

20140219_WHOISIRD_ID85583

Steve Sheng: Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening. Welcome to today's call. And on line we have Naoki, Jim, Dennis, Nishit, Takao; and myself, Steve from Staff. Did I miss anybody?

Jim Galvin: The operator, to start the recording.

Steve Sheng: Yes. Operator, could you start the recording?

Operator: The recording is on.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Thank you. Okay. Over to you Jim.

Jim Galvin: Okay. So first thing I want to do is thank Steve. I think he really has brought the document along here, over the past week. So I think we are starting to look pretty good here, and I'm actually pleased with the direction we are going in. So I just want to comment on that overall. So we've -- a couple of people have already commented on the list, and made some updates to the documents, and all of that is good. We don't have Jody with us. Jody is--

Jody Kolker: I'm here -- I'm here, Steve -- I'm sorry, Jim.

Jim Galvin: Oh. Jody.

Jody Kolker: Jim, I'm here.

Jim Galvin: Good, good. Jody, I had sent a note at one point, you said you made some changes to the document but I didn't see a copy of the documents.

Jody Kolker: Ah. Did I not -- did I not attach it? It was only editorial stuff. I'll resend it. Sorry.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Well, that's fine. I was just -- it's also giving me the opportunity for anyone else to jump in, and suggest that they got it, and my e-mail had its problems too, but -- so all of that's good. I think we have a nice -- a nice fax from Steve, and he will fold in all the comments that we are getting from people. I just have one comment, suggestion that I made in the version that I had sent out a little while ago, that I thought was kind of substandard (ph) and that we should talk about, but before we jump to that, I thought I'd give you the opportunity for anyone else who would like to jump in. And do you have any other additional comments that you want to make about the documents, anyone?

Nishit Jain: Hi, Jim. Tis is Nishit.

Jim Galvin: Please, Nishit, go ahead.

- Jody Kolker: Okay. So I understand (inaudible/audio skips) and comments regarding this report for (inaudible) this is under the category (inaudible) with language is all (inaudible), and really another of that was on the (inaudible) -- under this strategy.
- Unidentified Participant: It is hard to hear from you.
- Jim Galvin: Yeah. I was having trouble understanding you, too, Nishit. Maybe, could you try again? Or let me ask first. Did anyone else feel like they could repeat what Nishit said? I'm sorry could we ask you to repeat, Nishit?
- Nishit Jain: I'll try to repeat -- Sure. I will repeat my question. I'm sure that I comment on this (inaudible) and I asked some of the questions regarding this, and my first question is that in that category section, we have reported all of the 13categories. I can see a new category added with these languages. What I need to ask what's on that element on the two categories?
- Steve Sheng: Yes. This is Steve. If I understand your question, what you're saying is, regarding the categories there is -- let me scroll that down here, there is a category for languages, that's where you're question -- on this?
- Nishit Jain: Exactly. (Inaudible) under the (inaudible) section--
- Steve Sheng: Is that right? What I'm looking through, so when I look through the -- if I scroll down towards the end, what I took out is the comparison with EWG data elements, so I added a few of them here, registrar jurisdiction, registry jurisdiction. And then there is this -- another field called registration -- registrar agreement language. So I thought maybe, you know, this is an area that have not really talked too much about. So what I did is, I put a language category up there, but I haven't really done anything, just to document that. This is an action item, I think, for the Working Group to determine whether there's a need to add that category and if so, what are the requirements for that? So does that answer your question?
- Nishit Jain: Exactly. But (inaudible) to consider that there are many language as the document, and the (inaudible) registry that I can see in the (inaudible/audio skip).
- Steve Sheng: I'm sorry. I'm not able to hear very clearly. Does anyone else, can repeat Nishit's question? Or Nishit, perhaps you could type it in, in the Chat, so that would be easier. I don't want to (inaudible/audio skip) -- very good question.
- Jim Galvin: Okay. While Nishit types his question in the chat room, so does anyone else have any comments, or questions about the documents they'd like to jump to?
- Steve Sheng: I have, I think, the document is in the Adobe Connect, so you can scroll it by yourself, to the different sections, and you're free to do that.
- So, Nishit's question, "Does the language cater to the domain language data element under Dot CAT registry?" I am actually not sure what the domain language data elements that our CAT registry refers to. So those data elements are just for, kind of, an inventory, and we don't try to do like a one-by-one mapping, if you will. But if anybody knows more about that, you know, please chime in here.
- Jim Galvin: Yes. This is Jim. My question to Nishit would be, is the CAT TLD doing something special with their language data elements that you're concerned about? I mean, I would hope they are using it in sort of a typical or expected way, but please, go ahead.
- Nishit Jain: Steve, I saw this (inaudible) category gets added to a list of categories, which his languages, so I'm just asking why this particular category gets added to this, because as the main language, data elements which is (inaudible) registry? It was to do something with (inaudible/audio drop).

