the
new gTLD process now indicates that there has to be thick Whois and
therefore it has to be available at the registry level.

Steve Shang: Right.

Steve Metalitz: That doesn't rule out registrar - registrars would also have Whois
obligations...

Steve Shang: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: ...that doesn't change the registrar's Whois obligations.

Steve Shang: Yeah. But the new gTLD definitely makes the, you know, reduced the
complexity of the problem. But so the remaining complexity is really the .com
which, you know, have a lot of names on it and like 1000 registrars.

Okay I could ask the ICANN legal and see how they - if there's something can be done I guess to move forward. But I'm still - we're - Andrei, let me ask you a question. Andrei? Andrei are you still online?

Andrei Kolesnikov: Yeah, I'm here.

Steve Shang: For Russia you use UTF-8 right?

Andrei Kolesnikov: Yes.

Steve Shang: Okay. In your experience do most of the ccTLDs use UTF-8 like in Europe or, you know, is just everywhere on the map?

Andrei Kolesnikov: Yeah. What's the question?

Steve Shang: The question is do you know other ccTLDs that maybe do not use UTF-8?

((Crosstalk))

Andrei Kolesnikov: Well it depends on what you mean - we use UTF-8 in our daily life.

Steve Shang: Right, right but as a Whois transport?

Andrei Kolesnikov: The Whois transport - let me put it like this in some versions of the Whois transport UTF-8 is working and some not. We tested a few and I think we found the problem with (Solaris) support.

Steve Shang: Okay.

Andrei Kolesnikov: But we don't use the - we don't use the Cyrillic in the Whois so in the registration data fields...

Steve Shang: Right.

Andrei Kolesnikov: ...so we don't have a problem. We have only ASCII.

Steve Shang: Okay so...

Andrei Kolesnikov: We plan to move into UTF-8 sometimes. I think when the - our Working
                    Group will complete it's working but not today. We decided at least for a year
                    not to touch it.

Steve Shang: Oh okay. So you're waiting for this Working Group?

Andrei Kolesnikov: Yeah.

Steve Shang: Oh that's good. That's good. I'm glad. I hope - I wish other ccTLDs will be
                    as...

Andrei Kolesnikov: No, it's a matter - it's a historical matter. I mean, we have about 16 years
                    of the dot.ru with the ASCII only. And so our market and our, you know,
                    people who register domains, they kind of know, you know, that they use the
                    language script.

                    So it's not causing the usage problems so far. Of course it will be better to
                    use the Cyrillic but we, you know, we will wait for a year at least.

Steve Shang: Okay. Okay, sounds good. Do others have any thoughts on - okay, so if we
                    require this for gTLDs how do we socialize this with ccTLDs?

Bob Hutchinson: Well, I guess the other reference point that, you know, should be sort of
                    included in here is that the other internationalization Unicode and everything
                    is all built around UTF-8. So I don't really see why we should entertain other
                    things in Whois.

Steve Shang: Okay, that's a good thought. Okay, so as a follow up I will check within ICANN to see how to turn this into a more operationable kind of set of mandates. Any other thoughts on this issue?

Okay, that's good. So moving - let me see what time - oh, we still have half an hour. Moving on the discussion it will be very nice if we can have the document together, so going down, the second question.

So I'm just going to go through that document and see the areas that - where we agree - where we haven't reached consensus and see whether we can push something forward.

So the second question is, "What is needed for internationalized registration data that will accommodate users who want to submit and have registration data displayed in familiar characters from local scripts?"

And I think regarding this question the Working Group members felt that various elements of registration data could be separately internationalized. We - and then, you know, we've talked about the domain name which is - have the IDN requirement, how to display the u-label and the a-label.

And we are - we already solved that. We wrap up the variant discussion. One thing we haven't discussed is the name server names. Currently all the name server names are in US-ASCII 7.

However with the internationalized domain names it is possible that some will publish their name servers in the IDN u-label. So how do we - it's a possibility.

I don't know whether that will really happen, but in case it does how do we want to address that in Whois? This is regarding the name server names, so one ways - to always to display it in the a-label.

The argument that - for that is because name server names are mainly for technical consumption and it will be best, you know, just to have an a-label because the DNS only have a-label in it.

So that's one argument. That's one alternative. The other alternative is to have it displayed both in a-label and u-label to the extent such information is available. So any thoughts on that and what we should do?

Steve Metalitz: Well, this is Steve Metalitz. What do you think would be the benefit of having it available in the u-label - requiring that it be available in the u-label?

Steve Shang: Requiring it to be in u-label.

Steve Metalitz: As well as a-label.

Steve Shang: Well, a-label is the most natural way because the main server names are mostly used for technical reasons. For example, you know, make sure it's available or you can dig - you can, you know, do DNS lookups on that and perform technical operations.

