

**GNSO/SSAC
International Registration Data Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 12 September at 15:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO/SSAC International Registration Data Working Group on 12 September 2011 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-20110912-en.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#sep>

All recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO calendar page: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/> **Present for the teleconference:**
Rafik Dammak -- GNSO Non-Commercial Users Stakeholder Group
Steven Metalitz -- GNSO Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial
Avri Doria – NCSG
Jim Galvin – SSAC -Afiliias
Owen Smigelski - Sunrider International, Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial Stakeholder Group

ICANN Staff

Gisella Gruber

Steve Sheng

Absent apologies: Julie Hedlung

Dave Piscitello

Sarmad Hussain - CLE-KICS, UET

Coordinator: The call is now recorded. Please, go ahead.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's IRD call on Monday, the 12th of September. We have Rafik Dammak, Jim Galvin, Owen Smigelski, Avri Doria. From staff, we have Steve Sheng and myself, Gisella Gruber. Apologies noted from Dave Piscitello, Julie Hedlund and Sarmad Hussein.

And if I could please just remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you, Jim and Steve.

Jim Galvin: Thank you. So, this is Jim Galvin. Yes, we have a draft final report and Steve has been putting a lot of time and effort into this. He still has a few editor's notes in the report, but I think that this has been - we've had some really good discussions in the last few meetings. So, hopefully, we are getting much closer to closure here.

Steve, let me ask you if you have a preference - you and I didn't coordinate just prior to this - as to how you want to run this? Do you have some things you want to step through or would you prefer to open the floor for questions or something else entirely?

Steven Sheng: Let me think. There are a few editor's notes I would like to address, but maybe we can step through the report section by section, and I will kind of - I did make some changes. I'll highlight to the group what changes I made so that everyone is aware, and then we can discuss whether the approach or the text is appropriate. There aren't many, but there are a few of those. So in - during that process, we can also address the editor's comments. I don't know whether that's a feasible approach - acceptable approach to you.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Does anyone on the call want to suggest something different? Or is what Steve's proposing okay with folks?

Avri Doria: Sounds like a good idea.

Jim Galvin: Okay, Steve, let me turn it over to you, and you can start at whatever you think is the top and step through.

Steven Sheng: Okay, thank you. Could everyone open the report that I sent I think on Thursday night or Friday morning last week? If you have it open, let me know. If you have problems finding that, let me know.

Steven Metalitz: Hi, this is Steve Metalitz. I just joined. Sorry, I'm late.

Steven Sheng: Hi, Steve. We are stepping through the report.

Steven Metalitz: Okay, great.

Steven Sheng: But we haven't started, yes.

Jim Galvin: Yes, he's just asking folks to open up the copy that he distributed last Friday, and Steve is going to step through and just give a quick highlight on the substantive changes in each section and give folks a chance to comment. And he'll call out the editor's notes too along the way.

Steven Metalitz: Great.

Steven Sheng: Yes. Okay, so we'll go over it section by section. By the way, for this section, I've also incorporated comments from Steve Metalitz and (unintelligible). Thank you very much for those comments.

So the executive summary, I have an editor note here, it's saying, you know, currently it's not really a summary. It's - once we finalize everything, I will add a paragraph, you know, explaining what our findings and recommendations are in greater detail. So, I don't anticipate that will be a problem.

Introduction, I tied up the text to address one of the editor's comments from (John Quentin). (John) is a very well-respected internationalization expert, so I took his comment. Other than that, it's nothing major.

The introduction basically highlights why there's - why this is a problem. So, it cites both the Internet Architecture Board's statement in RFC 46.90 as well as sect 37, the report, and, you know, the - kind of the background for this work. So, there's nothing major there.

Section 2.1, the...

Steven Metalitz: Okay, Steve.

Steven Sheng: Go ahead.

Steven Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I just noticed in section 2 you deleted this sentence about IDNs?

Steven Sheng: Right.

Steven Metalitz: (Unintelligible).

Steven Sheng: Right. So this is - was addressing the editor's - (John Quentin's) comment. So, (John Quentin's) comment is, you know, IDN does not contribute too much about the multilingual Internet. It contribute only a little bit, and having it there may distract people's attention from the real issue.

So, the real issue here is when Internet has been use - is being used by people around the world and made - and then it's truly multilingual, and we cannot expect people to enter - to know and enter this information in English.

Steven Metalitz: Right.

