

20131204\_WHOIS IRD\_ID837409

Steve Sheng: Thank you. Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening. Welcome to today's call on the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group.

On the call we have Jim Galvin , the Chair. We have Dennis. We have Sarmad, we have Naoki. We have Jody. We have Steve Sheng, myself; and I think there's one person I'm missing. Ah, we have Nishit. We are still waiting for Edmond and Takao.

So, Jim, over to you.

Jim Galvin: Thank you, Steve. And thank you, for everyone -- to everyone for joining us here today. I apologize for my mistaken start time here, trying to get us all up an earlier, but at least we got that sorted out, and we are here now -- excuse me.

Okay. So, last time we met it was before the ICANN Meeting, so it's been a couple of weeks, and we had left as an action to look at the documents that we've been thinking about and to comment on where to go from those documents and the elements that are in them. So Naoki sent some questions, some good comments, and I also sent, actually just recently, I sent it, I guess, about 20 minutes or so ago, a comment about a -- I don't know I'm calling it a simplified proposal, maybe it's not. Maybe it's too simple, and that we are something.

But I was hoping that if folks had access to their e-mails, they might have a chance to take a look at that, as well taking a look at Naoki's comments. And I replied a bit to Naoki, and I started a new thread with a different subject line when I replied to him, and I did that earlier this morning, more than an hour ago in advance of what I thought was the previous call.

So why don't we -- those are the few things I wanted to talk about, let me first ask if anyone else had anything else they wanted to put on the agenda, to make sure that we cover today?

Okay. So let me first suggest that we take a look at Naoki's comments since he had put things out here right away. I had called that his first comment, and thought that it really was one of the most important things, where he asks the question about the fact that there is a fair amount of work going on with improving the existing WHOIS, and of course, some things are really a replacement of existing WHOIS.

And he asked the question, perhaps we should begin our work by being clear about our relationship among these groups. I actually took five things to comment on that exist, other activities that exist, and made one brief comment about each. I was wondering if folks have had a chance to look at that, and had any comments about what I said, and agree or disagree, or is there anything that I left off, or something that that you don't

think should be included. And anyone who would want to comment, and including asking for more time if you haven't had a chance to look at it yet.

Jody Kolker: Hi, Jim. This is Jody for the queue.

Jim Galvin: Yes. Jody. Go ahead please.

Jody Kolker: I'm in a similar -- I think that I agree with both you and Naoki, and the fact that I'm curious as to what we are developing from here, and there is so much work out there that is being done with the WHOIS, and as you say in your last -- or your second to last paragraph, I think it was there. Is there really more to say than to reaffirm all of this work. It appears to me that that may what we are doing is just saying, yes, we agree with one of these options, here. I thought I looked at one of these and they had given four options as to how the WHOIS should be displayed or recorded.

And they really didn't give their recommendation, they just said that they were out there. I mean, is it up to us to give those -- e-mail, to give our recommendation then, on what's one that we agree with? And I'm sorry that I can't remember which one that is.

Jim Galvin: Right. So, thank you, for that, Jody. Actually I remember which one that is, because that's the IRD Working Group, and it was unable to come to a conclusion. I was Chair of that working group at the time, and it was unable to come to a conclusion on what to do about translation, and transliteration in particular. And that's where we came up with the four models for what the data might look like, and when it might be translated or transliterated.

I believe, Sarmad, you part of that group too, weren't you?

Sarmad Hussain: Yes.

Jim Galvin: And in fact it's because of the fact that we had those four models. That the GNSO has started PDP process on translation and transliteration, so one of the other groups which is now, just getting started, the charter was just approved, and they're doing a call for volunteers to join that group.

To answer the question of whether or not a single language or a script is required, and then of course if it is, where the translation and transliteration would be done, and who would bear the burden of that cost. So that was a question that was called and set aside from the IRD Working Group. I can give my perspective on why we set that question aside, and in my opinion it was because we really did not have the right set of people in the room to answer the question.

The Group had been long-running which I guess was about two-years old by then, and we really didn't have a good cross section of registries and registrars in the room, in my opinion, and so it really would have been inappropriate to try and cast the recommendations since you really couldn't have the right discussion about it.

I don't know, Sarmad, if you want to add anything to that. If you have a different perspective.