And since the DNS is only in a-label so, you know, it might be good to simply keep it in a-label. For u-label I don't know. Maybe for user experience reasons?

But again I think it's - personally I think it's - this field is mostly used for technical reasons so there's - there may not be much benefit to putting it in u-label as opposed to like the domain name, which has a lot of benefit.

Steve Metalitz: Well unless we can identify some benefit to requiring that it be in u-label then perhaps our recommendation should be that it always be displayed in a-label.

Steve Shang: Okay. Do others have thoughts?

Bob Hutchinson: Yes, since it's pretty much trivial to do it both ways when you have a XN dash dash a-label why would we not want it in parentheses displayed in its u-label format?

I can see if we're not - for things that are not Unicoded but I do think for readability if somebody puts a server name in internationalized domain character, I guess my take is that eventually there will be a standard format that people will display, both the a-label form and the u-label form in parallel to each other because everybody's going to have this question everywhere internationalized domain names are displayed.

I mean, it's not just a Whois question. It's a general question about how internationalized labels should be displayed in general. And I don't know if Tina Dam and the people who have been working in this area have some preferred forms that they believe, you know, should be used for displaying this.

Steve Shang: Okay, that's a good thought. So Andrei, what you're suggesting is to place a u-label alongside with the a-label. And you also suggest about Tina Dam, and maybe I can also ask her to see what she thinks.

Bob Hutchinson: I mean, considering everybody in the world is going to have to scratch their head over this, it seems like ICANN, since they put together this standard should have a preferred way of displaying internationalized domain names when they're presented to the user.

Steve Shang: Okay.

Chin-Hai Yin: This is Chin-Hai Yin. I personally agree with for the display both the u-label and the a-label for name server because u-label is friendly to the Ethernet users.

So the XN dash dash is another friendly to the people, Ethernet user. But for - but a-label is - we must put it into the - for configuration on name server and name server, therefore we ask you to use it. So I - we think that we should put both, one for Ethernet user, one for DNS. Thank you.

Steve Shang: Okay. Thank you. Any other thoughts? So it seems that we are - people are thinking about, you know, displaying both u-label and a-label for name server names.

That's perfectly fine and good. Okay, so I will take the note for this. The next element - so we talked about domain names. We - that already have a standard name servers - seem to agree on both - to display both a-label and u-label alongside with it.

For sponsoring a Registrar, this was the original discussion that some thought that this is a good example of data that should always be available in ASCII to aid investigation purposes of law enforcement, and optionally make it available in local language scripts.

So what this is, you know, always requiring US-ASCII for sponsoring Registrar, but if Registrars want to provide they can also provide it in their local language scripts. Okay, what do people think?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I mean, I think this makes sense as we have previously stopped, and I would just note that as a new Registrar accreditation application that was just posted last week and it says - it instructs the people who are applying to be accredited as Registrars, that if they have any legal name, street, electronic or mailing address which is not in Latin characters, please specify and also provide a transliteration in Latin characters.

So this is something that anyone who wants to be a Registrar has to be able to provide this.

Steve Shang: Okay and, you know, and so they should display that in Whois as well. Okay, sounds good. Any other thoughts on this point? Okay, we've talked about the telephone and fax, that is to use the UPU E. 123 standard.

That's good. Email address, we talked about using RFC 5335 as a basis for internationalization. That means also people could put internationalized email address in that.

I think since Jim Collins is an expert in this area, Jim Collins, I was wondering if you could brief us on the up - on the status of that standard track for the internationalization of email addresses.

Chin-Hai Yin: I'm more familiar with this issue because I'm yes, Working Group Secretary. Currently we have most three important RFCs that will go to standard trends. And the first is the 4952 or is the framework on not only the (IEST) lab corps I think in a while, in one month maybe we're going to ask the iData for publication.

Then beyond to two months or three months there will - I will see 5335 based on the RFC 5336, so there's a email header, yes, header on the - your SMTP or (IEST) or for - be - going to RFC publication.

I think that history documents for sanitary will both - will be finished. They are currently on the list yes. So I think - so sanitary will come to...

Steve Shang: Okay, sounds good. I think once it's standardized and used there's no reason for us not to use it - updated standard, to - I'm sorry, to put in use in Kuwait. Okay, so that's kind of an update on discussion.

There are two remaining items that we have not discussed. The first thing is registration status, so for example, you know, Registrars and Registrys often provide status of the registration.

You know, client hold elite prohibited, update prohibited, you know, these status. Now the question is should these be internationalized or should they always remain in US-ASCII 7?

There are a couple options. One is to always leave it in US-ASCII 7. The second is always publish the exact EPP status code and leave it to the client to decide whether to localize it or not.