Steven Sheng: So, that was the real issue, and (John), you know, saying...

Steven Metalitz: Yes, I don't have a problem with that. I'm just pointing out that that was where we said, "Internationalized domain names per in IDN," so we explained what IDN meant.

Steven Sheng: Right.

Steven Metalitz: And as it stands now, we just dive in into that quote with IDN. So, if...

Steven Sheng: I see what you mean. Okay.

Steven Metalitz: ...(unintelligible) explain what that is. That was my - I'm not arguing with the substantive point there.

Steven Sheng: Okay.

Steven Metalitz: Totally editorial.

Steven Sheng: I'll think about it.

Steven Metalitz: Should be some way to do it.

Steven Sheng: Okay. Thanks for that note. Let me put a note to myself on that. Make sure the IDN is not (unintelligible). Okay.

So, nothing really changed from - this is about the same from the interim report, so nothing really changes here.

Section 2.1, here I added the whole text of the Board resolution. Before in the interim report, we just kind of cite part of the resolution. Here, I just - for the - for completeness's sake, I put all the Board resolution here on this.

So, the major difference here that I make is the working group interpret in page 5, I think is a very important section, that the working group interprets the Board's request at two broad questions. So, the two broad questions I did not change, but I added a few sublet to distinguish them better.

The reason for this is we have a lot of text that we did not end up using in the final report, and I have to go back and see which texts are useful to include. So I readjust. I parse out the questions a little bit. I wanted to have a discussion on that if possible.

So the Board asks for the suitability and feasibility of introducing display specifications to deal with the internationalization of registration data. So I separate them as suitability issue and feasibility issue. Under suitability issue, I have three sublets. The first kind of is almost stating the obvious is, is it suitable or desirable to internationalize domain name registration data? That means is it suitable to have that data represented in scripts and encodings out of the U.S. asking? So that's kind of the very first fundamental question.

And then the second one, if it's suitable, what data elements is it suitable to be internationalized? And I think the working group did went to great lengths discussing what data elements those to be internationalized? And then the third question is, is it suitable to introduce display specifications to deal with the internationalized registration data? So those are the suitability issues.

And then, under feasibility, there are two issues. So the first one is, is the current WHOIS system capable of handling the query and display of internationalized domain name registration data? And the second is, is it feasible to introduce display specifications?

So those are the ways that I parsed out the Board's request. I'd like to hear people's thoughts. It's a little bit fine-grained than previous draft. But I'd like to hear people's thought on this.

Steven Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I think it's good to have the questions spelled out a little bit. I did have one question. You took out, I think, the reference to submissions specifications in the last bullet? I understand that we're...

Steven Sheng: The lot...

Steven Metalitz: Yes. It says, "Is it feasible to introduce?" and then on the red lines, it has submission and was deleted display specifications.

Steven Sheng: So is it on the feasibility or suitability?

Steven Metalitz: Feasibility.

Avri Doria: Second bullet under feasibility.

Steven Sheng: Second to introduce, submission. Okay.

Steven Metalitz: Yes.

Steven Sheng: Is it feasible...

Steven Metalitz: The only reason I raise that is that when we talk about, you know, should there be a must-be present script, we're basically saying - you know, or not, we're basically saying it's a submission specification kind of, is it?

Steven Sheng: Yes, good point. So, submission - so maybe the submission should also be added under suitability, right?

Steven Metalitz: Think that's right.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Steven Sheng: Okay. So I'll add submission and display to both suitability and feasibility. That okay with everyone?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. In principle, yes. Wouldn't it be "entry and display" though as opposed to "submission and display"? Speaking about it as the mechanics of doing it? Just a small point.

Steven Metalitz: Yes, I'm fine either way.

Steven Sheng: Okay. People, other participants on the call, what do you think of adding submission to both the third bullet under suitability and the second bullet under the feasibility? Under objections?

Steven Metalitz: Submission or entry I think is what...

Steven Sheng: Submission or entry. Okay.

Avri Doria: No, no, no, no. Either the word "submission" or the word "entry." Not both of them.

Steven Metalitz: Right, right. I understand.

Steven Sheng: So maybe let's just...

Avri Doria: Yes, I know you did.

Steven Sheng: Maybe I suggest we keep submission because it'll be consistent for both. Okay? Okay, I don't hear objections. So, if people have objections, they can raise it later on, I guess.

Okay, so those are the three. I think this section is important because in the finding section I go question by question. I answer each of the questions based on what we discussed. So this is as - almost as a framing, you know, outline here. And I'll update the sections accordingly.

