

20131113_WHOISIRD_ID832592

Jim Galvin: Okay. If we can, I'd like to pose on our charter first. I don't see Steve at the moment. But, while we're waiting a minute here, we can bring our charter up in front of us. That would be good.

Okay. I have the document open in front now. Now, Naoki, you and Steve, were exchanging messages yesterday. I've not looked at this since yesterday. I'm scrolling through. I don't see any comments left. So I guess that means everything has been resolved, let me ask first. Then, if anybody has any questions or concerns or comments that they want to make about our proposed charter--

Okay. I'm not hearing anything, so I'm going to take that as consensus that we are satisfied with our charter. And we will suggest to Steve that he take this and format it, clean it up, and put it up on our Wiki page.

Unidentified Participant: Sounds good to me.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Hang on. One last thing I want to do here. I sent an e-mail message to Steve. Oh, I was about to say I'm going to send Steve a text message, and it turns out I have a text message from Steve. He's saying that he's going to be a bit late this morning and that the charter is good to go. All right. Well, that takes care of that. That was easy enough to see (ph).

Okay. Well, I'm glad that we got the charter settled. So that's a good thing.

So I think the next step for us is to--

Oh, I know what I wanted to do. I forgot. So, yesterday-- I noticed yesterday-- I hope everyone else here noticed it too. I didn't forward it to our list, but the EWG sent out a status report yesterday. I was actually able to grab it before-- I was traveling yesterday. And so, before I had gotten on a plane, I was able to grab it and look at it. And it actually does have more detail about data elements and information that they believe should be collected. So I think that this is going to be very useful and very helpful to us. And it looks like they have also already done quite a job in a survey of data elements that are captured by other registries and registrars. So I'm thinking that, rather than our doing a survey, we might be able to make use of that.

Has anyone else had a chance to look at that yet, or did anyone else notice and have any comments about that status report they issued yesterday?

Unidentified Participant: I haven't seen it. Sorry.

Jim Galvin: No. That's okay. It is all kinds of short notice. I understand that. I just happened to notice it more by accident than anything, to be honest with you. But it was good to have had a chance to take a look at it.

They're now suggesting they're not going to be done until sometime early next year, which means it will probably be into June or so before we really get community consensus on what they're doing, which is fine. But, if you haven't taken a look at that report, you should. I will try and find a link here and see if I can get something sent to our list so that everyone has it and knows what they're looking at.

Unidentified Participant: That would be great. Thank you.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Forward EWG to the list. Okay.

So, I believe, as I recall, the next thing that we were supposed to focus on here was about the data elements in fact. So it is kind of nice that we got this EWG report. But now it's kind of a shame that Steve is not here because I thought Steve was going to provide the baseline for that for us.

Unidentified Participant: I thought that he had sent something out with that in it actually. He sent out another e-mail that had data elements from various registries in it.

Jim Galvin: Yeah. There was a document that was done for the (unintelligible) working group in the ITF. And quite a bit of work was done there. And they had a document, and some of that was work that Steve had done before.

Okay. Now, I apologize for not being ready. I probably should be ready, but I'm actually-- I am literally between trips here. I apologize. I'm actually leaving to head to the ICANN meeting as soon as we're done here.

Unidentified Participant: Actually, it was in an e-mail that he sent out on the 30th. Yes. That had-- I believe it has a gTLD registry data model on it actually.

Jim Galvin: Data elements for gTLD. There we go. So, yes. So Steve has his questions down here at the bottom about reviewing these data elements and documents.

Now, I haven't given them a detailed review in a while. I kind of have to look at them again myself. I apologize. But have other folks had a chance to look at these documents that Steve sent?

Steve Sheng: Hi, Jim. I'm on the line.

Jim Galvin: Ah, welcome, Steve. Thank you. So we're just getting started looking at the documents that you sent back on the 30th.

Steve, maybe if-- Do you have ready access to a computer where you are right now?

Steve Sheng: Yes. I do.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Could you forward a link for the EWG report to our list?

Steve Sheng: Sure. The EWG report.

Jim Galvin: Yeah, the fattest report they just published yesterday.