So it's, you know, different clients in different languages have different translations for that, so leave it for the client to decide. The third option is to identify a more easily understood representation for, you know, for example an amended character set.

And the fourth is, you know, publish the easily understood representation in mandatory and local character sets, or it could be any combination of these approaches. So what does the Working Group think?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I - my question is could you explain what is the exact EPP status code? Is that something that is currently in ASCII 7 or what is that?

Steve Shang: I think Edmon will probably the best person to - for that. The EPP status code is really a set of - well, the status - it also depends on how Registrys implement them.

So for example in the Registrys' own database they usually represent each status in a code, you know, as a two-bit mask code so that they can be combined.

But what is usually displayed instead of - is the ASCII string for example. You know, client delete prohibited, you know, client hold server, you know, server delete prohibited, something like that.

So to answer your question, is there a uniform code? I'm not aware of that. The way it's represented is - currently is the ASCII string.

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon. I sort of heard my name and I tried to follow with the discussion and - sorry. I think it's in the RFCs, the set of statuses that are standard in the EPP.

Steve Shang: Right, but the question is, do each one has a code, so for example is client - is there a numerical code associated with each status? I guess that's the question.

Edmon Chung: Numeric code - why is that...?

Steve Shang: Go ahead.

Edmon Chung: Well why is that a - oh, so that when it gets translated - not translated, so different languages you could at least hold on to the code. Is that the idea?

Steve Shang: Yes.

Edmon Chung: I - sorry, I don't remember off the top of my head. I can probably look and see the RFCs and see if it provides a code for just the textual string.

Steve Shang: I think it's just a text string. Let me - so even if it's the text string we can always publish exactly as what the RFC says. And then, you know, if a client wants to localize it then they could just refer to the RFC and always match that.

So it doesn't have to be in numeric code, even it's a, you know, ASCII string that pretends with RFC then, you know, it's all right. Yes, I don't see it in the EPP.

Steve Metalitz: So then where would that leave Option Two?

Steve Shang: Yes, so maybe the Option Two could be - should be rewrite. It's always
                    publish the exact EPP status, delete the word code.

Steve Metalitz: So that would always be in ASCII but it's up to the...

Steve Shang: Client to decide whether to localize it or not. I'm almost done here.

Man: You're almost done here?

Steve Shang: Yes.

Man: We're throwing you out.

Steve Shang: Yes you are. I'll be about to be thrown out of the room so do others have
                    some thoughts on this issue, which option do we want to choose? So I think
                    the options are, you know, always to - one is to always to publish the exact
                    EPP status and leave it to the clients to decide whether to localize it or not.

                    Or is to - just to identify a more easily understood representation and
                    recommend that. Any thoughts? For the new gTLDs I think they require to
                    always put into the exact EPP code.

Bob Hutchinson: Yes, I would prefer to see us adopt whatever they're specifying if they are
                    specifying something in the new gTLD process. But it seems most logical to
                    specify the codes and specify their representation. But...

Steve Shang: The code and representation - you mean the code into numeric to code?

Bob Hutchinson: Well, so for example you have a client hold delete prohibited and we have a
                    bunch of different statuses, okay. So specifying a list of the statuses and what

they're coding is seems like the easiest, most straightforward way for everybody here.

Steve Shang: Coding means like a set of numerical codes, or just - I'm trying to understand.

Bob Hutchinson: Whatever coding is decided on. I don't know what - you said that there is something already in the new gTLD standards.

Steve Shang: The new gTLD standard asked the Whois to publish the status codes exactly the same way as it is appear in the EPP, so that's what the new gTLD asked. So you just have client, you know, delete prohibited like in one word.

Bob Hutchinson: I see. So they're just string codes at this point.

Steve Shang: Yes, it's all string code. There's no numerical codes.

Bob Hutchinson: Okay, so then I think we just should use that and, you know, the question is, what do you want to try to internationalize it? I don't know. Is it - could we hear from somebody, (Jing) or somebody from a language that this might not be friendly to leave in English representation?

Do they really want this internationalized? If they really want it internationalized then we will have to figure out a way to internationalize it, I mean, to me it's a field that I don't see a great deal of benefit because it has to be interpreted globally, and it's more a data processing field than a user consumed field. I mean, that's my take but maybe that's wrong.

Steve Shang: Okay, that's a good thought. I think I'm done with this room here so Julie, can you take over? I have to be dropped off the call soon.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, thank you everyone. I think we'll go ahead and schedule another call in two weeks and Steve can send around some notes from this call. And thank

you all for joining us and if there is no other business, I'll join - I'll adjourn the meeting.

Bob Hutchinson: Thank you Julie.

Man: Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: All right, thanks everyone. We'll talk in two weeks. Thanks.

Man: Bye.

Julie Hedlund: Bye.

END