So, the IRD membership, that's the same from the last one. There's not much to discuss.

Terminology, so the terminology - the major one - there are two major changes here from the interim report. The first major change is ASAC is working on a advisory on terminology for WHOIS, and they did a PowerPoint presentation in the last Singapore meeting, and they're working on a full

report on this which they will release fairly soon. So I have a kind of a early copy for that that I include the three terms they defined - domain name registration data, the domain name registration data access protocol, and the domain name registration data directory service.

So the basic rationale for having separate all these three instead of just saying WHOIS is because the term "WHOIS" without qualification it could mean very different things to different people. So here, the goal is trying to bring precision in the discussion to know when we talk about WHOIS what we are really talking about. Are we really talking about the data? Are we talking about the access protocol? Or are we talking about the directory service that implements the protocol provides access to the data and stats policies. So those trying to pass those out more carefully.

If - I think - Jim? Jim?

Jim Galvin: Yes. Go ahead.

Steven Sheng: Do you know when the ASAC advisory will be published?

Jim Galvin: I would say, Steve, that since you're the editor, any day now, right?

Steven Sheng: Yes. Any day. Okay.

Avri Doria: That's how you have an advance copy.

Steven Sheng: Add it to the advance copy. So it'll be any day. So if they do have revisions, then we will...

Jim Galvin: Yes. I mean it's in last call and, you know, Steve's got the - got just - it's in last call. I guess you sent it to me and - because I'm also chair of that work party over there on the ASAC side, just for context for folks here on this call, but it will certainly be out well before this document's going to be out. So we'll

be able to reference that document for this and folks will be able to see the complete thing that's in there also.

Steven Sheng: Okay, sure. So the next section about terminology is - I added a few terms here. I added translation - the definition of translation and transliteration from the IRC 63.65 which just been finalized last week as well in the IETF. So I think those are important because later on we're going to talk about translation and transliteration, so it's - it'll be nice to have that. I also added (unintelligible) registry because we did talk about that in the later section.

So there are some other terms. This section is not yet complete. There are some terminologies later on that needs to be expanded, so I need to - once we have everything, I need to go a thorough look to see any new terms that needs to be included here. But other than that, those are the major changes to...

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I have a quick question.

Steven Sheng: Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: Are - is the definitions that you've got for domain name registration data, et cetera, exactly the same as those that'll come out in this advisory? Or are they...

Steven Sheng: Currently, it is exactly the same.

Avri Doria: Okay, great, thanks.

Steven Sheng: But if they revised...

Avri Doria: So you would keep things consistent. If they change, you would change them in both places?

Steven Sheng: Yes, yes.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks.

Steven Sheng: Any other questions on terminologies? Okay, all right. Moving onto background, I think we discussed this extensively during the outline phase. We haven't changed very much. Actually, we haven't changed anything to this.

So the - so I talk about what data elements are there in the RA. I talk about the IRD makes a few observations where some registries are subject to slightly different requirements. And also in the ccTLDs, each operator sets its own policy regarding what constitutes this data and what to be displayed in the directory service. Those are the same.

By the way, when I'm going through, if you have any issues, just let me know directly so that - you know. Section 3...

Avri Doria: This is Avri.

Steven Sheng: Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Just to let you know, I've noticed a couple typos, but I'll send those to you separately. I won't bring them up during the meeting.

Steven Sheng: Sure, sure, sure, yes. Section 3.2, we talk about where are the different data elements collected, stored and displayed, and we have collection, storage and display. Steve made a comment about the data escrow, so I added a sentence there for ICANN accredit registers the data escrow provision in the RA requires them - to them to regularly deposit a backup copy of their gTLD registration data with ICANN.

Steven Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I'm not sure that's right. I mean it's an escrow provision. It's not deposited with ICANN, is it? It's - it can be deposited with a third-party.

Avri Doria: Right.

Steven Sheng: Well, it's an ICANN-specified third-party. So I - it's...

Jim Galvin: Yes, you just need to tweak the words there a little bit, Steve, because it's an ICANN requirement, but they're submitted too approved third-parties.

Steven Sheng: To deposit a backup copy with the ICANN-approved third-party?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Steven Metalitz: Yes.

Jim Galvin: Actually, you could probably just stop with - if you could just remove the "with ICANN" clause and just stop there and then not try to explain it in detail.

