Internationalized Registration Data Working Group
Meeting Notes
25 October 2010

Attendees: Rafik Dammak, Jim Galvin, Jeremy Hitchcock, Robert Hutchinson, Steve Metalitz, Owen Smigelzki, and Jiankang Yao; from staff: Julie Hedlund, Dave Piscitello, and Steve Sheng; apologies from Edmon Chung and Avri Doria

The Working Group (WG) began discussion of the Draft Interim Report 20 October 2010. Refer to the Transcript and MP3 for the detailed discussion.

Feedback from Presentation by Jim Galvin at the SSAC Retreat

Jim provided a report on the feedback received from the SSAC from his presentation at the SSAC retreat on 21 October. He said that there was consensus in the SSAC that the WHOIS protocol is insufficient for internationalized registration data. He also noted that the WG should be careful in its discussions, reports, and presentations to make a clear distinction between the WHOIS protocol and WHOIS data. Jim suggested that the WG should prepare a comment for the Public Forum for the next version of the Draft Applicant Guidebook (DAG) should not recommend WHOIS as a protocol in the new Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA). In addition, the SSAC recommended that the WG should refer to directory services, rather than WHOIS, to draw attention away from WHOIS. Steve Sheng added that the SSAC had a question concerning the four models and specifically how transliteration is different from translation. Jim noted that that it may not make sense to translate addresses or names. Bob Hutchinson emphasized that the WG does not have a consensus on what should replace the WHOIS protocol since it is inadequate. He also asked in what ways was the WHOIS inadequate. Jim said that there is no way to signal a character set or scripts in WHOIS and that it is not accessible in any standardized way. He did agree that there is no consensus in the WG on an alternate protocol, but that the WG could explore the advantages of IRIS or others.   But Jim reiterated that the WG has until now focused on data rather than protocol. Jeremy Hitchcock agreed and noted that the WG had focused on what is lacking in the current data model, but the WG could also decide to make a recommendation on an alternate protocol.

ACTIONS: Dave Pisctello pointed out that SAC027 and SAC033 talked about the need for features that are lacking in the WHOIS. He agreed to send the links to the documents to the group. The staff also agreed to draft a brief comment on the protocol for the WG to review that could be submitted in the Public Forum for DAGv5 when it is opened.

Discussion of the Draft Interim Report

Steve Sheng asked what was the best way to gather edits for the Draft Interim Report. Julie suggested that WG members could send their edits to the list, either in an email, or directly in the document. She said that the staff could collect changes that the WG could discuss on a call next Monday, 01 November. The WG members agreed that it would be helpful to submit comments by Wednesday, 27 October.

On the issue of transliteration versus translation Steve pointed to confusion in the report. Specifically, on pages 14 and 15 figures 4 and 5 appear to be the same, not examples of translation versus transliteration. Steve Sheng agreed to make the change with assistance for the Russian translation from Andrei Kolesnikov. Bob Hutchinson noted that for the WHOIS labels the WHOIS directory service should provide labels in the local language.

ACTIONS:
1. **WG members will provide edits to the Draft Interim Report by COB Wednesday, 27 October.**
2. **Staff will incorporate the changes including a new section with a statement that the next iteration of the DAG should not include a recommendation in the RAA for the WHOIS protocol and should provide examples of the inadequacies of the protocol. This also could form the basis for a comment to be provided in the upcoming Public Forum on the DAGv5.**