20140115_WHOISIRD_ID846463

Steve Sheng: Hi. Good morning. Welcome to today's call on January 15 for the WHOIS review team internationalized registration data working group.

On the call I have Jim. I have Dennis and Naoki. I have Takao. I have Nisit. There is one person that I'm missing.

Jody Kolker: Jody.

Steve Sheng: Jody. Yes. Jody. Thank you, and welcome.

Over to you, Jim.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Thank you, Steve.

I had about 15 minutes ago or so or maybe 20 minutes now just proposed to quick agenda items for us here today. One was to go through the comments that we have been getting here, primarily from Nisit and Naoki. And then I was hoping that we could just try and get to some more of these elements and get our first draft together. Now, Steve has produced a document collecting where we are. So some of the comments that we have here from Naoki and Nisit address directly that document. So I was hoping that we could get through those and perhaps discharge those. So that would be a good thing, just to try and get some closure in some areas.

Any changes to the agenda? Does anybody want to do something else or do things a little differently? Okay, not hearing anything, then let me suggest that the first thing that we do here is to jump into the comments that we've gotten recently from Naoki and Nisit.

Now, it's been a while since we've met, so the first comments that I wanted to get to were from Naoki, and they were actually quite a while ago. It was just after our last call. But he was commenting about internationalized e-mail address. Naoki, do you recall the comment that I'm talking about here? It's all the way back from December 20.

So, you were making the comment that we might not be able to identify why e-mail failed with respect to internationalized e-mail address and, in particular, not know if they support the correct SMPP option. And so the only way to verify an e-mail address would be from bounced e-mail addresses.

And my question is-- While I think that that's an important comment, I believe that our objective here is really just about identifying what the appropriate requirements are for

the e-mail address. So I'm not sure that we can have any effect on how an address is verified or not.

Could you maybe say a little more about what your concern is here? Are you suggesting that we change our suggested requirements? I'm not quite sure I understand what you had in mind here that you wanted us to do. And that's to Naoki.

Naoki Kambe: I think we don't need to change our (unintelligible).

Jim Galvin: Okay. So your comment was more just an observation about the use of internationalized e-mail addresses?

Naoki Kambe: Yes.

Jim Galvin: So I think, Steve, for now, we should probably-- I think it's a good comment to capture. I'm not yet quite sure how our work product is ultimately going to be organized. But, if there's an opportunity for us to offer relevant comments about particular choices, I think that this is a good comment to make. So, until we figure out exactly how we're going to organize our work product, I want to make sure we don't lose this comment because I do think it's an important thing that could be noted if we can find a place for it.

Steve Sheng: I got that, Jim. I think, in the Proposed Requirements section, perhaps we have a proposed requirement and then have a section below that called Discussion to capture all these nuances, at least comments like these are not lost.

Jim Galvin: That sounds good to me. When we see it all together, we'll figure out-- we'll make any fine tunings or whatever that we need to on that. But that's certainly a good way to approach it for now. So, yes. Thank you.

Okay. And Naoki, in your message, you make a second comment about submitting mixed-language in script. Again, I guess this comment is similar to, in my opinion-- others may think differently. I'm interested in what anyone else wants to say or think about this. But your touching on operational issues again when you talk about submitting mixed-language in script and the use of HTTP headers and the language attribute in XML.

I think you're just making an operational comment. But I guess I would just like to make sure that I'm not misunderstanding what you're saying.

So, if this is just an operational comment, I would suggest it falls into the same category as the previous comment about internationalized e-mail addresses. And it should be something we can capture for right now until we figure out what we're doing with it.

Now, let me ask first if I correctly understand and captured the point that you were trying to make here. That's a comment-- question to Naoke.

I'm sorry. Did we perhaps lose Naoke?

Unidentified Participant: Naoki is gone.

Naoki Kambe: I definitely agree (ph) with you, and I think this is one of operational issue-- global problem.