Owen Smigelski: Or - this is Owen - you could say, "Or registration data as required by ICANN," and then kind of is a little more broad and should cover all of that.

Jim Galvin: Yes.

Steven Sheng: Okay. Okay. So I'll say "gTLD registration data as required by ICANN." Thank you for that.

So for display here, I really changed, because since we're using the new terminologies. So I want to - I make sure the - we're using the new terminology. Okay. So for display for thick registries, the query displays the data on the registry's domain name registration data directory service and from the registrar's directory service if known to the user. Right? For thin

registries, the query displays the data from the registry's directory service and some clients could parse the data and continue to query the registrar's directory service. So I'm just trying to bring some clarity by using the term we defined above.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. If known to user.

Steven Sheng: Right.

Avri Doria: I'm not sure that the phrase parses correctly for me.

Steven Sheng: So let me try to explain. Maybe it's really poor English here on my part.

So the - a registrant may not know what the registrar's WHOIS server is. So without knowing that, he or she cannot query that.

Avri Doria: That's what you mean? Okay.

Steven Sheng: Right.

Avri Doria: Right.

Steven Sheng: So in some cases, it's not known. Yes.

Avri Doria: But the user wouldn't have made a query then to that thick registry?

Steven Sheng: Yes, the...

Avri Doria: The registry will always display the data...

Steven Sheng: Right, right.

Avri Doria: ...if it gets a query. So I'm not - the "if known to user" is a confusing way to say it to me, at least.

Steven Sheng: Okay. So maybe if you have some suggested text, let me - I don't know if I can...

Avri Doria: You need to say anything there. I'm not sure that you do need to be specific, because if you've made a query...

Steven Sheng: Right, okay.

Avri Doria: ...if anything, you would put it up in the top sentence, I think. End-user, you know, it's basically an explanation of where they're making a query. And then - but as "if known to user," just confused me. But as I said, it may just be me.

Jim Galvin: No. Actually, this is Jim Galvin. I think Avri makes a good point. I think we should probably just remove that phrase and, you know, really it's probably too much information for us to have to address, you know, how a user makes the query. I think we should assume that a user is capable of figuring that out and doing it.

Avri Doria: If - this is Avri again. If you're going to say anything, you'd add a sentence above saying, you know, "The user may make a query of the registry if known or of the registrar." And if you want to make sure that information is given somewhere, that's where I would recommend putting it.

Steven Sheng: Okay. I will take a note myself to write a few text syntax on those and remove - revise this sentence. Okay, so that's 3.2. Any other comments on 3.2?

Okay. By the way, my apologies for sending this report late. I was in another meeting that week. So I realize not all of you have a chance to go through it in detail. So if you have time to go through it in detail and have more

questions, feel free to raise it on the list or suggest it, add in some comments, you know, just mark up this document. I really appreciate that.

So section 3.3, I basically added a few text, you know, expanding the WHOIS protocol description a little bit - you know, how that protocol works. And then, you know, a couple bullets, you know, the protocol has no constraints on the data it transports. The only constraint is they must determine it with an ASCII linefeed and carriage return.

The protocol has not been internationalized. You know, it's even written within the RC itself it's not internationalized. The protocol does not define a structured data scheme. So those are the kind of the background about the WHOIS protocol. Those are very standard.

So I'm going to section 3.4. Yes, so section 3.4 is a section that I need probably more time to write about. So 3.4 is the current practices by gTLD registries and registrars and ccTLDs to support the display of internationalized data. So I haven't really finished this section. I'm sorry.

I did - I was hoping to separate that section into gTLD practice and ccTLD practice and put whatever we know about those practices on the table. So that's to the extent I'm planning to write on this section. If you have more suggestions or guidance, I really appreciate that.

So for the interest of time, I suggest we go into findings directly. Okay, before we go into findings. Do participants have any major issues with the above sections - sections 1, 2 and 3? If so, I'll appreciate if you could raise it now. Okay. Hearing none, let's go to findings section.

So as I mentioned earlier, the way I structured findings is to answer those Board's questions directly. So the first section, first, you know, we organized the findings as responses to the Board's questions.

So the first one is, is it suitable to internationalize domain name registration data? This is pretty much the same - it's pretty much the same with the previous findings that we discussed in the outline.

Section 4.2, what data elements are suitable to be internationalized? So what I did here, I moved stuff around. The first couple paragraphs, I say, you know, what are the data elements? So taken from the RA, what are the categories of the data elements? And then we talk about, you know, how they could be internationalized separately. So this is ready - this is pretty much from the interim report.