Sarmad Hussain: So I actually want to make a comment, and I think one of the things which -- and I guess I'll probably phrase that as a question rather a comment. The question is that, you (inaudible) overseas as many groups which are working on different aspects -- division of WHOIS right now. The question is which group is deciding which of the elements will meet in local language, or is that something which is automatically -- one can very easily or automatically deduce from the element itself?

- Jim Galvin: So, thank you, for that. Just to play that back to make sure that I got it. You're asking the question, which elements should be in the local language, which suggests that it may be that whatever the elements are collected as part of registration information, there might be different requirements on different elements.
- Perhaps -- and I don't know, an obvious one that jumps out at me is a phone number, so maybe numbers are always cast in exactly one way, using -- well, they're normally Arabic numbers, but I guess they are US-ASCII, but you know, should be considering that question. Did I play that back correctly?
- Sarmad Hussain: Yes. Exactly. So I guess my question is, which of the working groups if it's not us is going to answer that question?
- Steve Sheng: This is Steve, I'd like to be added to the queue.
- Jim Galvin: Yes, Steve. Please go ahead.
- Steve Sheng: My understanding of your question is, there are special data elements, right. And then, you know, each of those may have different internalization requirements, and you're asking which group is to determine those requirements? Is that what you're asking?
- Sarmad Hussain: I think the requirements is probably going to next step. So the requirements is more on specification details. My impression is that I think we have a binary question to answer, but the phone number is supposed to be in local digits , or in US-ASCII digits? Or are both going to be in script or in the US-ASCII script? Which particular working group actually decides on that?
- Steve Sheng: My understanding is that it will be this working group. So I think for the IRT Working Group, did some of those exercise. So he went through a subset of the data elements and say, these elements these are the requirements. So I think the starting point is to use (inaudible) report as some sort of requirement already, and use that, because I think what the community working group, represents, some part of a community consensus, on both elements. And then I think it's up to this working group to decide, what the elements are.
- The IRT Working Group consider -- is a subset of what's being played today in WHOIS. We may want to take a look at the full manual to be WHOIS and answer the similar questions for the other big elements. So that, to me, seems to me that if this working group's task -- as its target to -- the requirements -- translation and transliteration, it's kind of a special place that needs some coordination between this and PDP sites so that we don't come to a very different outcome. But I think it's certainly within this groups' purview to consider those, but that question needs to be closely coordinated. That will be thoughts.
- Jim, what do you think?
- Jim Galvin: Well actually I was going to ask if anyone else had a comment.
- Sarmad Hussain: So Jim, I'll put in myself in the queue after you're done (inaudible) , and other people have done as well.
- Jim Galvin: Thank you. That was Sarmad, again, correct?
- Sarmad Hussain: Yes.
- Jim Galvin: Actually, I agree with you, Steve, and I like question, Sarmad. I hadn't really thought about that, and I think that's an important detailed question . Although my simplified proposal was suggesting that a registrant should only be required to use their local language or script. I do think it's an interesting question for us to ask. Are there elements

for which that requirement would not be true, and does it make sense for that requirements not to be true.

I wonder if anyone else who has more experience , you know, with other languages. Suppose we were to say something like phone number, for example, let's just pick a concrete example. Rather than saying your registrant could only use your local language and script, would it be reasonable to think that a registrant should always be able to enter, say a phone number, and perhaps other things, if we can pick them out. I mean, a phone number could be US-ASCII digits. Is that a reasonable requirement? Or should we stay away from that?

And so that's my question that I've put out there, but Sarmad, you wanted to speak again? Please go ahead.

Sarmad Hussain:

Yes. I guess the reason I pose is because as Steve also said, and I guess what you're also saying, is to me, that's sort of what puts us aside from other working group, because that's really not something anybody is doing, and that's probably one space we can (inaudible), so this was a comment, in response to work (inaudible) email, so that's at least one thing which we could look at. And maybe there would a few others.

But I do want to separate that out from the translation and transliteration kind of work, because they're two separate things. What we are, I think, focusing on is, what are the greater requirements as they are entered by the registrants, given to the registrants.

The translation and transliteration process is not this part of the process. The translation and transliteration process is, once this data is available, how that data may actually be made available to third parties, whatever those parties are. That could be our end user or that could be a law enforcement agency or something like that.