Jim Galvin:	Okay. So I heard you say that you agreed with what I was saying, but I didn't quite catch the second half of what you were saying. Could you say that again? Naoki, I'm sorry. I didn't quite understand the second half of what you were saying.
Naoki Kambe:	My second comment is about one operational issue and one (unintelligible) to develop, finish our problem (ph). I basically agree with you.
Jim Galvin:	Okay. All right. Thank you. That's good.
	So, Steve, if you collect-- you know, capture this comment too and make sure that we don't lose track of it for now and treat it the same way as we do the internationalized e-mail address comment. Okay?
Steve Sheng:	Got it, Jim.
Jim Galvin:	Okay. And we have a set of comments from--
	I'm sorry. I should pause for a moment and just see if there's anyone else who wanted to add or say anything about those two comments, since I didn't ask about the prior one either. Any comments from anyone?
Steve Sheng:	Jim, this is Steve.
Jim Galvin:	Go ahead, Steve.
Steve Sheng:	My understanding was that we were saying the e-mail address should comply with the original ASCE e-mail address and also be able to handle internationalized mail, specifying RFC-6531, '32, and et cetera. It more or less means that have a capability that should be able to accept. It doesn't mean that a user will start using them right away. I think Naoki's comment was, right now, the address is not so popular around the world. I think that's right. But, because of that, probably it will take some time for people to actually use it. Right now, for us, in terms of setting requirements is to make sure the latest RFCs-- if people use it, then we can accept it and display it. That's my comment.
Jim Galvin:	Yes. So, I agree with you, Steve. I mean, what's important about the work products of this working group is there is another step that follows our work. We're supposed to lay the requirements out, and there'll be a follow-up policy development process that would have to approve and agree that everyone is going to follow these requirements. So they'll get a little bit of broad discussion as a next step. And in that next step is when there would be an implementation timeline. So think that's important for us to keep in mind.
	On the other hand, it occurs to me that one of the things that you're saying is just the observation about-- it's interesting to make this requirement, but that doesn't mean e-mail address is useful, even if you can enter it. And that's probably another one of those discussion points that we should capture for completeness as a comment about the requirement.
Steve Sheng:	I agree with you, Jim.
Jim Galvin:	Okay. Thanks.
	Okay. So, moving on to Nisit's comments about the date, I don't have anything in particular to add here, except to agree with you. I don't think, Nisit, that you're asking a question in your comment here. This is a message dated January 2. So you're actually

suggesting that we-- that what we should use as a reference, and I don't have any reason to disagree with you-- You're right. You sort of track the origins of the-- and all the references, and you lay it all out.

So, unless anyone has any other comments about this, Steve, I just-- I think that what Nisit is proposing here is the right thing to do.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Jim. I agree with you. Right now, the requirement captured is based on time elements to conform to format classified in RFC-33, '39 (ph) and represented in UTC with no offset on the zeros median. So that's exactly as Nisit suggested.

Jim Galvin: Right. And he references the internet profiles and the ISO-8601.

Steve Sheng: Yes.

Jim Galvin: Okay. So, unless there's any other discussion about that-- Okay.

And now I have one last message here from Naoki from the 15th; actually, much earlier today, about six hours ago, where he makes some minor comments. I think that-- Well, let's see. Let's take them one at a time.

Your first question, Naoki, about the created-by-registrar data element-- that's actually a registrar ID. Isn't it, Steve? So it's not a date. It's a registrar ID. Right?

Steve Sheng: My understanding was the actual registrar name. But I will double check. So, for now, let me take this off from the table, for now, until I confirm that.

Jim Galvin: Okay. For the status, the next question that you asked, Naoki, about-- Do we need to add the name server status? I guess you suggest here that it could be displayed when a name server is queried on RDAP (ph). I'm not sure what you mean by that, Naoki. One would not ordinarily query a DNS name server with RDAP. Perhaps I'm not understanding your comment. Could you say a little more about what you mean?

Naoki Kambe: Do we need to configure about (unintelligible) data? That's my question.

Jim Galvin: Okay. So, ignoring the second comment that you make in your e-mail message, are you talking about the operational status of an name server? You're suggesting that we add an element in all of this to reflect the name server status?

Naoki Kambe: I'm not sure here. But I'm asking about the necessity about the other (ph) status. That's the question.

Jim Galvin: No. I understand. I'm trying to make sure that I understand the question. I mean, the domain status is as defined by EPT, all the various states that a domain name might be in. The name server status is-- it's a separate operational thing. I just want to make sure I understand. When you say name server status, you really do mean the DNS name server for that domain. Is that correct? That's what you're asking about?

Naoki Kambe: Sorry. I couldn't understand. Please skip this question.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Do you want to come back to it later, or are you withdrawing the question? I mean, I'd rather just deal with it if we can rather than just skipping it if it's going to come back later.