And then one question is about the dates. We have not discussed whether or how to internationalize this. I think probably for completeness's sake, we need to do that. Could we have a quick discussion on this? Hello?

Avri Doria: Hello.

Steven Sheng: Okay. Sorry. I don't know if I'm talking - if my line was...

Avri Doria: Yes, I'm reading as we talk. So...

Steven Sheng: Okay.

Jim Galvin: Steve, could you repeat your question?

Steven Sheng: So, we talk about date, right? But we have not talked about like whether or how to internationalize this field.

Jim Galvin: Yes. My recollection was that everybody thought that was pretty straightforward, but maybe not.

Steven Sheng: Pretty straightforward. It's straightforward, but we need to talk about it briefly.

Avri Doria: Yes, I thought - this is Avri. I thought somebody had mentioned, and I don't remember who or exactly what the answer was, that there was some standards body that had standardized how dates would be expressed internationally.

Jim Galvin: Right.

Avri Doria: But I don't remember the information. I just remember someone knew, someone said, and I'm not sure how to recall it. But I thought that there was some standardization somewhere.

Steven Sheng: Yes.

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. Maybe we should look through the archive on the mailing list. I'm just thinking that we didn't do that before and maybe there's a reference there historically. I mean, I guess that's the issue. I'm kind of with Avri; I sort of have this recollection that we had put something on the table but I don't remember what that was or the reference.

Steven Sheng: Okay. So I'll take that action item to dig that up. And if I couldn't find it I'll just try to find those standards and send it to the mailing list and see if we can agree on that. Is that okay with people?

Jim Galvin: Yes, I would say that if you don't find it, you know, relatively quickly in the archive send a note to the mailing list and just ask if anyone recalls. And then, you know, in parallel in with that see if you can look around and find something.

Steven Sheng: Okay, sure.

Avri Doria: Yes, I mean, if it's a standard we should be able to find it relatively easily otherwise it's not much of a standard.

Steven Sheng: Right.

Jim Galvin: Yes, what's interesting is ASN.1 would obviously have some kind of reference to a date format. I mean, it has a date format and in fact might have some references to where it got it from.

Steven Sheng: Right.

Avri Doria: There's an ISO 8601 that may be worth checking as well.

Steven Sheng: Okay I'll do that.

Jim Galvin: So there's at least a couple of starting points.

Steven Sheng: Okay. So that's fine. I'll do that. Regarding the registration status like we talk about using the exact EPP code. There was a editor comment that for example ccTLDs may not use EPP at all so those codes does not mean anything to them.

So I guess that's a question for the whole group. What do we do in that circumstance?

Steven Metalitz: Well the reason - this is Steve Metalitz. The reason this is in here is because we're looking at what's required in the registrar accreditation agreement, right, which is only gTLDs. So I'm not sure we're - obviously ccTLDs may have their own different lists of data and (everything) else; we're not trying to address that are we? The reason it's in here is because it's in the - because it applies to gTLDs.

Steven Sheng: Yes, yes, yes. So I completely agree with you. But on the other hand this raise the issue the extent of impact of this report. So if we are too gTLD-centric then it can - it will only be applied to gTLDs. So maybe we could add a sentence and say note that ccTLDs do not use EPP at all and we

recommend, you know, some effort being made to standardize this field by then.

Steven Metalitz: Well they may not even have that field. I mean, that's the point isn't it?

Steven Sheng: Yes, exactly.

Steven Metalitz: So I don't object to having a sentence that points out this doesn't apply to ccTLDs but for particular ccTLDs some of these other data points don't apply either.

Steven Sheng: Right, yes that's true.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. It could be a two-tiered recommendation that basically acknowledges that they don't. If they use EPP it is recommended that, you know, they use the same format and...

Steven Sheng: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...you know, and perhaps even a recommendation that, you know, EPP be considered, you know, but that's going perhaps too far but certainly...

Steven Sheng: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...a recommendation that says for any ccTLD that does use EPP it is recommended that they follow the same - well you wouldn't want to say recommended - they follow the same recommendation because that's redundant but you know what I mean?

Steven Sheng: Okay. Okay I like that approach. Do we have any objections on that? Here right now I will write some text in line with Avri's recommendation.

Okay so then I have this table summarizing the discussions in this section. So maybe here we can quickly talk about this table and see if this is what we are agreeing to and if not then let's re-discuss.