So these are two separate processes, and we are sort of involved in more than step one of the process. Whereas translation and transliteration, the question is, it's more involved in step one of the process. Whereas translation and transliteration, the impression is more -- so that's how involved on how I see it.

So that was one thing. Considering your question about, for example, phone numbers. So to me, I think, a simple answer would be, that we need to make sure that the data can be entered , (2) if it's a data that (inaudible) that data should be able to do a very good job, should be able to into that data through the keyboards, I see, Hebrew, for example. So that could be one of the constraints, but there could be other constraints as well. So, again, these are the kind of (inaudible) that we need to have an input to finalize these things. Thank you.

Jim Galvin:

So, thank you. I'll just comment then. I agree with your characterization that we are at step one, if you will, with respect to setting requirements for internationalization, but I -- I mean I like that sort of model, but I observe that the translation and transliteration PDP, it seems to me that it is within their purview to state that the translation and transliteration is to be done by the registrant, if they decided that everything has to be in a local -- I mean in a single script or language, which I find it hard to believe they'd pick anything but English, quite honestly, but setting that question aside, they could also declare that the obligation is on the registrant to make that translation and transliteration to whatever it is, which is step one.

I mean it's right where we are with this, I just make that observation, I don't know that they would do such a thing, but anyone else want to comment?

So let me say, I want to try to keep us focused here. I had started by talking about Naoki's question, the fact that there are a variety of groups, and we should speak to our relationship to all of these groups. I think that was a good issue to all out, so whatever we

write I think we should make an observation about all of the current activities at the time that we are coming to closure, and speak to what we think what our relationship is.

I guess Naoki said that -- I guess I'm agreeing with that, and I sort of made in one-sentence proposal on that. And anyone want to comment on whether that's a good or bad idea? I mean, do you agree. Do we just keep that as action and we have my draft as a starting point? Or do people think we shouldn't do that and we should just focus on answering our questions.

Or, I should ask my question as a yes or no, so I can get silence as a clear answer, instead of ask or, right, because otherwise everybody has to speak.

Well, for the moment, let's just hold out there, the fact that we have these groups and try track them ourselves, let's leave open the question of whether that ends up in our final document or not. But I do think as part of our work, we need to make sure that we are always clear on our relationship with all of the other work. So as these activities change, or if we have concerns about the work that's going on there we should call it out here as part of our discussion. Just to make sure that we are tracking all of those activities. Let me suggest that we do that.

Naoki had some other questions in his message. Some other comments that he put there. People have a preference as to how we do this. I think I put my simplified proposal out there, which we started to talk a little bit about, but I did feel like since, Naoki had gone through and done his review, that we should take some time to consider his comments first.

Would anyone like to jump in and make a comment about anything that Naoki said.? His four additional comments, after the main about tracking other groups?

So I'll make one comment. Naoki, there are two places here, really, where you talk about aggregated versus the iterated RDS. I'm not sure that we should speak the question of whether federated or aggregated RDS is better. I think that, ideally, we should see the choice between federated or aggregated as an implementation detail. And we should focus on making requirements about the data, and not about how it's stored or maintained, if you will. I have no idea where that particular recommendation is going with EWG and the rest of the community, and I'm thinking that to the greatest extent possible we should not insert ourselves in that discussion if we can avoid it.

Do you have any reaction to that, Naoki?

Anyone else want to comment on whether we should comment on aggregated verses the federated RDS.

Okay -- I'm sorry. Someone wants to speak?

Jody Kolker: This is Jody, for the queue, I guess.

Jim Galvin: Please, go ahead, Jody.

Jody Kolker: Is our working group to decide whether we should propose or recommend that we use the aggregated or the federated RDS? Is that what the question is? I'm not sure I'm following quite along in step.

Jim Galvin: I think that that's how I interpreted Naoki's comment, that we could comment on federated versus aggregated if we thought that was important to internationalization? I mean, in a broad sense, since we are supposed to speak to internationalizing registration data, part of me believes that we can comment on anything we think is relevant . And yes,

as I understood Naoki's question, he was suggesting that we should consider commented on federated versus aggregated.

So I'm saying no, we shouldn't do that. Does that answer, Jody? Or do you want to--?