Jim Galvin: Okay. So, I'm still having trouble understanding you Nishit, but it sounds like you're -- if you are asking, I think, if there is any difference between what they are doing and what we are doing, and I agree with you that something -- I mean, if that's your question, yes, we should figure out if there is a discrepancy or not here. And that, Steve, in general, when we posted interim report, and we are asking the community for comments--

Steve Sheng: Mm-hmm.

Jim Galvin: --we should ask, in general, for people who read it to consider if we have used or defined any data elements in a manner that's inconsistent with known usage.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Jim Galvin: That would be a good question to ask in general.

Jim Galvin: Ask in general if we have used data elements to define the categories consistent with current usage?

Jim Galvin: Yeah.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Jim Galvin: So that will be part of the -- that will be a part -- a fraction, or in the beginning of the report, where we pose a few questions for the community. Is that right, Jim?

Jim Galvin: Yeah. I guess I'd leave the form to you. Would it be something we would put in the report, or is it something to put in the announcement?

Steve Sheng: Hmm? I would think both.

Jim Galvin: Okay. That's (inaudible)--

Steve Sheng: (Inaudible) the announcement, and pass -- and some people will be reacting to the report, so it's good to have them both.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Sounds good to me. So, Nishit, I'm sorry but -- so have we covered your question? Or did you have another question?

Nishit Jain: Yes. My question commented on that site 5.1.1 (inaudible question) and we should be able to input this particular -- under the elements on the standard (inaudible) in a language. Or is it appropriate for region, as it is located. So here we will need to clarify that, all this restriction, and input in a particular language that is (inaudible) and belong with each region. Or in other way, it should be written like -- it should be (inaudible) and be able to input in a language or the script, and the script by him at the time of registration.

Steve Sheng: Okay. So I think Nishit is referring to, which section? That would be section -- So, Nishit, are you talking about 5.1.2?

Nishit Jain: No. It's about 5.1.1.

Steve Sheng: Oh, 5-point -- okay here, all right. Ah, this is a -- your proposal is -- your proposal is--

Nishit Jain: What I'm saying is--

Steve Sheng: Go ahead. Yeah, go ahead, Nishit.

Nishit Jain: Should I say it again? Okay. So what I'm saying is we agree under the proposed department (inaudible) under the 5.1.1, and we are (inaudible) that we should be able to input this in language or script that's prepared for region that it is located. So, here we will need to clarify that how the restriction on inputting in particular language or script will be made with each region. Or, we can say other way that you would -- should be able to input in language that been selected by him at the time of registration.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Sorry, Nishit. I can't hear you. Do others hear Nishit okay? If so, could you repeat? Or, Nishit if you could type in the chat room again. I'm sorry to impose this on you. But type it in the chat room or, you know, send an e-mail (inaudible), that will be much easier for me to incorporate, than to summarize here.

Nishit Jain: Okay. I will--

Jim Galvin: So why are -- Nishit types in the chat room, this is Jim-; I actually had a comment about 5.1.1 also--

Unidentified Participant: Go ahead. Yeah.