So I think this table summarizes what we all discussed before.

Owen Smigelski: This is Owen. Just to, you know, make a note that dates is something we're going to consider so make sure to have a note to follow up on it when we decide that.

Steven Sheng: Yes, yes, yes. So do people have any comments on this table?

Jim Galvin: Well you want to update the date row but...

Steven Sheng: Yes, yes, yes.

Jim Galvin: ...other than that I, you know, I think it accurately represents where we are.

Steven Sheng: Okay. All right so let's move onto 4.3 whether to support the translation or transliteration of entity name and contact information into a single script or language.

Okay this, you know, the previous section talked about different elements to be internationalized and, you know, we sort of agreed that the entity name and address - the registrants should be able to submit this in their local language or script.

But then there is a issue here is to balance the needs and capabilities of the local registrants with the need of global user of the data. You know, we consider the question is whether to support translation or transliteration.

So this is a section that I put in a lot of text. And I think we - this is an important section; I think we probably want to spend more time on this. The

major text I put in are added a discussion on translation and transliteration. So I'm in the middle of Page 15, you know, a list of four models. And I say, you know, it's described in the appendix.

We examine these models but we cannot reach consensus on which one to choose and kind of explain why, you know, we cannot reach consensus. So the first reason is the language translation systems are inexact and cannot be applied repeatedly.

So I gave some examples that, you know, thanks to Dr. Sarmad's example that people may translate differently even within a same language and the same person. And then, you know, the word Mohammed could be translated into all these different spellings and it's not exact.

Steven Metalitz: Steve, this is Steve Metalitz. On that point...

Steven Sheng: Go ahead.

Steven Metalitz: ...is that really an example of translation or of transliteration? It's not really a translation because it's just trying to render a name phonetically.

Steven Sheng: Right. Is it a translation or a transliteration? Let me think here. Is it translation or is it a transliteration?

Owen Smigelski: This is Owen. I think it's kind of a hybrid of both. It's not like if you were to, you know, picking say - Berlin or, you know, maybe Cologne in Germany and the way it's got a standardized English version that you translate it to; you don't actually transliterate it.

Mohammed is something where there's no officially agreed acceptable English translation; it kind of varies. So it's kind of a translation and transliteration issue.

Steven Sheng: Okay so what I hear comments is this example needs to be further discussed whether it's translation or transliteration. Okay. Go ahead.

Steven Metalitz: No I was just going to say, I mean, I think it - I view it as transliteration because it's not, I mean, all of these spellings - or none of these are English words. This is somebody's name so it's just different ways of writing the same name. I just - I think the point is well taken that there's a lot of variation but I think it's more an example of transliteration than translation. But...

Steven Sheng: Okay. I take - go ahead.

Owen Smigelski: This is Owen. I agree, I certainly think it's an example to include but I agree it may be a transliteration as opposed to translation but it certainly highlights the issues that we have here that we're addressing.

Steven Sheng: Right.

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. Steve, let me suggest that you take these comments back to Sarmad and...

((Crosstalk))

Steven Sheng: Yes.

Jim Galvin: Yes, well, you know, I mean, offer them back to him and say this is, you know, this is what people were saying and ask him if he can, you know...

Steven Sheng: Sure. Actually I may be asking...

((Crosstalk))

Jim Galvin: ...the list to these comments so that we can, you know, find some closure here. If we need a different example let's try and find something that is...

Steven Sheng: Okay.

Jim Galvin: ...to demonstrate the point.

Steven Sheng: Sure. So moving on to - so we have a section that's discussed about translation. The basic - key point is it's inexact and cannot be applied repeatedly. You know, this is what the RFC said so I just go directly from the RFC.

The second one is the RFC does that many script translations are exact and many have perfect (roundtrip) mappings. And there are official standards so, you know, the ISO standard which I did cite below.

Oh by the way we have a international standard section. I removed that and I just put those two standards everywhere in the document where they are applicable. So the rationale is really there are standards - I think it's better if they are referenced within the context.

So the question with transliteration is - well actually there are two issues; I only wrote one here. So it's not clear whether transliteration will meet the community needs for the data. I gave an example that for example the word street in Chinese is (Jia) or (Lu). It would be transliterated into (Jia) or (Lu), you know, directly.

But however nonnative Chinese speaker would have no idea what those transliterated words mean. So even we put a transliteration there it may not be feasible for someone to find out - a nonnative speaker to figure out what that is. So that's one.

