

**GNSO/SSAC
International Registration Data Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 15 February 2010 at 14:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO/SSAC International Registration Data Working Group on 15 February 2010 at 14:00 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-20100215.mp3>

All recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO calendar page:

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

Present for the teleconference:

Bob Hutchinson, GNSO Commercial Stakeholder Group

Steven Metalitz -- GNSO Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial Stakeholder Group

Yao Jiankang, GNSO Registry Stakeholder Group, CNNIC

Jeremy Hitchcock - DYN-DNS

James Galvin - SSAC, Afiliis

ICANN Staff

Dave Piscitello

Gisella Gruber-White

Julie Hedlund

Absent apologies:

Rafik Dammak -- GNSO Non-Commercial Users Stakeholder Group

Gisella Gruber-White: I'll do a quick roll call. Good morning. Good afternoon to everyone on today's IRD call Monday the 15th of February. We have Jeremy Hitchcock, Yao Jiankang James Galvin, Steve Metalitz, Rob Hutchinson. From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Dave Piscitello and myself, Gisella Gruber-White and we have apologies from Rafik Dammak.

I'd also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks very much Gisella.

Julie Hedlund: So Jeremy if you would like I could run through the agenda for today's call.

Jeremy Hitchcock: That'd be great. Thanks Julie.

Julie Hedlund: So as you may recall, we had quite a bit of discussion on Question 1. At last week's call, you may recall that Dave Piscitello had done a setup of various questions for us to consider and the Question 1 was, you know, what do we require from internationalized registration data. And Question 1a had quite a bit of discussion last week and that was that a user can submit or have a domain name displayed in the IDN A label or U label format.

And I think we pretty much completed that discussion on the last call on the first of February and we provided a summary of that discussion to the list.

Also on the last call we started with Question 1b and that was what do we require from internationalized registration data that registration data be accessible to accommodate users who would benefit from the ability to submit and have registration information displayed in familiar characters from (unintelligible).

And Steve Sheng had provided a summary of comments on the list received on this Question 1b and we spent a good deal of discussion on the last call talking about domain names, the various elements, including domain names, registrar and entity names. We talked a little bit about postal addresses and email addresses and just very briefly on telephone numbers and (Rom) had suggested that maybe we pick up the thread - there's a little bit of further discussion on 1b in particular with respect to telephone numbers and what kind of standard, if any, we might recommend there.

And we did have a little bit of discussion on the postal standard as well and I know we had talked about whether or not - how the UPU standard might apply and so on. But I'm not sure we really closed that discussion.

So I would suggest that we - if others agree, start up with that. That summary and see if there are some further comments with respect to some of the other elements there; postal addresses, email addresses, telephone numbers, before we move on to Question 1c.

And some of the questions received so far on that as far as the summary are that David suggested for postal addresses that the conventions of the universal postal union could be helpful. (Bob) on the (left) noted that those might be difficult. It's not a computer based standard and it might be difficult to write a Web page to capture manual addresses.

Do you have more comments on the postal address issue?

Dave is there anything you wanted to add here?

Dave Piscitello: I think that the - one thing that we might want to consider, this is Dave Piscitello. I'm sorry. One thing we might want to consider is whether or not we want to treat contact information as a single data object or individual data objects, you know, when we're discussing them in the context of internationalizing the data.

So by that I mean when we are - when we think about displaying contact information, do we think about that contact information being - as there are each elements of the contact information and particularly, the address, being displayed in the same language or in the same character set for a given language.

So would one expect that if you were going to display a contact address that one line would be in Chinese characters, another line would be in English characters, another line would be in, you know, extended you know line characters like Spanish tilde.

So my feeling is that, you know, like a contact address is really a single data object and whatever we would - whatever guidelines we would describe for display and submission would simply say when you are submitting a contact's address, it must be - you must use the same character set for a given language much as we have requires on IDN for the composition of a label.

Does that sound reasonable to everyone?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. Could I ask a question about that?

Dave Piscitello: Of course.

Steve Metalitz: Does that mean that you could not submit an address in two different scripts. For example, an address in Chinese script and then the same address in ASCII?

Dave Piscitello: No. I mean in - so in like a given contact address submission - yeah. If you say - let's say that the Web page is set up so that you can submit information in a character set for Chinese language. When you get to the fields for address, street and the apartment, you know, city and whatever it is that you would use in China, you would not be able to then say well, you know, I think I'll just use Russian. You have to submit it in, you know, using character sets or characters from a Chinese script.