Jody Kolker:

Yeah. I guess I'd like add a couple comments on that. I think it depends on what we come up with, as what should be internationalized, and how it should be internationalized. If we are trying to determine how to do the internationalization in one of the working groups where it's that, who does the transliteration, the transcription or the translation? Where would that be done?

If we are commending on how it's done, or who should bear the cost of that, then I think, you know, commenting on the federated or the aggregated RDS systems would make sense based on what our recommendations would be on who should do the translation or the transliteration .

I mean, as I was reading these documents, from an operational viewpoint and development viewpoint for a registrar, it seems to me -- after thinking about for a little bit, not enough to dive into it, it would make sense if we decided that the transliteration or transcription, or anything like that, was to be done on a WHOIS provider, then it would make sense that we would consider either the federated or the aggregated RDS system.

I think I'm jumping ahead a little bit here, about what we are tasked to comment on. Like I said, if we are tasked to decide what is stored as localized or internationalized, do we allow the registrar to just store only localized content, and if they do that, that means many law enforcement will have to bear the brunt of trying to translate or transcribe that information, unless there's like an aggregated RDS system, that would do that for them.

Sarmad Hussain:

Jim, it's Sarmad , to the queue.

Jim Galvin:

Yeah. So, please , Sarmad, go ahead.

Sarmad Hussain:

Okay. I think already see what Jody is saying and what, I guess, what we now hear you saying as well. And in this context I think we probably should not go as far as saying local one should be preferred over the others, but once we've done a good analysis, we could probably put down recommendation on whether -- what other implications on internationalizing this data. Given the federated model versus aggregated model. And do a comparison without really going into translating that comparison into a recommendation, per say, of one over the other . So that is something which could be done.

Jim Galvin:

Thank you. Anyone else? All right, Naoki did you say any more about your question, or clarify your comment? Or are you comfortable with the discussion so far?

Steve Sheng:

Naoki, this is Steve? Are you on the line? Are you still on the line?

Naoki:

Yes. That makes sense for me so far. Thank you.

Jim Galvin:

Okay. Thank you. Let me just play back what I think I heard. I think I agree both Jody and Sarmad here.

Jody, I believe I heard you saying, that whether or not we speak to this question should really depend on what we want to say about internationalizing registration data, and we should first answer that question and that will drive us to whether or we need to speak to aggregated versus federated.

And then I believe that I heard Sarmad suggest that, rather than actually picking one versus the other, we could at least, if we found, based on our requirements, that there was a difference, that there would be implementation issues that mattered we wouldn't necessarily have to pick aggregated versus federated, but we should certainly speak to the issues and lay them out as a consideration by the community, as part of our recommendation.

So did I characterize that correctly? I guess first Jody and the Sarmad.

Jody Kolker: Yes. I think you have my comment, understood.

Sarmad Hussain: (Inaudible).

Jim Galvin: Okay. Good. I wasn't going to jump in particular on anything else that Naoki said, I think that he had some good comments there. Does anyone else want to jump in on anything, or want to move to talking about my simplified proposal for a bit? Okay--

Steve Sheng: I'd like t be added to the queue.

Jim Galvin: Steve, please go ahead.

Steve Sheng: I was going to comment on Naoki's last comment about data elements, and not supported in EPT or ODAT (ph), whether that should be included in our requirements. Well, I think, perhaps, we could set that question aside as the Meta question. I've been thinking about the -- how do we approach these requirements. And I would like to propose -- if we could start with a set of principles. So I think, for example, Sarmad articulated some principles, for example, whether to decide (inaudible) to be internationalized, which would take into consideration the user capabilities of his or her keyboard, or when he or she is entering those information.

So I think those are, kind of. And then start with the principles, we would look at the data elements on a one-by-one -- or maybe by data element types. For example, phone member will be one. That would include both telephone and fax number, e-mail address,, mail server information, so it's kind of infrastructure information, and look at one-by-one whether to internationalize. Then in the end look at last pieces, look at various other moving pieces and how our relationship with them.

So I'm just thinking aloud to add to the thoughts, here. "Thanks Jim"

Jim Galvin: So thank you, for that Steve. Yeah, in my simplified proposal , I was suggesting , is there really any more to say than, a registrar, and should be allowed to use their local language or script. All data elements should be tagged to the language and script, and that's the they should be stored, and that's the way it should be taken in.