Steve Sheng: Sure. Happy to do that. I'll do that in--

Jim Galvin: Okay. So my question is, and Steve asks these questions in his message down here at the bottom, is how we're going to structure our discussions about data elements. I think, you know, our obligation here is to produce the requirements for internationalized registration data. The approach that I was proposing was that we begin to look at elements that are going to be present, and then we can talk about-- then we can sort of back from that out and talk about what we think needs to be said in terms of the requirements for gathering that information and supporting internationalization. That was just the approach that I was suggesting. But I'm certainly open to other ideas or other ways to do this. We have this inventory.

As I said, we now have an EWG inventory of elements too. They have some very nice descriptions of elements and why they're relevant. And, actually, they're beginning to list some optional elements too. So one question that I have is how we're going to look to structure what it is that we want to say. Do we want to consider what the EWG is doing in terms of mandatory versus optional versus registry-specific? That looks like how they're going to structure things. Or do we want to consider something different based on internationalization requirements? And, more importantly, now that we have these inventories, what would folks like to suggest we do as far as how to structure our discussions about getting requirements out of looking at the elements?

Sarmad Hussain: This is Sarmad. I'd like to go, Steve (ph).

Jim Galvin: Please, Sarmad, go ahead.

Sarmad Hussain: So, just, I guess, thinking aloud at this time. To start with, I think what we need to do is-- so we are more focused on internationalization layers in our areas. So the core data requirements, I think, we need to probably keep the same and see-- if key things are the same, these are requirements we can internationalize that and then add only things which we think are required for the internationalization in addition to the core things. So I guess what I'm trying to say is that we focus on, first, just what EWG has issued and see if we can just internationalize that. And we can have already parallel structure. And, if a parallel structure is not possible, then we look at what is available additionally to do to make that possible.

Jim Galvin: So, Sarmad, I have a question. You used the phrase core data requirements. And did you mean a core set of data elements? Otherwise, I'm not sure what you were referring to when you said core data requirements.

Sarmad Hussain: So, I think the reference point is a list, which I've not been able to see that yet, but I would imagine that the reference point would be the work by EWG. So, eventually, whatever EWG decides or whatever the community eventually decides, I guess, would need to be international. And what I am saying is that we need to assess whether it is easily possible to have a parallel structure in internationalized-- parallel, internationalized structure.

If it is not possible to have a very parallel, internationalized structure, then the next step-- we see what is the minimal addition or change in that data requirement to have something which is (inaudible).

Jim Galvin: Okay. So, if I can just say this back to make sure I heard you probably-- when you're talking about core data requirements, you're suggesting that we should-- you're really referring to data elements and the information that's collected. And we should use the EWG report as our baseline, keeping in mind, of course, that none of that has community

consensus yet. But it would probably head in that direction. Variances wouldn't be that significant, I wouldn't think.

And then I think the second thing you were talking about is a parallel structure. Were you suggesting that we might keep two systems going - a new, internationalized system and whatever the old system is? And we would do both for a while? We would expect registries and registrars to do that?

Sarmad Hussain: So, what I meant was that I believe for-- as key elements, we have an internationalized element. And, ideally, that would be a one-to-one relationship. So we start with that possibility, and where a one-to-one relationship is not possible, then we look at what is the minimal possibility which can be done (inaudible) solutions. So, for example, one could say that you have just one element-- let's say domain name or something like that, domain label, and that's key. And then, obviously, that can be internationalized. And, for domain label, we just have an internationalized domain label. But, in some cases, that may actually not be easily possible. So, for example, in the case of address, for example, we may not have an internationalized-- just an internationalized address but maybe also the script of that address or the language of that address in addition to just the address content itself. So the same one item at a time (inaudible) in a one-on-one relationship for those and one-on-one relationship with (unintelligible) not possible than what is the minimal that we should need to specify that clearly.

Jim Galvin: Okay. So, again, just so that I understand, I mean, one of the questions that we have for ourselves written out in our charter is about whether or not there are supposed to be two copies of a data element - one in an internationalized form and one in-- well, probably, U.S. ASCII. But, if there is any kind of common language that's decided that things have to be in, whatever that turns out to be-- And we also have another question about what is supposed to be the relationship between those data elements if there are two. So you're suggesting that we should address those questions very early on and first if we can?