If there were also requirements to submit it in English, the same would apply on whatever form that you would create to submit it in English. You wouldn't be able to use Chinese characters in that one. So it's essentially a no mix scripts prohibition on the address field.

Now I don't necessarily mean phone numbers, telephone numbers. I just mean address field.

Steve Metalitz: I understand that and I think that makes sense but that would mean that if we were to say that you had to submit it in ASCII, as well as in the local script, then you would have to have a separate field for that.

Dave Piscitello: I think that's true. And I actually think that from a Web input forms validation standpoint, you know, as a - you know, just having written some scripts for Web input, it seems to me that there are certain benefits in terms of preventing or protecting against invalid input when you do that.

When you know what the script set is you at least can filter out invalid characters.

Jeremy Hitchcock: So the question is - this is Jeremy Hitchcock. The question is whether or not different items of a contact or I guess location in some ways because this is all dealing with some sort of postal code, is within the same script. But this does relate a little bit to an assumption of whether or not we're displaying both U and A labels.

Dave Piscitello: No. No. That's a...

Jeremy Hitchcock: I would...

Dave Piscitello: That would be a domain name. So I'm trying to understand the granularity that we want to deal with here, because if we treat registration data - if we treat, you know, WHOIS as one rigid object and we say it's all got to be ASCII or it's all got to be characters for a local script support, I think we're boxing ourselves into a solution that really starts - is really going to start to polarize the community and some of the conversation that (Jay Daily) and I have had in electronic mail regarding, you know, localization from (Jay)'s perspective.

You know, every registrar will accept whatever he wants to accept and every registry will, you know, store what every registrar has accepted and that's just the nature of things. That's one way to characterize this.

Another way to characterize it is to say that let's look at this from each object of data in a registration record and see what, by necessity, could remain ASCII. For example, sponsoring registrar and a sponsoring registrar's contact address is not something a registrant submits.

And then start to explore what you would do with the individual other data objects such as domain name. With domain name, we already have a solution which is A label or U label or both and frankly, I think, that's the world of automation can deal with whatever that is. And the world of humans can probably deal with whatever that is because we've had to deal with odd ball strings in URLs for a long time.

If you look at automatically generated URLs today you'll see <http://www.icann.org/security/committee> gibberish, gibberish, gibberish, gibberish (unintelligible) htm.

Jeremy Hitchcock:Right.

Dave Piscitello: And we're...

((Crosstalk))

Jeremy Hitchcock:Particular contact and the meta data about that person in terms of kind of the location or a postal - I don't want to use the word postal but just mean the locale of each of the registrant information or the technical contact or the IDN contact.

Dave Piscitello: Right. So the idea I've been mulling over is that if we can understand what we'd like to try to do in terms of individualizing or grouping objects in the registration data, then what might be useful would be to say all right. Let's apply this in real life and let's go to registrar X who's accepting registrations in

only local script Y and see what that does when it goes back to a GTLD. You know, what's that - you know what the consequences are.

So you know I think we can try to test case everything once we understand what we think the requirements are on how the data should be submitted and displayed for each data object or group of objects.

Does that make sense?

Julie Hedlund: So any comments on - do we want to talk then about each of these elements again on how we - I mean we talked quite fairly extensively about I think domain names and registrar information last week. I don't think we got, you know, we did not get that much into entity names, postal addresses, Email addresses, telephone numbers.

Do we want to talk about how we think each one should be displayed to give us as much flexibility as possible rather than looking at these as all one element? Did I capture that correctly Dave?

Dave Piscitello: Yes. I think that (Jay) and I actually had and several others had commented on telephone numbers and fax numbers. And I think that that's like domain names, relatively straightforward. Ideally, and especially for automation, it would be very nice to simply say, you know, that registrars would not accept anything in a field that was supposed to be a fax number or telephone number that wasn't an Arabic number.

And so if you're going to type in a, you know, a U.S. phone number, you would always type in ten Arabic numbers. And with the same guideline would apply for other countries according to the way that they compose their telephone numbers.

So we could actually knock off two. We have domain names. We know what to do there and I think we have fax and phone and we - you know, it's seems

relatively straight forward. I don't know that other phone in the world actually, you know, have substitutions for 1 through zero.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I mean if (Jay) agreed to that, fine but I would expect (Jay) to say, you know, there's many countries where Arabic numerals are not widely used. You know...

Dave Piscitello: For phones?