I agree you with you that -- Sarmad raised an important distinction, are there elements that don't need to be in a local language, and should we see if we can consider that.

And I like your proposal, Steve, that perhaps we can adopt some principles. We can find a way to describe the distinction, so that the choice can be made. So what I'm saying is, there might be some elements, that, yes, a registrant always directly enters, and they should be allowed to use their local language or script.

There might be other elements like -- in Naoki's last comment there about the registrar jurisdiction, those kinds of elements. A registrant never sees those and doesn't have anything to do with them, so they can be in some other kind of standard format, that a registrar simply has to provide and that they put it, and maybe we can draw that distinction.

The one concern I have about looking at elements, and I guess this is kind of embedded in my comment here about simply reaffirming the work of others is, I'm wondering if we, or if any of these groups, perhaps, is the right place to decide on the full set of data elements. One of things that I was observing is that, you know, there are right now, three sources of sets of data elements, that we as a working group has got some source of data elements. There was a source of data elements from the IRD Working Group from two years ago. They had some things they talked about.

The EWG of course is talking about a set of data elements, that would be included in registration data, and I'm thinking that we are just going to make things worse if we try to talk about elements in the specific also.

I like your comment, Steve, that we should try to stick to principles, and I'm sure now that the situation is not as simple, just use the local language for everything.

Sarmad asked a good question, and I think we need to consider that question. But can we break this down into principles, is the comment that I offer to the group here. Anything related to contact information, should be in a local language or script.

Everything else probably has a defined language or script that can be used and is sufficient, so the registrar idea and things like that, fall into that category, but it does leave the question of where the phone number fits.

I'm sorry, let me just come back and repeat my question. I don't think it's as simple as using a single language or script, I think we need to find a way to characterize categories of data elements without actually specifying all the data elements themselves.

Anyone wants to comment on that?

- Group: (Inaudible)
- Jim Galvin: So, actually too many overlapping people, let's try again with a little random back off here. Who wants to speak ?
- Nishit Jain: Hi, this is Nishit.
- Jim Galvin: I heard Nish, anyone else?
- Sarmad Hussain: (Inaudible)
- Jim Galvin: So Nishi, I think I heard Sarmad, correct? Anyone else?
- Jodi Kolker: This is Jody. I was just going to ask for a repeat of the question?
- Jim Galvin: Okay, Jody, I'll do that. Anyone else who wanted to speak. Okay, I have Nishit and Sarmad in the queue.

The question was, I was suggesting in my simplified proposal that all elements should simply be in local language or script, and that's the way they're carried. I think that based on Naoki's comment, and I realize that -- and also Sarmad's comments, I realize that there are elements not under of the registrant, so that's one point.

And therefore, those thing being in a single language or script is probably not appropriate, so we can create at least two categories of elements that are part of registration information. Those things that under control of the registrant and things that are not. Based on that, anything a registrant does, could be local language or script. Anything else would have to be -- have its language as part of the definition of the element, whatever that might be.



So I wanted to make that split. The other comment I wanted to make was that, we should mix splits between elements as descriptions, not as a list of specific element. I'm concerned that I don't think we want to define all the set of specific elements, we need to find to characterize the elements and talk about them. Partly because elements will change over time, partly because there's at least three other groups that have defined sets of elements, and I don't think we need to be the fourth.

So I guess, Jody, I'm really asking two questions. Do you agree that we should not be specifying a list of elements explicitly, although we might give examples. And then two, can we define the requirements based on categories of elements. Does that help, Jody?

Jody Kolker: That does.

Jim Galvin: Do you want to be in the queue.

Jody Kolker: Yes.

Jim Galvin: Okay. So let's start with Nishi.

Nishit Jain: My comment is on your second point. I do believe that we should better define various classes and the different data element should come under that particular classes. So we can go for internationalizing on qualities for that particular class. For example, do we consider a class (inaudible), so that all of the data elements, like last updated expiration date, or creation date should come under that particular slot. And all data elements that comes under that particular category, should be internationalizing, I think that (audio skip?)--

Jim Galvin: Okay. Thank you. So you were agreeing with the idea that we should have classes of elements and requirements based on those classes. Is that correct?