Sarmad Hussain: No. Actually, that's not what I meant. What I meant to be saying is that, if we only had to store data in a local language, not in ASCII, would one particular field in the ASCII version (unintelligible) or sort of map onto a single field in local language-- or is that going to be, for this particular element, there'll be more than one (unintelligible) that's going to be stored for (inaudible). So I guess I'm talking about mapping, I guess. That clearly is probably a wrong word there. So we can see whether there's one-to-one mapping or (inaudible) element or whether, if that's not possible, what is available possibilities?

Jim Galvin: Okay. So we would have to have a requirement of the form, something either-- if the data is stored in a local form, then there needs to be a one-to-one mapping to a common form. And, if not, we would need to-- we would specify what you would do in a situation where it would not be possible to do that. Is that what you're suggesting?

Sarmad Hussain: Yes.

Steve Sheng: Jim, this is Steve. I'd like to get into the queue.

Jim Galvin: Yes, Steve, go ahead.

Steve Sheng: Two thoughts. On Sarmad's first question about where to start, Sarmad is suggesting we start with the EWG list of data elements.

I propose something slightly different. I'll propose we start with the existing gTLD contracts-- what the gTLD today are producing, as well as the registrars. So that's-- My

reason for that is that set of data elements is already part of the policy. It has community agreement. So we start tackling the internationalized requirements for those set of elements first.

Once we've done that, we will seek to incorporate any additional elements possibly in there. And one such candidate is the EWG. I read through the EWG elements. I saw some of them are-- do not have community consensus yet. For example, jurisdiction information, SMS information. Those are traditionally today not part of the WHOIS output.

So that's a first thought.

Regarding the second thought, whether there should be a one-to-one mapping, this seems to me largely a policy question, really, to me. We tackled (ph) a bit in the original IRD working group, but we could not agree. Right? And there's no consensus. And it's going to be tackled in the upcoming PDT. So I would suggest we make-- we articulate the requirements and provide that feedback to the PDT.

My two cents.

Jim Galvin: Thank you, Steve. I agree with your second comment. We do need to be careful to just specify what we believe are requirements. And then those will get fed into the next process, which is PDT. So they'll seek to be evaluated.

With respect to the second part, I guess I'm interested in the first thing that you said, Steve. I'm interested in what other people suggest. There are some differences between what's in the EWG report and what is done today. I don't think the differences are too dramatic. But perhaps we should take some time to clearly identify where the differences exist.

But how would folks like to deal with that difference? Should we start with the existing gTLD contract as a baseline? Should we start with the EWG as a baseline? Should we do something different? Comments from anyone?

Jody Kolker: This is Jody for the queue.

Jim Galvin: Jody, please, go ahead.

Jody Kolker: Well, I haven't seen the EWG yet, so I guess I'd like to be able to look at that before I make a decision. That's all that I'd like to propose there.

Jim Galvin: Well, that's certainly fair. Don't want to make choices about something unseen.

There are some interesting additions. I mean, I didn't look carefully at it, but I have gone down the list. And nothing jumped out at me except, like Steve said-- he pointed out a couple things there. There are some jurisdiction elements that they want included in data, which are different. Things like that, though-- there are a couple other things but I don't think anything too dramatic. I mean, there's pretty much a baseline, you all. We all kind of know it has to be there. There's just some stuff around the edges that might have some debate about.

Well, we do have quite a collection of data elements at this point here. And we are going to have to figure out-- I mean, it may be-- I'm sorry. I'm thinking out loud here a little bit, and I'm rambling a little bit. I apologize for that.

Ideally, we can come up with a set of requirements which is not tied specifically to a certain list of specific elements. There may be things we have to say about certain specific elements, and I guess we'll see as we go through this and evaluate them. But, ideally, we won't be tied to a particular list, which would be really good because the list is clearly going to evolve over time. So it would be nice if we could keep things just abstract enough to not be tied to what's existing today and what's going to come down the road.

Okay. I'm trying to think about what's the most effective use of our time here today.

I guess, again, the approach-- now that we've got the charter settled, Steve, which we did agree to before you came on-- so you can do what you need to do to format that and get that posted on the Wiki.

Steve Sheng:

Sure.