Steve Metalitz: I don't know what the story is for phones. I know for license plates and every - all other types of places where you see numbers in the real world. But...

Dave Piscitello: I - yeah. I mean I would - I imagine that maybe license plates don't use - I can't - we can always speculate like you because I haven't been everywhere but I can't remember anyplace that I have traveled in 25 years where a phone doesn't have a 1 through zero.

Julie Hedlund: And - this is Julie. I should point out that one of the comments that (Jay) had sent and Steve Sheng had captured was he recommended that the working group consider this one solved by reference to E.123 Internationalized Notations for Telephone Numbers and he sent over key links for that.

Dave Piscitello: I'm happy with that. I mean...

Steve Metalitz: I'm fine with that too. I just know that (Jay)'s view seems - it seems to be that we should allow, you know, we should be designing this so that people can use the script that they use in everyday life but I'll take it. Because I agree with you, I've never seen a phone differently either. I do know that - I guess people just use a separate script for phone number than they do for all the other purposes.

Steve Sheng: I think this is a good idea using just the E.123 Internationalized Notation for Telephone Numbers. So currently (Rom) mentioned last time that most of the

phone numbers that we currently store in the registry or registrar database are currently not internationalized. So if we are to recommend this, some kind of a scripting needs to be done at the registry or registrar level to make them internationalized. I just want to raise that point.

Dave Piscitello: That's a very good point. This is Dave again. If you would go and you scan through WHOIS you know, one of the challenges in automation is that most Americans don't put a 1 in the field. Quite a few will just simply no put their area code and it's not necessarily a malicious act it's that people don't ask you for an area code. In some parts of the United States, you don't give an area code.

So I think that they would have to be more syntactic effort on the part of registrars to clean up WHOIS but from my perspective, that's a good thing.

Steve Sheng: I think so. Are there any from the registrar that is on the call?

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. We're officially a registrar. We use the international E.123 standard. It is somewhat of a, you know, for U.S. residents, it's sometimes a confusing thing for them but they kind of figure it out.

And just as kind of a question, we would want to use the international standard for numbers; not the national standard. Is that correct Dave?

Dave Piscitello: Yes. I think that would probably be a minor inconvenience, if any, to users and a benefit to automation.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Yeah. And whether the registrar does something in a user interface standard where they say what country is your phone number and the local part for allowing the raw test of plus 41 71 78 901 - something along those lines. That's up to the registrar.

Dave Piscitello: Well, I guess if we want to be that liberal, sure. I mean I think so long as whatever - I mean the registrar could do whatever he wants in the Web page so long as the only thing that ends up in the registration data are the, you know, the Arabic numbers. That would be fine.

Jeremy Hitchcock:Arabic. And would you allow spaces as well or pluses? Because I think the...

Dave Piscitello: I would allow the submission. I mean, you know, frankly you know having written scripts, I would allow plus and parenthesis or period or hyphens but when I got to the - when I went to store the data or pass it to the registry, I would want to pass it just as numbers.

And then if it comes back to me and it wants be a, you know, it wants to be something representational, I could do so. But, you know, once you get into pluses and parenthesis and hyphens and dots, they are very localized. You know, like what we consider an area code, you know, is not necessarily an area code in other countries.

Jeremy Hitchcock:Right.

Dave Piscitello: We meaning the United States.

Jeremy Hitchcock:It's just the - just a plus sign and a space seems to be in the actual body of the E.123 standard.

Dave Piscitello: Oh. They do.

Jeremy Hitchcock:Yeah. They have - the parenthesis. Hyphens are not allowed. Parenthesis are using the "national flavor" of a phone number but it does not include the country code. So for the idea of world dialing, there's no sense of what the true origin. So it would be basically ten possible characters, a space and a - which is irrelevant for the call and so I guess it would - in the sense of case preserving or space preserving just for formatting and then a plus sign to - I

guess just to designate the beginning of a phone number - a (unintelligible) phone number if you would.

Dave Piscitello: Is that the display requirement. Right. They don't talk about what the storage requirement is.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Yeah. Under use of symbols. Yeah. It is only a display of course and they do say that phone numbers should be written in the form with those particular spaces.

Dave Piscitello: But...

Jeremy Hitchcock: Like you said. It's irrelevant for human - for the actual dialing component.