Nishit Jain: Exactly. Exactly.

Jim Galvin: Thank you. Sarmad?

Sarmad Hussain: Okay. So we've been talking about objectives, and I totally agree that we should have some generic objectives, as far as requirements for international region is concerned of particular elements. I certainly agree with the recent comment on categorizing elements, so I agree with you that we should not comment on each one of the elements, because it's not a closed link (ph), this will grow over time.

So we certain -- so the only way to address that is to actually define classes, but even though we do not address all elements, we must try to ensure that we identify all possible set -- the complete set of classes which can actually happen within this -- within this data, and guide you then -- propose some internationalization requirements for those classes. So that's a great way of doing it, I think.

But what I also wanted to point out, add to the list, was that it seems to me that we then also probably need to get into and define a core set of things, which is the process. I'm not talking about concentrating or transmitting. But supposed that the additional elements which are introduced in WHOIS, over time, there should be a process which defines those elements in a particular category or class. And then based on their assignments, imposes or certain internationalization requirements on that new element. Thank you.

Jim Galvin: So, thank you. All right. Just to play that back, I think I heard three things. You were agreeing that we should not try to list all elements, you were agreeing that classes of data elements is a good idea, although observing that we would have to put some effort into defining all possible classes. And then the third thing you said, was that we need a

process. Given that the list development might change over time, we need a way to figure out which class a given element, you know, gets added to. Or if that causes the creation of a new class for some reason. Did I get that correct?

Sarmad Hussain: Yes. And through that class (inaudible), will it go certain into nationalization departments on that data element?

Jim Galvin: Yes. And so based on the class that it goes into that would then decide the internationalization requirements. Okay, thank you. Jody?

Jody Kolker: Actually, you can remove me from the queue.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Thank you. Okay, so pulling it together here. I actually think we made a significant step forward here at the moment. Because up to this point we've been talking about trying to collect data elements and list data elements, and understand them, and we've now stepped back from that, and I believe we have agreement, so I'm going to test that in just a moment, that having classes of data, is a better path.

We'll probably obviously give examples of the various data elements that would go in a class, just to ensure that our descriptions are concrete and usable by everyone, but the idea here is that the list of elements are likely to change with time. In addition, should point out that certain registries have special requirements. There are some restrictive registries coming in the future, and they'll have special requirements, so they're likely to have special data elements that apply only to them, and we'll need to accommodate those in some way too.

So let me just test this consensus. I think we have consensus at the moment here, that on talking about classes of data elements rather than specific data elements is the best -- the way that we should characterize our final work product. Is there anyone who disagrees with that, or wants to clarify that in any way?

Okay. So that's a good thing. I do still think we are going to need to look at specific data elements, obviously, because now we have to come up with a set of classes that we want to us. I'll observe that the recent EWG Status Report, actually does do this in a way. They do actually divide up data elements into collections. I don't know that it's quite the right breakdown that we are looking for, for our classes, but at least it's a useful way to do our first review of data elements, and consider how we might reorganize things. I mean, I'm already thinking that there's at least three classes of data elements that jump out at me.

There's your basic contact information for a registrant, there are (inaudible, kind of interesting. I don't believe that a registrant has control over dates. A registrar would put those in, and the registry would, I think that we could have a single standard for anything which has a date element. Then I also think that there are, I'll call them ID-like elements. I'm not sure what to call them. But you've got like a registrar ID, this notion of registrar jurisdiction, which was being included in the EWG Report, and I think there's a couple other things like that.

Again, those are object-like dates. Registrants don't see them or have them, but they're added by the system. It seems to me that the system could also define what the values are allowed to be and have registry, if you will, of all those values, and so that can be a single-stated standard for representation. There may be other classes but those are, at least, the three that come to my mind at the moment, based on our discussion here.

Does that spark any comment or conversation from anyone?

Steve Sheng: Hi, Jim. This is Steve, and I'd like to be added to the queue.

Jim Galvin: Please, Steve. Go ahead.

Steve Sheng: To define base contact information and IDs if it's a category of phone numbers, status, various status, these are registry, these are not in control by the registrant, but they are part of WHOIS output anyway, by registry and registrar. There's the -- so those are the two things -- two more things. One thing for each of these categories, I'm just thinking in terms of, we may have to report for each category, we kind of articulate what a category is, and then, perhaps, we could look at what are some of the ways to internationalize that category -- what are some of the international standards for the that category, and then based on the (inaudible) the working group decides, we use this particular standard. So kind of the flow of the final report.