Naoki Kambe:	Okay. Regarding the question, I will follow later on that mailing list.
Jim Galvin:	Okay. All right. That's fine. So we'll just defer that for right now.
	For DNS status, the elements. DS (ph) created one, and DS created two seem like a date type (ph). And is that correct? And should probably know this offhand, but I don't believe that those are dates.
Steve Sheng:	Those are dates, Jim.
Jim Galvin:	They are dates?
Steve Sheng:	Yeah. I was just looking at PIR.org, who has records. Those are dates.
	The (inaudible) question about categories. Should they be-- okay.
(Multiple Speakers)	
Jim Galvin:	I think what we need to do is something along the lines of-- We have DNS (unintelligible) information. So we have this category of-- We have this collection of DNStic (ph) information. We're going to need to write data (inaudible) underneath DNS into the categories of data types.
Steve Sheng:	Okay. All right. So we're saying the DNS (unintelligible) information is not a atomic category. It can be further broken down into other categories.
Jim Galvin:	Yes. That's a good way to phrase it I think.
Steve Sheng:	It's more like a meta category. Okay. All right. That's fair.
Jim Galvin:	Does anyone else have any other ideas or a different suggestion for how to do this?
	Okay. So we'll go with it being a meta category and having specific categories underneath. There's still time to make an adjustment here if we should decide we want to do this differently. Okay.
	And then, moving on down, Naoki has one more comment in this message about domain names. The referral URL and registrar URL are also seen in the URL category. Should we remove them from the domain names category?
Steve Sheng:	I think so.
Jim Galvin:	Yeah. This one-- Unlike the DNS information, we probably should move those under the URL category, I think.
Steve Sheng:	Agreed.
Jim Galvin:	Okay. All right. Any other comments from anyone? Okay.
	So let me say thank you, Steve, for putting together this chart and this document and keeping us up to date. This is good. So we'll begin to fill out the rest of this.
	Okay. So my suggestion then is we move back to looking at the list of information that we have here. I'm looking at the common gTLD registration data elements, the set of

things that you had given us on Mindjet. And I believe the only thing on here that we have not actually talked about is the identifiers section, although you have them in the chart over here, which is fine. I don't think there's much to say about those in terms of the requirements. The requirements for the identifier are set by the, I guess, IANA primarily. Right? I think IANA maintains all these identifiers, these registries. Right? Or maybe ICANN does in this case.

Steve Sheng: Some of those. For example, the IANA ID was probably maintained by (unintelligible) IANA. But there are other identifiers; for example, domain ID. Those are each registry assigned, registrar ID. These are internal identifiers. Each registry or registrar keeps track of technical contact ID. So it's really a mix of administrative responsibilities. Most of them are at the registry level.

Jim Galvin: So we should, for the purposes of our documentation, identify who the administrator is and the administrative authority. And, if it is the-- In cases where it's the registry, that's fine. If it's the registrant, that's fine. We have to figure out what the-- I mean, it may be that EPP simply defines the format of these. But-- So identify the administrative authority for the values. And maybe it's just the EPP standard that defines exactly what the values are allowed to be here. And let's carry that forward.

                 Anyone have any other comments about the identifiers? Okay.

                 I believe that that covers all of the information in this common gTLD registration data elements page that Steve had prepared for us some time ago. On this page, we had organization and personal names, statuses, dates, phone and fax numbers, e-mail, address, URLs or domain names, DNS information, and identifiers.

                 So, Steve had also put together a list of common-- another separate list here with another seven things on it with some overlap here. So let's just take a look.

                 We have here registrant information, which is just, it looks like, address information. Well, no. It's a collection of the other elements. And he characterized this appropriately.

Steve Sheng: Jim, which one are you looking at? Are you looking at--?

Jim Galvin: I'm looking at the one which has everything labeled Information.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Jim Galvin: So it's got registrant information. Oh, it's the file--

Steve Sheng: Yes. What's the file name?

Jim Galvin: The file is Common Registration Data Elements as compared to the other file name, which is called gTLD Registration Data Elements Category. One says Category; the other does not. The other says just Data Elements. And I'm looking at the Data Element one.

Steve Sheng: Okay. All right. Let me-- Yeah. So this-- One of the discussions-- earlier discussions we had is how do we discover the categories. Do we discover the categories by their inherent data type, like states, phone numbers, URLs? Or do we categorize based on their usage, in this kind of logical group in a registrant information? (Unintelligible) contact information

So this is another way to visualize it. I wouldn't-- I was just playing with that. I wasn't sure which category to go.