Dave Piscitello: Yeah. So I guess the way that we characterize that is a Web form is that you could create a Web form that would allow you to accept characters in addition to the Arab numbers. You would create a Web display that would allow you to also display those characters but when you submit and you receive data from the registry, you would want it to be strictly in Arabic numbers and that would allow the most uniform set of characters for automation.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Yeah. I think so.

Julie Hedlund: Do we have anything else we want to discuss on telephone numbers? It seems like we're coalescing around the E.123 standard and having a recommendation for only Arabic number in the information that's stored or that comes from the registry. Does that sound correct?

Dave Piscitello: Julie, I'll summarize it for you if you want. I'll just write it and put it up on the list.

Julie Hedlund: That'd be perfect. Because I'll send out a collective summary of this discussion some time tomorrow so Dave if you could do that that would be very helpful.

Do we move on to one of the other elements? How do we want to address postal addresses? There was a little bit of discussion last week on the convention for the UPU but some concerns about how that could be, you know, put into some kind of Web form I think.

Steve Sheng: Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah.

Steve Sheng: Before we do the postal address which I think is harder, can we just focus - get the email address out of the way, which I think is simpler?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. That's a good suggestion. Should we discuss email addresses a bit?

Steve Sheng: So for the email address, Dave suggested the (RFC A22 Mind Conventions). I took a look at the convention and I think last part, you know, it's a convention how to compose email for different addresses to internationalize. I was wondering if you can make it simpler. The E.123 standard also has a convention for email address Dave. I don't know whether you think that would be sufficient.

Dave Piscitello: As long as it's consistent with the successor documents to RFC A22, then that would be fine. You know, I know that (Jay) was, you know, just pointed out that I'm an old person and I'm, you know, thinking in terms of you know the original RFC by (Dave Crocker). So I'm happy to admit that I'm an old fart and that I should, you know, follow the succession of documents.

But as long as we're not creating opportunities for obfuscation. Yeah. I think that's fine. Do you want to get a copy of the standard and post a URL for us Steve? That would be great.

Steve Sheng: Okay. I mean it's very - it's you know very simple. It's basically, you know, a name, ampersand, example.com. That's it.

Dave Piscitello: Yes.

Steve Sheng: That's pretty much it. I don't know if for our purpose if that's enough or that's too simple.

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy.

((Crosstalk))

Jeremy Hitchcock: Oh. Sorry. I'll let you speak.

Jim Galvin: Yeah. This is Jim Galvin. I'm not familiar with E.123's recommendations for email addresses but I can tell you that there is an internationalized email address working group developing documents even now in the ITF. And I think that, you know, going back just to what Dave said, I mean I don't - I'm new to this group so I don't know what the history is here in terms of preferences. But if you're going to go with ITF standards, then I think that that's the side that you want to go on and it's that document that you want to follow and track.

In fact they just - I think it might actually have just been published or it's about to be published so I think the timing is right to point to it.

So again I'm not expressing a preference between E.123 or the internet standards but I observed that there is an internet standard document and we shouldn't lose track of that. So that's my comment.

Dave Piscitello: So this is Dave. Would it be possible for us to post the two alternatives to the list and then just submit - carry this discussion off to the list because I think that we're in agreement. We want to use the prevalent, you know, standard for composing email and we just want to make certain we have the right citation.

Steve Sheng: Right. I think so. Yeah. We can do that. I can circulate those two links. I'll dig out the ITF working groups.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Yeah. This is Jeremy.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Just a quick comment about the various standards. I think the E.123 sort of has kind of a reference or is at least trying to acknowledge the RFC standard about actual encoding and representation of emails as far as what characters are allowed and what characters are not allowed. The notation in the actual E.123 standard is kind of light, and I wonder if we may want to think about that as we're mulling over which one we prefer and using the RFC email standard is probably - it may be better to have that specificity so that way registrars and registries would know what exactly to implement and what character (script) to allow.

Steve Sheng: And you make an excellent point.

Jiankang Yao: And this is (Yao Jiankang) speaking. (Unintelligible) we have 12 other internationalized email address currently. I'm also member of the email address international and the working group or ITF. I'm also the author for (RC) Part (336) for intention to - for the email - internationalize the email address. So in current email address format, we only allow ASCII format like

(unintelligible). But in future, we will soon have Unicode-based internationalized email address. This (unintelligible) international working group with focus on future update of email address.

So I think the email address should allow Unicode or UTF-8 encoding. Thank you.

Steve Sheng: That's a wonderful point too.