Jim Galvin: --and I think it's related to what Nishit is saying. I didn't quite get the details, but he was talking about language or script as we recommend here. I was wondering if -- I thought the name was allowed to be free form, as opposed to being required to be a language or script appropriate for the region. The address, I remember specifically, had to be appropriate for the region in which it was located. But I -- and maybe others should speak up here. I thought I remembered that the name, you know, was allowed to be free form. I mean, obviously a language or script would have to be indicated.

Unidentified Participant: Right.

Jim Galvin: In the discussion we would need to say something like, you know, it would only be limited by what the registrar happens to support, but -- anyway that's my comment. Anyone else? So, Steve, go ahead.

Steve Sheng: This seems to be fine. I'm trying to understand the proposed requirement would be, this data element. No requirement to be imposed on this build, right. Other than it needs to be -- it should be a free form text limited only by what registrar supports. But what language or script registrar supports?

Jim Galvin: Correct. That's what I think.

Steve Sheng: That's what I--

Jody Kolker: When you say region -- this is Jody, sorry, for the queue.

Jim Galvin: No. Please, Jody, go ahead.

Jody Kolker: Yeah. When we say region in there, we are talking about the region that's actually entered into the address, but if that -- I agree with you, Jim. Because I think the registrant should be able to -- the person should be able to register in whatever language or script they want regardless of the region that they are using for the address. If they want to be more global as a registrant, and they want to use a global language, then I'd say we allow them to do that, even if the region is -- even if the region is -- are not depending on the region, I guess, is what I'm trying to say.

- Jim Galvin: Yes. I mean -- this is Jim -- I'm thinking about two things. Either of two examples in my mind when I say that it should be, you know, free form. One is, a person might -- a person of one nationality or culture could live anywhere.
- Jody Kolker: Right.
- Jim Galvin: So their names would be relative to where they were born, and then the other thing of course, is there are multinational companies, their name is going to be whatever that corporate name is, and they are going to use that wherever they happen to be located.
- Steve Sheng: Good point. Jody, just one question, I guess. Ask for your operational expertise here, in the registrar, so for example, you know, Go Daddy operates globally, and in that sense, you would -- you'll accept a name from any place -- in any script, or any language from anywhere around the globe, right, regardless where that registration takes place?
- Jody Kolker: Yeah. It would require changes in the registrar system to be able to do that, and maybe in the registry too, but I believe most registries will now allow you to put in any language or script you want into that registrant's name. Now, I'm not sure about that, but I think that that's something that we should check. I mean, this will put -- if we are allowing people to do that, or recommending that, this could put a pinch on registrars, because I think currently right now, we will not allow customers to put in a script indirectly into the registrant name filed, other than Latin or US-ASCII I should say.
- Jim Galvin: Oh. I see.
- Jody Kolker: So, yeah. This is -- what we are talking about here is definitely a big change for the registrars to support.
- Steve Sheng: Okay. So, any input from that will be really helpful. Kind of the implications.
- Jody Kolker: Yeah. The implication is going to be very big I think for a lot of registrars, if they are not allowing scripts to be used besides US-ASCII, and that could be huge. I mean, the operational effort on that could be, you know, ranging to their databases and into what they are sending into the registry. Now, the WHOIS system will have to be changed to allow this also. I mean, the Port-43 WHOIS since it only allows US-ASCII, and I think that that's where we got into discussions of, it should just be translator -- transliterated into, you know, one single script of US-ASCII, because I believe that that's all that is support with Port-43 that -- Jim or Nishit, if they want to correct me there if I'm wrong.
- Steve Sheng: Okay.
- Jim Galvin: Yeah. So let me -- you bring up a good point and let me use this as a segue into the one -- there was comment that I had made in my readings that I thought was kind of substantive, and I don't know if you're displaying my version of the document here, Steve, or something else.
- Jody Kolker: This is (inaudible), yeah.
- Jim Galvin: Okay. So if you go up into section four, I put in a third paragraph there.
- Steve Sheng: Yes.
- Jim Galvin: And this kind of gets to what Jody was just talking about, to some say, sort of introduce this in the following way, it is right that if registrars are not -- well in technical terms, we always like to talk about ASCII (ph) clean, but basically that means, do they allow the input of Unicode characters, and then of course push that up into the registry. I mean, I know that for our registry, in fact, this business of taking in any language is really not an issue for us because our database and our