But it seems that the working group's current approach is to look at these basic elements and determine their internationalization standard. So I'm not sure if this DOCSIS (ph)-- the other (unintelligible) graph will be as useful. But up to the working group to decide.

Jim Galvin: Okay. So now I understand. And now I see what we've got here.

So the distinction-- The choice that we have to make in this working group is how we want to organize our work product. For the moment, the document that you've been tracking for us here, Steve, as you described, lifts the basic data elements. So we've looked at basic data elements, and we have organized them according to the data types, the categories of data that those data elements represent--

Steve Sheng: Yes.

Jim Galvin: -- so that we can talk about the standard for that particular data type or data category.

This other mind map is a more intuitive or-- intuitive representation of the data elements, and it's a collection, a human consumable, if you will, representation of all the data elements.

Steve Sheng: Right.

Jim Galvin: And it's a question of which way we want to organize our work product. How are people likely to want to look it up? Are they going to want to look up basic data elements, or are they going to want to look it up under the other categories? Am I going to want to look up administrative contact information and then see everything inside of that with all the references to it?

Anyone have any opinions or comments about what we might do here and how we want to do this?

Sarmad Hussain: Jim, this is Sarmad. I'd like to go.

Jim Galvin: Oh, Sarmad joined us. Excellent. Yes, please, Sarmad. Go ahead.

Sarmad Hussain: Just a couple of comments. This is a good way of structuring it. I've been going through the document which Steve circulated.

One small comment regarding that was whether we want to keep the country inside the address string or we want to separate that because countries have a way of standardizing names and different scripts where address information is not as specialized. So whether we want to have a separate category for country and take it out of the address feed. So that's one comment.

Jim Galvin: Can I comment on that before you go forward? Are you referring to the particular country element, or are you suggesting that we organize address by country?

Sarmad Hussain: So, I'm saying that this address feed (unintelligible). So, within the address field, it has technical contact, (unintelligible), address one, (unintelligible), technical contact, and so on. And it also has not only address one. So it has street address. It has city. And then it has country all lumped into address.

Jim Galvin:	Right.
Sarmad Hussain:	And what I'm suggesting is that country probably can be taken out as a separate feed rather than lumping it into-- with the address one and city name because that can actually-- we have standards which can refer to countries and so on. So we have ISO standards which have country names-- numbers for (inaudible). So the countries are special, and they're not like just regular address-- street addresses.
Jim Galvin:	Okay. So I-- The way in which I understood that we were organizing this-- I think what we're doing here meets what you're proposing. But let's test this a little bit just to make sure. I mean, the way that we're describing the requirement for an address over here in the third column is we're suggesting that all of the address fields have to be appropriate for the region in which it's located, which might be the country. It might be something inside the country. I mean, I think we're going to have to expand on some text to explain this a little better. But, at least my interpretation, and others may feel differently, and so I'm certainly interested in other opinions here about how we want to do this-- I think what you're asking for about the country being called out because it does have its own standard-- it's covered by that particular reference. Or perhaps you can say a little more about the change that you want to make and how you see things as different.

I'll give you a moment to speak again to what I said. And then we'll see if anyone else has a comment to make. |
Sarmad Hussain:	So, for example, what I was saying was that, for country, we have ISO-3166. It's a (inaudible) code which we can use to defer to a country policy (ph). But we don't have something like this for street address or city names or things like that. So what I'm saying is country field is a little special, and it probably can be taken out as a separate field.
Jim Galvin:	Ah, okay. I see the distinction that you're making now. All right. So there's actually an external, third-party standard for values that go into the country fields, and we should reference that, whereas the rest of them really are under control of the individual country and we should leave it that way. That's what you're saying.
Sarmad Hussain:	Right. So these are strings (inaudible) country codes (inaudible).
Jim Galvin:	Okay. All right. So I get that. That makes sense to me. Any comments from anyone else? I don't mean to sort of dominate--
Nisit Jain	Hi. This is Nisit Jain to comment.
Jim Galvin:	Yes, please. Nisit, go ahead.
Nisit Jain:	When it comes to address part and the country part of this, (inaudible) standards. We just need to (inaudible) in their country name. But, when it comes to the (inaudible), is it recommended to (inaudible) local languages?
Jim Galvin:	Good question. Sarmad?
Sarmad Hussain:	Yes. So, what I'm suggesting does not replace the country name with the ISO-3166 standard but more like (unintelligible) so that we have both options. But, in any case, country name still is a special case of address. It's not like a regular address. So we may want to-- I just wanted to point out that we may want to differentiate the address at this point. And, eventually, if we want to merge it back, obviously, that's fine as well. But