Dave Piscitello: Well, you know, one observation I'd make - again, this is Dave, about the composition is if the IETF standard allows, you know, characters other than ASCII, mail systems must be able to process it which means that systems that are designed to protect SPAM are able to process it. And so automation is probably accommodated. And humans are accommodated. So it sounds like whatever the standard is that emerges from this working group that you had mentioned is probably the one that is going to be most applicable over time.

Steve Sheng: Yes. I think so.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. Well. That's great. So Steve you're going to circulate some links. Do you need any information from Jim Galvin to be able to point to the IETF standard that's about to be published.

Jim Galvin: Yeah. That would be great.

Julie Hedlund: Jim, if you wouldn't mind sending something on that to Steve Sheng. That would be great. I can send you his email. I don't know that you have it. Or you could send it to the list. That would be perfectly fine.

Jim Galvin: Sure thing. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: And I - you have been added to the list so you do have sending rights. So you're fully part of the group. Do we want to move on to the more complicated issue of postal addresses?

Steve what do you think?

Steve Sheng: Sure. I think so.

Dave Piscitello: Actually Julie I'm going to ask whether there might be another easy one. I'm making a big leap of faith that it's an easy one but...

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead Dave. We're always happy to hear easy ones.

Dave Piscitello: Well, registrars provide, you know, provide a certain amount of the registration data and registrants do not actually submit that. And the registrar is sponsoring, you know, sponsoring registrar identification.

Steve Sheng: Hello Dave.

Julie Hedlund: Have we lost you? Hello.

Coordinator: Excuse me. This is the operator.

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Coordinator: Mr. Piscitello seems to be connected. I hear sound coming from his line.

Man: Hello.

Julie Hedlund: I'll send Dave a (jab) and let him know that we're not...

Oh. I see that he's disconnecting now.

Coordinator: He's now disconnected. Yes. Madam.

Julie Hedlund: Right. I'm sure he'll come back to join us momentarily. We'll just give him a moment if that's okay.

Coordinator: Up to you sir.

Julie Hedlund: He's dialing back in he told me. He'll be here momentarily.

Dave Piscitello: Hello.

Julie Hedlund: Hello Dave. Welcome back.

Dave Piscitello: I'm sorry.

Julie Hedlund: No problem. You were cut off in mid-stream. You were just talking about registrars and so on and you might want to start back where you were.

Dave Piscitello: Okay. So I think I began by saying that some of the registration data are collected, you know, and submitted by the registrar and you know they include sponsoring data, all the dates regarding the creation and modification and expiry. And I'm wondering whether it would be beneficial to simply say that since registrars already collect that data, it's already in ASCII 7, that you know, we could allow those data specifically to remain ASCII - you know, ASCII data.

Is there really a requirement to be able to display those and perhaps display them, but it certainly doesn't seem that there's a requirement to submit them in something other than ASCII.

Julie Hedlund: Any comments on Dave's suggestion?

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. I think that that would be fine. I think the only reason why we would want to go back and perhaps modify that in the future or that we defer that if there's ever a standard or a requirement that ASCII 7 is not the only thing that's used. Do you know where that actually comes from? Is that just a RA thing?

Dave Piscitello: Well, I think it's just historical. It's just legacy Jeremy. This is Dave again. And it's simply RA but it's just information that the registrar's knew that, you know, and ICANN and the registrars through the agreement acknowledged that being a registrar responsibility.

One of the values of doing - of leaving that information in ASCII is that there is always a party that whoever is running automation will be assured that they can reach. And you know there would be hopefully in the future if other RA amendments are accepted, there will be a list on an ICANN site of accredited registrars and that list would also include contact information or for abuse points of contact. And, you know, if those other amendments were to be put in place, there would be a much clearer path for response - for examining abuse and incidents on the part of any party than there is today.

Steve Sheng: Dave, this is Steve. I think two weeks ago, we discussed about this a little bit and (Jay) is, you know, taking the position you know - (Jay) is kind of against it essentially. But I think at the end of the discussion, he is willing to let the registrar contact information - the name of the registrar needs to stay ASCII.

One question that some of the working party member raised is for the gTLDs this is fine, but for the ccTLDs, whether that's okay, you know, there was some discussion about that.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah. This is Steve Metalitz. I have notes too that I think we already discussed this and that was the only issue was whether - in the ccTLDs, were the registrars, if there are any, are not subject to the registrar accreditation

agreement and it might not necessarily be the case that this information is available in ASCII.

Steve Sheng: Yeah. So it's Jiankang still on the line?