Jim Galvin:

I think the approach that we have chosen so far is to take our list of data elements and begin to look through them, look at the two different sets, and I guess now we have three sets of data elements because we have the EWG report data elements, and begin to think about how we want to structure those in terms of what kinds of requirements that we might write.

I think we've just put a step in front of that, which is to identify the differences between the EWG report and these other lists that we have. It would be nice to understand where the differences are, what the distinctions are. And we can take a look at whether that's going to matter to us or not.

At the moment, I'm thinking that it's probably not an especially productive use of our time to sit here and go through those elements, especially considering we just got the EWG report.

I think maybe we should all take as-- what I'm going to do is propose that we all take the specific action to do our review of the data elements and a comparison between EWG and the others, and we come back. I'm also going to propose, in two weeks-- that we not meet next week because it is the week of the ICANN meeting. And we use that time between now and the next two weeks to review the data elements and come back prepared to talk about them.

Jody Kolker:

Say, Steve, this is Jody. Just a couple of comments, if I may.

Jim Galvin:

Yes, please, Jody, go ahead.

Jody Kolker:

The three data elements that we're talking about-- I'm just trying to get them clarified. We're talking about the data elements from the EWG on gTLD directory services. We're talking about ones from the RA agreement. Is that right? And then elements from Steve's list that Steve has sent out, the compilation that he has.

Steve Sheng:

Right. The compilation I sent is mostly gTLD outlines.

Jody Kolker:

Okay. And then we're talking about the elements that new gTLDs have signed-- from the agreements that new gTLDs are signing right now. Is that right?

Steve Sheng:

Yes. So, in the document that I sent, it's a (unintelligible) of all the elements today gTLD registries provide. And that includes the gTLD elements.

Jody Kolker: Okay.

Steve Sheng: The new gTLDs. Yeah.

Jody Kolker: All right. Thanks for the clarification.

Jim Galvin: Okay. So anyone object to my proposed action? We need to-- I think everyone-- We now each need to dig in and actually look at these elements and decide for ourselves how we want to organize them and how we want to structure our conversation so that we can come back in two weeks; ideally, if we can, sending stuff to the mailing list before two weeks from now so that we know that we have a baseline discussion that we can start to have about what to do. Anyone object?

Takao Suzuki: No. Sounds good to me. This is Takao.

Jim Galvin: Thank you, Takao. And, actually, Takao, I did not have you on the attendance list here. So thank you for speaking up. That means we have everyone but Edmund. Okay.

So, with that, let's not meet next week. Anyone object to not meeting next week during the ICANN week?

Okay. And let me do a little tangent here. Who is going to be next week-- who will be present in Buenos Aires? I mean, I'll be there. Anyone else?

Steve Sheng: I'll be there.

Jim Galvin: And Steve will be there. Okay. Well. All right. That's unfortunate. I was kind of hoping if anyone else was going to be there it would be an opportunity to perhaps find some time together.

And then we do have a request from Naoki to push our meetings back an hour. And it didn't look like anyone objected on the mailing list. But, since we're all here, let me ask the question. Anyone object to pushing our meetings back an hour?

Takao Suzuki: Actually, I think it's me. This is Takao. I asked for it.

Jim Galvin: Oh, Takao asked for it. Oh, okay.

Takao Suzuki: (Unintelligible) in Japan. I'm in the west coast.

Jim Galvin: Ah, okay. Well, as long as no one objects, then we'll move our meetings to 9:00 on Eastern, 6:00 a.m. Pacific. I guess it becomes 1400 UTC. Right, Steve?

Steve Sheng: Yes. 1400 to 1500.

Jim Galvin: No. It must be moving 1300 to 1400. It needs to be at 2:00 for the meeting to be at 9:00 for me.

Steve Sheng: Right. So it's 9:00 a.m. Eastern time.

Jim Galvin: Yeah. So we're moving the meeting from 1300 to 1400 UTC.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Right.

Jim Galvin: And we'll meet again in two weeks.

Steve Sheng: Yep.

Jim Galvin: Okay. I think that's it for now then. Please, just do a data element review of all of the lists that we have. And let's begin and dig in and have our first real conversation in two weeks.

(Multiple Speakers)

Takao Suzuki: Thank you so much.

Jim Galvin: Thanks, everyone.