	there is a special status of country which is not applicable to what the levels of address is. I just wanted to point that out.
Steve Sheng:	This is Steve. I'd like to join the queue.
Jim Galvin:	Just one moment, Steve. I just want to ask if that answered. Did Sarmad answer your question first? Okay. So I'm not hearing any further comments. So, Steve, go ahead.
Steve Sheng:	One of the benefits of-- I was reading a lot of the UPU standards for international addressing. For example, for sending international mails, if you send the international mail from one country to another country, what they do is-- what they recommend is you write the country name in the-- the country name should be Romanized (ph), regardless which country you're sending to. But the address can be localized. So, in that way, it does speak for having country name as a separate and just keep that a Romanized to the whatever standard and keep it in that format. So that's another thought on that.
Jim Galvin:	So I like that comment too. I think that Sarmad makes a good comment. And I think, Steve, you're providing some additional motivation in support for that. So that's another relevant point that we can make in the discussion when we're separating out country as a reason why. So let's capture that too to bring it forward.
	Okay. Any other comments on this issue from anyone?
	Okay. Back to you, Sarmad. You had another item.
Sarmad Hussain:	Yes. Also, I think, just thinking out aloud again, there may be value in keeping the information which is provided by the registrant separate from the information which is provided by other entities in the process because those may have a different kind of internationalization requirements. So just lumping things together-- so the registrant name-- the registrant name versus the registrar name may have different implications or requirements. I'm just thinking forward vis-á-vis the requirement in our required script or things like that.
Jim Galvin:	That's an interesting observation. I don"t-- I hear you. I don't have-- I personally don't have an opinion about that at the moment. Anyone else want to comment? Do you have any thoughts about that; in particular, Jody or Dennis, as a registrar?
Jody Kolker:	I'm not quite sure that I was following the conversation at that point. What was the question again?
Jim Galvin:	Sarmad, do you want to say it again, please?
Sarmad Hussain:	Sure. So, what I am suggesting is that, within each category-- so we have, for example, organization/personal names as the first category. In there, we have multiple names. What I'm suggesting is that name of the registrant, so information which is directly provided by the registrant may be one possibility to separate that out from the other information which is provided through the process, not directly by the registrant. So, for example, registrars are going to be your other organizational names in the process. So those may have, eventually, two different kinds of requirements in the process. So they may actually be segregated for those reasons.
Jody Kolker:	I'm still not sure I'm quite getting it all. But just a question. When a registrant provides the information, they'll be providing organization and personal name and all of that

address information at the same time. We could definitely separate out the organization name from the address.

Jim Galvin: Sarmad, if I may, can I offer a different example that may help? I think-- Just to make sure that I understand what you're suggesting too, Sarmad, I believe what he is referring to here is that a registrant name, for example-- I would imagine that we would have a requirement that says that a registrant would enter their name and their local language and script, whatever that might be. But it's possible that the sponsoring registrar's name would have different requirements. And so the question that I would have is: Would ICANN have a requirement that the sponsoring registrar's name would have to be in a Roman text, a Latin text of some sort versus would a registrar be able to have a name which was in its local language and script, wherever it happened to be located. I think that's the distinction that you're making is that-- Did I get that correct, Sarmad?

Sarmad Hussain: Yes. Thank you.

Jim Galvin: And I apologize. I'm not sure who was speaking before. Was that Dennis or--?

Jody Kolker: This is Jody.

Jim Galvin: Oh, Jody. Okay. I'm sorry. So, Jody, go ahead. Does that help?

Jody Kolker: A little bit. If I can rephrase it again-- I'm sorry. So the registrar name, and we're talking about the name of the registrar, like Go Daddy, (unintelligible). Is that correct?

Jim Galvin: I believe so. Yes.

Jody Kolker: So we're talking about having the registrar name being in local script--

Jim Galvin: We're not.

Jody Kolker: No. We're not.

Jim Galvin: Or not is the point. Would it have different requirements than the registrant giving their own personal name? Is it possible that an organization name might have different requirements imposed on it?