Jiankang Yao: Yeah.

Steve Sheng: So I was wondering Jiankang how does (Semic) handle like this issue. Do you require that the registrars in China to display, you know, at least their English name in the WHOIS.

Jiankang Yao: English - what kind of name?

Steve Sheng: So for example, so I guess my question is would you think this will pose problems for ccTLDs? So for registrar, when we do the internationalized WHOIS, we still require ASCII - that their name to be displayed in ASCII for automation purpose. Would you see that problematic or do you think that's okay.

Jiankang Yao: For current email - for example international domain names (unintelligible) actually display. So you mean domain name or just the...

Steve Sheng: No. Not the domain name. Just the name of the registrant; the name of the sponsoring registrant.

Jiankang Yao: All right. Yeah. Currently we - the name of the registrar is displayed in Chinese. So currently we have - for example, we have (unintelligible) Chinese - (unintelligible) in China. First of all (unintelligible) domain name. Second is domain name status. Third is container information for domain name. (Then is) registrar of domain name.

Steve Sheng: So for the registrar of domain name, that's currently displayed in Chinese?

Jiankang Yao: Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah.

Steve Sheng: I see.

Dave Piscitello: So do you have an English page for registration as well?

Jiankang Yao: No, no, no. Maybe you talk (unintelligible). No. We do not display English name of all registry.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Sheng: (Unintelligible) registrar.

Jiankang Yao: Yeah. The registrar - registrar.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. I'm just looking through the notes from our last meeting. Note that (Jay) had noted that ccTLDs - different ccTLDs handle output very differently and that he didn't think it was in the scope of this working group to recommend (unintelligible) ccTLDs, although it might be useful to provide a toolkit or some type of guideline for each data.

Dave Piscitello: This is Dave. I guess the one observation that I'd make is that, you know, ultimately what we come up with here would probably be something that would go to the GNSO and through a PDP process and be applied to GTLDs. But the hope would be that it would be sufficiently robust that the same conventions could be adopted by all TLDs and I think that that's all we can really say.

As (Jay) said, you know, it is out of scope for us to say or, you know, other than to encourage ccTLDs to read what we've done and to participate and make certain that we're not making life more challenging for them, you know, and for everyone else by creating something that's not tractable.

Steve Sheng: So Jiankang this is Steve again.

Jiankang Yao: Okay.

Steve Sheng: Is there any particular reason that you don't display the English name of the registrar.

Jiankang Yao: No, no, no. No particular reason. We cover - we current we just display Chinese name because most of us - because is who the information - mostly used by Chinese. Maybe user name is another user for them. No particular reason.

If ICANN requires display English name too maybe we display English name too. Actually, no particular reason.

Steve Sheng: Right. So I think that's well said. Currently most of the WHOIS are used in the queries that are used within China and then, you know, you want them to understand Chinese.

So one of the reasons why we may want a registrar to display their English name is mostly for abuse contacts. So for example, if some domain name registered in China was involved in some kind of a malicious abuse and a company for example in - an investigator in United Kingdom wants to investigate, the first thing he needs to do is to contact the registrar.

You know, obviously probably he's not going to be able to get in touch with the registrant so he will likely to contact the registrar. And if only having it in Chinese may make it difficult for somebody in the UK to contact that. You know, that's the rational I think.

Jiankang Yao: Actually (unintelligible) some Chinese domain name is registered by the (ORC) but the (ORC) they will (unintelligible) support registrar English

information - you know database. For their information, we will display English registry.

Dave Piscitello: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Jiankang Yao: If (unintelligible) registered in China - mainland China. Because they provide us with - the Chinese with the information so we display Chinese information.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Jiankang Yao: (Unintelligible) different.

Steve Sheng: Right. Right. Right. Yeah. I'm just trying to think. If for example if someone, you know, register - this is, I think I'm not just picking on China. This could be true for any other localized group. For example, Japanese or Russian. It's the same case.

Because you're from (Semic). That's we're just using China for example. We're not implying anything. I'm just saying for example, if someone from China, you know, a malicious user register a domain in China and hosting a Web site that's engaged in malicious activity.

Jiankang Yao: Yeah.

Steve Sheng: Someone else from other outside China may want to get in contact with that registrar. So do you see my reasoning? I mean I think that's where we're reasoning why, you know, why does registrar's information may need to contain ASCII - may need to contact (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Steve Sheng: Go ahead.