The other problem with transliteration is within the Romanization a specialized part of the transliteration is also inexact as well. So those are the two issues which - with transliteration which I didn't have time to put in here.

Steven Metalitz: Steve, this is Steve Metalitz.

Steven Sheng: Go ahead.

Steven Metalitz: I think the point you make there in your indented bullet about the street in Chinese, I mean, the point is accurate; that doesn't necessarily mean that that information is not useful.

Steven Sheng: Right.

Steven Metalitz: For example if you wanted to - if you were trying to compare...

Steven Sheng: Right.

Steven Metalitz: ...the same multiple registrations were associated with the same address then as long as street were transliterated the same way each time or even if you knew that (Jia) and (Lu) both meant - both were transliterations of street then...

Steven Sheng: Yes.

Steven Metalitz: ...you would be able to associate one with the other even if you didn't actually know what that meant. So...

Steven Sheng: Right.

Steven Metalitz: ...your point is right; it isn't necessarily intelligible but that doesn't mean it's not useful.

Steven Sheng: Right. So that - thank you, exactly, for that point which would be the third point I raised. I think this is a policy question is so the third bullet have - there's a set of important policy questions that the working group could not

tackle due to its lack of expertise and lack of participation from key stakeholders such as the registrars.

So that's the first policy question I highlight; what are contact names and addresses used for? And I think that needs to be decided before we can tell whether the information loss and consistency issues associated with translation and transliteration is acceptable.

So to me that's almost - what's - Steve, what you've described, a matter issue that needs to be resolved. You know, I don't know whether that's a policy issue; I don't know whether this group will - should resolve that. But someone should resolve that and then we can decide whether translation or transliteration is acceptable due to is information lost.

So for example to put it concretely if the information is mainly used to do automatic pattern matching then transliteration is probably enough. But if it is used to contact people, you know, through those addresses then transliteration is probably not enough. So that's a highlight-able issue that I highlighted here.

And then another highlighted issue I highlighted is...

((Crosstalk))

Steven Metalitz: ...go on from that? Before you go on...

Steven Sheng: Go ahead.

Steven Metalitz: ...from that point.

Steven Sheng: Go ahead, yes.

Steven Metalitz: Yes, that is a - definitely a relevant issue but there has been quite a bit of work done in ICANN over the years on this question of what are contact names and addresses used for. I mean, we had a whole Whois taskforce that looked at that and there were - was a big survey done about 10 years ago that looked at that.

I'm not trying to extract any conclusions from that but just to say there has been a lot of work done on that topic already. If we raise this question we might want to reference that.

Steven Sheng: Okay. So, okay, so you're saying maybe this question has already been answered?

Steven Metalitz: Well it's certainly been addressed, yes.

Steven Sheng: Okay let me - then let me take a note to (unintelligible). Okay, okay that's good. Yes if it is addressed then I don't need to raise it again I just need to reference say where this is addressed and there is community consensus on that one.

So what do people think of this point? Oh, silence, okay. Okay so I will - thank you, Steve, for that point. I will definitely reach out to my colleague - policy colleague to see whether that question has been addressed and if so where and what are the answers and provide that as a information.

So if that is acceptable then maybe transliteration could be a way forward, you know, if people desires. Of course that also have to resolve the question of who should bear the burden.

Okay so what I hear is - the current conclusion in this section is we would like to recommend the issue's report on this subject. In the interim the working group recommend that the directory service output should at least include tags to identify language and scripts, for example, using RFC 5646.

Thus at the moment those who need translate or transliterate would at least know what language and script the contact information is in. So that's kind of the interim - the most immediate recommendation is if we - besides anything else.

Okay do people have questions or issues with that? Hello? Hello?

Avri Doria: We're still here.

Steven Sheng: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...I can't speak for the others but I'm still here.

Steven Sheng: Oh okay. Sorry I'm - I'm talking to - sometimes my phone quality is not very good so. So Section 4.4 is this suitable to introduce this place specifications to deal with internationalized domain name registration data? So the answer is yes because while standards defined for domain labels there's no standard format required for other elements of registration data.

And here I also moved some text here is the working group concluded that the community would benefit from the standard registration data schema, for example in XML, you know, it lists the benefits of our - a schema. This was the text from the previous sections. No, not from the previous - from the outlined document I just put in here as the most logically fit.