Jody Kolker: I would agree with that. It could have different requirements placed upon it. From a registrar perspective, I believe every registrar is going to want to work in their native language, whatever language is most comfortable to them. But the registrant may want to put in their localized name. And maybe there's an international name. This is a tough road to go down I believe. It's very difficult.

In short, I agree with Sarmad that we could have different-- that there could be different rules for the registrar name, how it's displayed, and for how the registrant name is displayed.

Jim Galvin: So let me suggest the following for right now, Steve. As we begin to develop this text and grow it, I think this becomes another point that we should capture. Do we want to split apart registrar-- split apart the various organization and personal name elements because they may have different requirements? I think Sarmad was raising that as a question as opposed to a definite suggestion at the moment, because the other part of what I think I heard you talking about, Sarmad, was not just about the organization name but, more generally, it may be appropriate for us to split apart all of these elements where

appropriate to distinguish where they're input from. So have an address category for addresses provided by registrants, addresses provided by registrars or addresses provided by other third parties. Did I understand correctly that you were raising the general question, Sarmad, not just about organization name?

Sarmad Hussain: Yes. So I'm actually-- I am raising a general comment across all categories. But I am actually suggesting just two (unintelligible) - information which is provided directly by the registrant versus information which is automatically inserted through the process, which means it will be inserted by registrar or registry or any (unintelligible). So, to me, I think those two distinctions are clearly something which may actually have different requirements. But maybe information which is provided by registrar versus information by registry may not have different requirements. So I'm suggesting at least two ways (ph). But, as you're suggesting, we can also consider multiple way (inaudible).

Jim Galvin: Okay. So, Steve, let me suggest we capture this question somewhere at the top here so that, again, as we begin to fill out this text and some of the discussion that goes with it, we have to-- this is a decision that we have to make. I think we still have the broader decision of maybe we want to provide two tables or, at least, two ways to reference this. Right now, we're organized according to the data element. Sarmad's suggesting that there's another characteristic of the data elements that we might want to capture, which is whether or not the data comes from the registrant or it's automatically inserted or perhaps even some other input stream. And, as part of our work product, we may actually want to capture this other organization of these data elements, organizing them by object-- human understandable object, if you will; so registrar information, registrant information, administrative contact information, and that kind of thing. Let's make sure to capture these questions for right now. And we can figure out how we want to answer them as we begin to see what this document looks like as we begin to add to it. Okay?

Steve Sheng: Yep. Sounds good, Jim.

One observation I make is to Sarmad's point. It seems that the focus is on organization, personal names and address. And those are where things differ. So other elements such as status, e-mail, phone numbers generically apply. So that's kind of an observation that I make.

The other point is, really, we might need to think about some of the principles behind making these distinctions because, right now, it seems arbitrary to me. Oh, you should be localized, or no, you should not be localized. It would be good for the working group to articulate kind of ground principles why it should be one way or the other. That way it's much more easy to justify making decisions later on.

So those are two quick observations.

Jim Galvin: So thank you for that, Steve. I do agree with you that we've been-- Now, over the course of two or three meetings here, we've talked about-- we've kind of made a first draft of what we think the requirements are for certain data elements. We now have to provide some context and some support for why those are the right choices. And I believe that's the question that you're asking for here. As we begin to develop this, we certainly have to justify, if you will, our choices and explain why they're the right choices.

Okay. For now-- Any other comments from anyone about anything? Sarmad, were you done? Did you have another comment?

Sarmad Hussain: No. That's it.

But, just building on to Steve's comment, just a quick response that two fields, not just the name but also the address field provided by the registrant may have different implications. But I do agree with Steve that dates and some of those other things are generic and may be-- that may not be distinguished.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Thank you.

Okay. So one other quick status update. We have this transliteration and translation working group. I just wanted to call out-- I'm actually a member of that working group. I'm representing the registry stakeholder group as part of that working group. I'm just a participant there. The two chairs are Rudy Vasnik (ph) and, I confess, I forget who the other co-chair is. Do you remember, Steve?

Steve Sheng: Chris Dillon (ph).

Unidentified Participant: Chris Dillon?

Jim Galvin: Oh, Chris Dillon. Okay. They're really only just getting started. We really only had one working meeting, and we're meeting-- that group meets on Thursdays. So we'll be having another meeting tomorrow. And they're really just getting started. So I don't really have any status to report there.