Jiankang Yao: I think you are right. I think that's true. Both the registry - registrar information should be both - displayed both in English and Chinese. I think you are right about it. Currently (unintelligible) seen only provide one information - one language in information.

Steve Sheng: Okay. I see. Thanks.

Jiankang Yao: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks. This is Julie. Do we want to - (unintelligible) our discussion on that one. Do we want to move on or other comments on display of registrar names information.

Do we want to take up the issue of postal addresses. We've got about - a little less than ten minutes left here.

Jeremy Hitchcock: This is Jeremy. Why don't we start it off and we can think of some things that we can work on over the list over the next couple of weeks.

Julie Hedlund: All right. Thanks Jeremy. Dave did you want to give a little bit about our initial recommendations.

Dave Piscitello: I guess I'll - I'll just restate the - sort of the first principle; not necessarily the entire one but just that it would be valuable to have or to treat a contact address as a single data object or group of objects and that we should not allow mixed scripts in any contact address.

And that's not necessarily saying that you can't have ASCII and local character but just simply saying that no matter what you choose, it should always be, you know, always be one character set and pretty much following the kind of guidelines that IDNA sets for labels.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. This is basically your Question 1e. Right.

Dave Piscitello: God, you remember my questions better than I do.

Steve Metalitz: I'm just looking - I'm looking at the list here. And I think - I mean I think everyone would agree with that but the - what you just said sort of presented it as an either/or when it might be a both/and. I mean I thought we had not - well I know we haven't come to rest on this question of whether this type of data needs to be displayed in ASCII even if it originates in a non-ASCII script. That could be the outcome and so it's not really either/or. It could be both/and and again, getting back to what we said at the beginning of the call, I think you're just saying that those would have to be separate data fields.

There might be a data field for the local script and a data field for ASCII.

Dave Piscitello: Yeah. This is essentially - I guess it really it 1e. And I'm very specifically trying to separate the issue of whether or not there are two or one and if they're one, which is it - from when you - whatever you choose. Now if you have one and it's a local script, it must be - you must not allow mixed scripts in that. If you have one that's ASCII, you must not allow characters that are not in the ASCII seven set.

If you allow both, then in both the ASCII case and the local script case, you can't have mixed scripts. So those are the conditions that I would want to impose.

Steve Sheng: Yes Dave. I think Jiankang in the email discussion groups also mentioned that if all data requests to use UTF-8, that should be no problem. And he also mentioned that yet along those same lines that, you know, mixed groups should be (unintelligible). I don't know what you think of that.

- Dave Piscitello: I guess I didn't know that you could actually represent every character in UTF-8. I thought that there were some languages where UTF-16 was required but I'm not an expert in that field. You'd have to ask someone like (Tina).
- Steve Sheng: Okay.
- Dave Piscitello: All right.
- Steve Metalitz: If what Jiankang is saying is correct for all, you know, all international language then that's - I don't have a problem with postulating that, you know.
- Dave Piscitello: The only difference is that if you use UTF-8 for English, you can introduce characters that are not necessarily desirable.
- Steve Sheng: Yes. Homographic attacks. Yeah.
- Dave Piscitello: I see.
- Steve Sheng: Yeah. I think that may pose - but would that be a critical issue for - so they - let me summarize. What you are saying is okay. If - for UTF-8 or any of the UTFs essentially, you know, UTF-8 or 16, represent other languages that would be perfectly fine but if you represent English, you know, someone may replace some ASCII characters with some Cyrillic characters that look, you know, very similar to English and that might be a problem. Right.
- Jiankang Yao: This is Jiankang Yao speaking. Actually UTF-8 is a kind of encoding - ASCII encoding as well - UTF-8 encoding. Unicode including ASCII characters, so UTF-8 display ASCII information is no problem. In computer storage both the special format of ASCII - so ASCII character in UTF-8 and ASCII character in ASCII or current (USA) ASCII is the same, so there is no problem.

Steve Sheng: But what I mean is the alphabet for UTF-8 is much larger than ASCII. So maybe, you know, if someone wants to display a domain name, you know, in English they can substitute some of the, you know, UTF-8 alphabet such as in Cyrillic and replace some of those. I think that's what I mean.

Dave Piscitello: Yeah. I think you guys are actually saying relatively the same thing. UTF is the encoding and ASCII is a subset of UTF-8 and I was talking not about encoding but about script. And so if what we want to, you know, ensure is that you don't allow a mixed script in a contact address and if you think about it, in the natural world, we don't typically see addresses being written in mixed scripts. And people by convention will write their address in their own script unless they're going to a, you know, to an actual destination.