Jim Galvin: Thanks.

Sarmad Hussain: This is Sarmad, I'd like to be in the queue.

Jim Galvin: Please, Sarmad. Go ahead.

Sarmad Hussain: Okay, so, as far as the classes are concerned, I see at least two ways of doing this. So far we've been talking about content of the data element, and that's certainly worth looking at classifying things. But whatever way of -- or whatever dimension of classifying things, there's not on its content only, but on its it use. So there are certain content elements which are used by end users, there are certain data elements which are only used by the restaurants. There are other data elements which are only used by maybe registrars and all (inaudible). So that's another aspect of content which may determine whether something should be in a particular language, or a particular format or another --

Classes should also be based on certain criteria, and content is only one of the criteria. I think use, for example, is another idea, but there could be other ideas, which basically, could become how we eventually make classes.

Jim Galvin: So, thank you, for that, Sarmad. I agree with you. You're right, we've been classifying by content so far we might actually think about other classification methods, and uses is certainly a good. Classifying by use, certainly helps to explain the IDs and objects things that I was talking about before, like the registrar ID and even a whole set of dates.

And Steve just mentioned status, those are obviously really offer internal use, internal to the system. So that's an open question, yes, we should keep that question in mind.

One question -- another question that I want to put out here for folks to think about. Steve was suggesting that phone numbers might be a separate object that should be pulled and have its own internationalization requirements, I want to leave that as an open question.

One of the things that's interesting to me in this, that I really don't know the answer to, and maybe other folks are merely interested in what other folks opinion is, especially those for whom your first language is something other than English, or US-ASCII based. Contact information, I'm starting from the premise that contact information should be in the local language of script of the registrant. But that actually affects two things, that are interesting in this context. One is the phone number, and another is an e-mail address if it's being used. Is there -- our e-mail address are going to be -- allowed to be in the local or script.

I mean, we do have standards now for how to have local part, as well as a domain name, using internationalized languages and characters. I really don't know the answer to the question of a phone number. I mean, is it possible to be in a from other than those US-ASCII, zero to nine characters? So is it fair to require registrant to have to enter a phone number in those characters? Or is there something else that should be allowed there?

So that's an open question in my mind. Again, I like the starting premise of a registrant always using their local language or script, so I'm being cautious about phone number e-mail address, and perhaps there's other contact info elements for which this applies to.

Takao Zukuki: I'd like to be in the queue. This is Takao.

Jim Galvin: Takao, please go ahead.

Takao Zukuki: Two things, one is just so you know, Edmond is typing in the conference, the page, so just you know that if he can pay attention that will be great, so you know--

And regarding the phone number, that one came up mind is -- maybe like English specific, you can 1-800-CALL-ME-PLEASE -- or something, like these are English words, that is English-Specific. I just want to confront that we are not supporting that add-on. Or maybe I'm wrong.

Jody Kolker: Jody, for the queue.

Jim Galvin: Yes. Jody, go ahead.

Jody Kolker: To Cal's we are kind of knee-deep in the RAA right now, and one of the formats that's required by the ITU 164 format, which basically says that it needs to be all number, that the phone number needs to be displayed numbers. For instance, a 1-800 number would have to be something like something like this, it would have to be a plus sign, a country code, and then actual number, that's assigned to the domain, or to the phone number, with a country in front of it. So you would not be able to use anything that says, 1-800-CALL-ME, or anything like that for a phone number, it needs to be all digits, according to the RAA Agreement that needs to be signed for 2013.

It's all new gTLDs, and the new RAA that will have to be signed when the current one expires.

Jim Galvin: So thank you for that, Jody. Anyone else?

Jody Kolker: But to your question, Jim -- I'm sorry, just to continue with that, and to -- must a phone number be displayed, or is there any other way to dial a phone number besides in Arabic characters, in Arabic numbered character? I have the same question, that you do, Jim, and English is my own language, so I'm not sure if Takao, if you can answer that.