registry and implementation is ASCII clean, and we do support Unicode. Restrictions are all put in front of that, to go along with current rules.

Jody Kolker: Right.

Jim Galvin: But for those who aren't there and haven't done that, you know, that would be -- that would certainly be a change. But one of the things that I notice here, I mean, I sort of make the sentence in here, sort of, along the lines of user capability principle, should we be saying that -- I think should we specifically seek what Jody was just talking about? If we are going to say that a user should be able to use, or let's see, two years ago the way the IRD Working Group had phrased it was that a user actually does have -- should have the ability, the right, if you will, to use their own language and not be obligated to do anything else.

And should we say something about that, because -- and I think then that the next implication is that a registrar and a registry needs to be able to store whatever is coming through at a minimum, and then a minimum requirement is that it might have to be translated, or transliterated for the Directory Services side of it, the WHOIS side of it. I mean, WHOIS doesn't support any of this, the protocols, but the WHOIS (ph) Working Group is developing a new system, and of course the EWG, the Expert Working Group on Directory Services is proposing something entirely new and different.

Jody Kolker: Mm-hmm.

Jim Galvin: Anyway, I'm sorry. I feel like I'm rambling a little bit here. Have I said something useful that's helpful, Jody?

Jody Kolker: Yeah. I'm sorry to interrupt, Jim. I guess what -- to your point of explaining some of this to the registrars, I think it's going to be useful and maybe a little more powerful to the registrars, because I guess from a registrar's standpoint, when I look at this, and I'm not sure where other registrars are, I'm explaining where Go Daddy is. You know, implementing something like this, if they are only based in US-ASCII it's going to be a pretty big overhaul for their systems. And it would be pretty hard for them to swallow as far as something -- a recommendation coming out like this.

So I think putting things in there -- or putting statements in there, realizing that this could be a pretty big change for the registrars, and that, you know, registrars won't -- should change this until the WHOIS Working Group or -- I'm not sure which one is responsible for creating the new WHOIS protocol to allow scripts to be used or to be returned on Port-43.

I mean anything that we -- when we suggest things in this document, this is not an edict for registrars to have to go out change right away. That would have to come down from ICANN. Is that correct?

Jim Galvin: Right. So, let me just respond to a couple process points here for you. We are an Expert Working Group, and so we only make recommendations. Anything that we recommend would be subject to an additional process of some sort in order to mandated to contracted parties. So to translate the five comparisons, the Translation and Transliteration Working Group is actually a PDP Working Group. So its work product actually becomes a requirement on contracted parties, or will become a requirement of the contracted party, and we are not in that place.

Another possible path, of course, is the ICANN Board to decide that whatever we say is the right thing to do, but I suspect that they would also defer to a PDP. So there's one more step after our work, that's one thing. The ICS (ph), (inaudible) Working Group is developing for proposing a new protocol which is basically using Port-ED, so it's using a RESTful interface on Port-ED to provide directory services. As opposed to the WHOIS protocol currently supported on Port-43, and of course the advantage of all of that is what you pull in, it's everything you get from HTTP, right, the Web protocols.

So you get all of your language designations, your script designations, you pull at all kinds of authentication models and all of that to get to build on all of that. The implication here is that when an ICAP Working Group is finished, and has a protocol, the expectation is that ICANN will begin a process, and there are a couple ways in which it might do this, but it will begin a process in which it will propose that that protocol is a new directory service protocol, and it will become a requirement on contracted parties.