So we have Section 4.5 is the Whois system capable to handle the query and display of internationalized registration data? I said yes but with limits. So basically saying that, you know, the protocol does not specify anything and in absence of that, you know, various registries or registrars have their own ad hoc solutions to support IRD.

And then continue deployment of such ad hoc solutions would raise, you know, use experience and interoperability issues. So for example a user would not know like would have to remember, you know, from registries to registries how, you know, what kind of ways he or she needs to do in order to enable, you know, the submission display of internationalized registration data.

And that is, you know, have serious interoperability issues. It also bring issues of clients because the Whois clients may not know what the server is requiring to handle. So they don't know how to flag to do that so that is a mess to begin with. And I just say these issues need to be addressed urgently. Any comments on that section? No?

And then 4.6 is the last one; is it feasible to introduce the mission and display specifications? Well actually I do have this - mission and display somehow. So I say yes most data have existing standards that apply to them and those should be considered.

In addition there are schema templates that have been worked on in the past and those should be considered. So that's it. And then...

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. Let me just jump in here for a moment...

Steven Sheng: Go ahead.

Jim Galvin: ...and use this as a stopping point. We are here at the top of the hour and I wanted to take sometime to schedule when our next meeting would be so having said that let me just pause for a moment and let Steve, you know, close down his thing. If folks want to offer any comments up through Section 4.6 here at this point and otherwise let's save talking about the recommendations for our next meeting. So last call for comments.

Avri Doria: Just on last call I will be sending in a couple minor things and a form I've been editing but things I didn't think were worth bringing up at the moment.

Steven Sheng: Oh okay, yes. So thank you; any editorial comments I really appreciate. Any major issues I appreciate too. But if you had any major issues I would encourage you to raise it directly on the mailing list.

((Crosstalk))

Steven Sheng: Okay, yes. But so, yes, thank you, Avri. Before I end I also want to know what does the working group think? There are some reviewers provided comments, for example, (John Clemson) from the IETF.

I was thinking, you know, whether the working group felt it's okay that, you know, we send in, you know, a pre-published version to him to review for some comments?

Avri Doria: Oh definitely.

Steven Sheng: And address those if he has any so that, you know, we can get some feedback from the IETF experts to make sure everything - they're okay.

Avri Doria: As a general rule I would recommend...

Steven Sheng: What do people think...

Avri Doria: ...that any time you think (John Clemson) might have an opinion on what you're writing and something he'll read send it to him early.

Steven Sheng: Okay. Thanks. Any other object of sending a pre-published version once we're done for him to review? He will probably send (unintelligible) through public comment anyway so. Yes, just give him more time. Okay I didn't hear any objections so I will try to see about that. Jim, over to you.

Jim Galvin: Okay thank you, Steve, and thanks to everyone for being here today and participating this far. Our troop is really getting a little bit thin these days but it's a good group and been some good discussion.

I'd like to suggest that we just have our next meeting next week and go through the recommendations and, you know, and any other comments that people want to bring up, you know, up through Sections 4.6. Steve does have a couple of editor's notes. I think, Steve, are you going to try to fill those out during this week?

Steven Sheng: Yes, I will.

Jim Galvin: Okay.

Steven Sheng: But none - but I think none of them are major except the translation and transliteration section which I'll need to check with Sarmad.

Jim Galvin: Right. So whatever you can put together by say Wednesday, Thursday morning at the latest and then, you know, distribute an updated copy by then...

Steven Sheng: Okay.

Jim Galvin: ...so that we are ready for next Monday's meeting. And if no one objects let me just suggest that we meet next Monday and ask Steve if we could at least send out a reminder about next week's meeting, you know, as soon as we can make that happen; today or tomorrow.

Steven Sheng: Okay. Gisella, are you on the line? Okay I'll remind Gisella to send a reminder.

Gisella Gruber-White: Sorry, I'm on the line. Sorry, I'm here.

Steven Sheng: Oh okay, would you please send a reminder maybe by Wednesday that we'll have a meeting next Monday?

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes no problem; not only will it be sent out when I send the MP3 recording today but I will send a reminder out during the week.

Steven Sheng: Okay thank you. Okay.

Jim Galvin: Oh I'm sorry. Muted phone. Last chance any other business from anyone? And hearing none then we're adjourned. Thanks everyone.

Steven Metalitz: Thanks. Bye-bye.

Steven Sheng: Thank you.

Jim Galvin: Bye.

END