Takao Suzuki: Yeah, I know. Jody, I am -- I don't -- ask the same thing, but the only thing I just wanted to confirm is that in the U.S., or maybe in English languages that someone had A B C D E F G H, and two of them of had A B C value too so, and then you can combine those words, and I just wanted to make sure that was not something we are talking about, so it has to be numbered, and that's the one confirmation that I can make here.

So, it has to be numbered as opposed to A instead of two (ph).

Jody Kolker: Yes. As far as I know RAA Agreement it requires it to be all numbers, no characters can be used for a phone number.

Takao Suzuki: Okay. So otherwise it's great, and otherwise, I'm not aware that any concrete list of phone numbers in any other characters, like Japanese, yes, of course, (inaudible) characters for each number, but I don't think we need to support that at all, for instance. Right -- I have some of the discussion -- like you said, Jody, whether or not we have the standard number, plus 8, 1, 3, or 7, 2578 (inaudible) local number, meaning 03 without the country code and so forth, and then there was discussion whether -- when somebody register we ask 8, 1 or plus 8, 1, or just, you know, that part can be skipped. (Inaudible), he or she is from (inaudible) from Japan or stuff like that.

Jim Galvin:

I hear -- so Margie wants to speak too, but let jus jump in here for a month. First of all I want to apologize to Edmond, I was not actually Adobe Connect room, so I was not noticing your comments, but I now, gotten the mails, and see what you were saying there, and I'm collecting all those comments and going aback.

I've between Takao and Jody here, and I guess Jody in particular, that RAA actually already answers those question about international phone numbers for us, because it required phone number so to be available according that the ITU Standard, which uses us actual widgets.

So the plus-sign-country code, followed by a city code and the rest of the phone number as would be defined by the ITU Standard. So I think that answers the internationalization requirements with respect to that.

We are the top of the hour here, I'm going to give a moment to Sarmad to make his comment, and then I want to put our action out for the next meeting. Meeting. Sarmad, please go ahead.

Sarmad, if your we are speaking we are not hearing your .

I'm not sure what happened to Sarmad. All right, we are the top of the hour her I, think we are a reasonable breaking point, we've come to some agreement here about using classes which I think is a good thing. We've started some of what those classes are.

I'd like us to pick up with this conversation next time, and as a specific suggestion, let me suggest that we focus on the data elements that the EWG has been collecting and putting forth, and we should look at those and consider, let's further begin to consider, what are the classes of data elements that we should be defining and describing. I think we actually an how to deal with phone numbers, but I think with respect to contact information, I really would like to talk some more whether those other things, to break out of contact information and say something special about them. And e-mail addresses jump out of , there may be other things, and then let's see if we can start to create a list of categories.

Steve, I'm hoping that you captured at least our initial step for now. So we'll have those distributed in our notes, and can pick up and continue our discussion here for next week.

Any objections from any or clarification?

Okay, then Steve, let me turn it over to you to adjourn the meeting.

Steve Sheng:

Thank you, Jim.. Following this meeting the transcript will be posted shortly. I think I need to do a better job sending out the emails, particularly the action items, quickly, so that we have a week in between, to work on things. The action items ,the agreement that I interpret from this conversation, is the working group agree that looking at categories of data elements is the better approach than looking at specific elements.

And the action item for the working group, to look at the either at the EWG report, and those categories of elements and (inaudible) of elements, and perhaps I would suggest that we mirror them before and the next meeting to propose those categories.

We had some discussion about whether to classify the data elements by content or by use, I think that's an open discussion. And the third point is the process, it needs to be considered and how to consider new elements when they're internationalized.

Jim, those are things I captured, did I miss anything?

Jim Galvin: Nothing jumps out at me, but you should go through and check Edmond's comments. I like what he said about statuses, for example, in particular.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Yeah. Sorry, I'm having some Internet problems so I don't have access to the internet other than from my phone, so I will check for Edmond's comments and incorporate them.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Good. That's it then.

Steve Sheng: With that, thank you, everyone for this productive call. Our next call is the same next Wednesday, and at 9:00 a.m. Eastern Time, that will be 6:00 a.m. Pacific Time, and I think 11:00 p.m. for Japan.

So with that, thank you, everyone. And the call is adjourned.

Jim Galvin: Thanks, everyone.

Unidentified Participant: Thank you.

Steve Sheng: Bye.