So what I'm trying to say here is that we've established criteria for IDN labels that protect us against homographic and other deception attacks by prohibiting the mixing of scripts and it seems that that would also be useful in contact address.

Julie Hedlund: Any comments on that. This is Julie and I should point out that we're now at the top of the hour and I think we need to wrap up our discussion and agree on the timing for our next meeting.

Any further comments. We'll obviously provide a summary on the list of this discussion and I think pick up where we left up both on the list and at our next meeting. And we will again encourage people to provide comments to the list.

Anything anybody would like to add at this point.

Dave Piscitello: I just have one question. This is Dave. And that is is there any intent to give a report Nairobi?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. There's certainly an opportunity if this group would like to provide a report at the SSAC open meeting in Nairobi which is probably going

to be scheduled for the afternoon of Tuesday the 9th but I'm not entirely sure who in this group is going to be in Nairobi.

I know Jeremy you are not as you mentioned.

Jeremy Hitchcock:I'm not. I think Jim is. Dave are you in Nairobi? No.

Dave Piscitello: No. I'm going to be in New York.

Julie Hedlund: And Steve...

Jim Galvin: And this is Jim Galvin. I mean while I'll be in Nairobi, I'm relatively new to this group and I may not be the best choice to represent this group.

Julie Hedlund: All right.

Jim Galvin: That'd be an interesting fall back if that's really where we are but I'm not sure I want to step up.

Julie Hedlund: Well let me - Jeremy since you're one of the coach (heads), do you think it would be useful to provide even just a brief status update of, you know, where the group is and what they've been doing. You know, what we've been talking about and where the conversation is so far at the SSAC open meeting and obviously that wouldn't necessarily be you but I could check and see if (Edmond) might be available. I don't know if he's attending.

Jeremy Hitchcock:I think it'd be at least useful to give a heads up of what the work that we're doing and what the expected outcome is just so that way people aren't - they're both looking for it and there's not duplicate work that's going on. Just in the sense of a quick, you know, two minute - five minute update on what's going on.

Julie Hedlund: Sure. So this is Julie. I'll check with (Edmond) and see if he is going to be there and (Rob Mohan) has also been quite active in the group. I know he's not here today but he might be willing to give a short presentation and I can check with him if (Edmond) might not be available if that would be okay with you.

Jeremy Hitchcock: That'd be great and he has - (Rom) has a good background on scripts and IDN and representation and so I think that would work out well.

Dave Piscitello: Great.

Julie Hedlund: Well I'll take that as an action item Jeremy and check with (Edmond) first and then Rob.

Jeremy Hitchcock: That'd be great.

Julie Hedlund: And our next meeting is scheduled for - will be scheduled two weeks from now if we follow our convention. That would be Monday, March 1st and we've been rotating time so that would be 1900 UTC or 2 o'clock eastern time and 11 o'clock. Are there any objections to that? Great. Then I'll go ahead and schedule that.

We do not have a meeting scheduled for Nairobi; a face to face meeting and I think that's contingent on whether or not we really feel like we'll have enough members at Nairobi. I know there's a lot of people who aren't going so we might - you know, feeling we could do teleconference. You know, be able to allow people to attend by teleconference but we would have just had a meeting the week prior.

Is there any sense that we should have a face to face meeting in Nairobi?

Shall I poll the members and see if there's a desire for that?

Dave Piscitello: I think you could poll to find out how many people are present. I'm just looking at the list. I don't see all that many people that I recognize as regular attendees and may of the regular attendees are not going to be there. So I'd poll the list first to see what attendance would be.

Julie Hedlund: I'll do that. I'll take that as an action item Jeremy.

Jeremy Hitchcock: Yeah. I think that's a good way to go. I would lean towards not really having a face to face meeting. I think that we've had some pretty good progress and just because of the remote participation and the different time zones that we're kind of working through these issues pretty well.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks Jeremy. Anything anybody - Jeremy or others would like to add on today's call. Then I think we can go ahead and adjourn this call. And I want to thank everyone for participating and we'll provide a summary in the next day and encourage all of you to continue the discussion on the list and we'll talk to you in two weeks.

Dave Piscitello: Thanks Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. Goodbye.

Man: Thanks. Bye-bye.

Jiankang Yao: Thank you. Bye-bye.

END