But, given that I'm on both groups, I am hopeful that I can make sure that both groups stay aligned. I remembered Rudy as a co-chair because I actually know Rudy pretty well and have worked with him before for a long time. So he knows. He and I have actually been in contact about these two groups. We were talking about these two groups way back in Buenos Aires at the last ICANN meeting. So I'm hopeful that we won't have any issues there, and we'll sort out exactly how we're going to keep our work products aligned and in synch, whatever we decide-- whatever each of these groups decide what their work products are going to be.

So that's that.

Okay. An important question that we have to answer is whether or not we've got the right set of data elements or not. And are we missing any potential data elements?

And this gets me to one interesting question about how we organize our work product. One of the things that I like about what we have so far in terms of breaking it down into categories of data elements as opposed to committing ourselves to breaking it down the other way, which is in terms of the objects that are represented by these data elements-- so, for example, registrants' information would make use of address and e-mail and phone number data elements. One of the nice things about the representation that we have is I don't think that we are-- I feel like we're not constrained by whatever the data elements might be because individual data elements can then come and go and can be defined by others if we can focus on categories of data elements. And I think that's a little bit easier question for us to answer and to think about how we likely covered all of the data elements-- all of the types of data elements.

Now, Steve had gone and given us this, at least, one set. I don't believe that we have closed on an action to carefully compare this to what's in the EWG document. Does anyone know offhand? I don't believe we have. Right, Steve?

Steve Sheng: I think the Takao did a analysis and provided on the mailing list.

Jim Galvin:	Takao did that. Okay. I should go back and look, and we should confirm that.

What is was getting to here is I think an open action for us is to make sure that we-- whether or not we believe we've got the right set of categories of data elements here and, also, just to provide a little bit of discussion about why I like this breakdown the way that you did this, Steve, and give people something to think about. If you want to disagree with that or propose something different or even agree, that would be good too.

So let me just open the floor for a moment as we get to towards the top of the hour. Any comments from anyone about that?

Okay. So action for next meeting. |
| Steve Sheng: | Jim, I can go over those. |
| Jim Galvin: | Yes, Steve, please, go ahead. |
| Steve Sheng: | Some of the actions I noted is (unintelligible) proposed requirements, create a section called Discussion to capture some of the comments and discussions related to that data element.

And the second is to separate the country from the address.

The next element I have is-- we think about this to (unintelligible) keep a note that the question whether to separate information provided by registrant versus registrar or registry (unintelligible) pose a different internationalization requirement on those.

So those are the elements that I captured. I probably missed something. But let me know. Those are the things that I noted.

Anything I missed? |
| Jim Galvin: | No. That sounds right to me.

The only thing that I'm going back to here is-- I'm looking back at prior discussions, and I'm looking back at the meeting notes from December 11, in particular, and noticing that we have some open questions here. And I was just quickly reading through them to see if we've covered them.

So what I'd like to do for next meeting-- Steve, if you can update this as we come to the top of the hour here. Everything that you've described-- so we get an update of this document. Steve, you and I need to make a point of getting together and reviewing our past meeting notes and making sure that we don't have any lingering, open questions that we haven't looked at. |
| Steve Sheng: | Okay. All right. |
| Jim Galvin: | And then what I want to focus on next meeting is we need to start to expand our discussion about why these are the right requirements. So the specific recommendation and ask of everyone here is to be thinking about some text, some words, even between now and the next meeting, just submitting some bullet points, if possible, about why what we're proposing here is the right thing. And, just as we've already done even today with the comments from Nisit and Naoki and Sarmad-- if there are relevant comments that we should capture in our discussion-- if anything comes to you, let's make a note of those, at |

a minimum, in bullet point form so that we have something to begin to produce some text.

Does everyone understand what I'm asking and what I'm suggesting here? Any questions?

Okay. I apologize for running right up to the hour here and just over.

But any other business from anyone? Then let me suggest we adjourn, and turn it over to you, Steve, to end the meeting.

Steve Sheng: Thank you. Our next meeting will be next Wednesday. That will be on the 22nd, at the same time. And we will kind of review the latest version of the document. And then, as Jim suggested, thinking about ways to propose some text to bolster these requirements and justifications.

So, with that, I thank you. And good morning, good afternoon, or good evening. The call is adjourned.

Operator, could you stop the recording?