Jody Kolker:

Okay.

Jim Galvin:

The existing agreements, the new registry agreements, and registrar agreements actually have a clause in them that allows for ICANN to update and say that this is a new protocol for use, and I believe it was 160 days, it was 180. I think it got reduced to 160 days, but it actually says that from the moment that ICANN says this is the new protocol, you have 160 days to implement and deploy the protocol. Anyway, I think those are the moving parts. Does that all make sense?

Jody Kolker:

Yes. Thank you very much for the clarification, Jim.

Jim Galvin:

But I do agree -- I do actually think that it's important in the interim report that we call out, kind of explicitly, questions or comments or recommendations that are likely to be, shall we say, meaningful to certain parties, so that we can solicit feedback. We obviously -- you know, we want to hear what people have to say, even though our recommendations will be binding right away. They are clearly on a path headed towards some version of them becoming binding, so people need to hear about them.

Jody Kolker:

Mm-hmm-mm-hmm.

Steve Sheng:

Okay. Thank you. So what I gather is, I will update requirements in 5.1.1; you know, very similar to what Jim proposed. Now Nishit has -- Nishit, actually, it will not, restricting to a particular and script to be made with this region then -- for this, then it should not be an issue for you, right?

Well Nishit was proposing the user -- the user will be able to input in a language or script selected by the user at the time of registration, and also interesting point. What do others think about this?

Jim Galvin:

Well I think -- this is Jim -- I mean, I think that's the point of our user capability principle, and it's also a part of the corollary that I'm, sort of, proposing there in that third paragraph. The discussion point that we have to allow a bit, I like to say it's limited by the registrar, and it really is. I mean, a user can only go to a registrar that will allow the user to use the language and script the user wants to use. If the registrar doesn't accept it, then they have to find another registrar. I mean in a sense to say that in the opposite direction, in an actualization, obligates registrars to be prepared to interact with users in the market in which they want to be deployed. Right? The market they want to draw customers from.

Steve Sheng:

Okay.

Jim Galvin:

I'm trying to find a more neutral, less business-oriented way to say that, and that's kind of the point that I'm getting at here in my third paragraph.

Steve Sheng:

Right, right.

Jody Kolker:

Say, Jim. I'm interested, and maybe this was a -- I'm sorry, I guess I shouldn't interrupt, you.

Jim Galvin:

No. Jody, please. Go ahead. It's all right.

Jody Kolker:

I'm curious, and if I'm going down the wrong path here, and if you'd like to defer this that's fine. I'm curious how this would affect -- curious how Edmond (ph) and you would be affected by

contact validations with different scripts. You know, I know that contact validation is a big part of registries, with different scripts how would that affect the registry?

Jim Galvin: You see, actually, as I understand the validation issue, it's not really a -- it's not a registry issue, it's a registrar issue, because--

Jody Kolker: Sorry to interrupt, Jim, but what I mean is that, if I try to -- as a registrar, if I try to register a domain name, the registry itself is going to validate -- what do I want to say? It's going to validate those variables that's sent in. For example, for a phone number, the registry is not going to allow a phone number to be blank, so there are definitely rules around an address to say, "Does an address have one character or two characters? Or how many characters are there, and do there need to be for this to be -- to allow the domain to be registered?" I'm not saying that you're verifying the actual address exists, but you're verifying the format. We are validating the format. So with the different script, how does that affect the registry?

Jim Galvin: Okay. So let's divide up this validation question into three parts, right. SSAC had a document in which they talked about validation, and we carefully divided the validation problem up into three parts. There is syntactic validations, operational validations, and identify validation. So syntactic validation, I would expect both registries and registrars to have to implement. Registries will do it because they do have to double-check the registrar, the registrars will have to do it because they need to get the right information from our registrar, so there is a first line of defense. Right?

Jody Kolker: Definitely.

Jim Galvin: And that's all about the -- I would expect syntactic validation could be automated. In fact, this is the way SSAC presented it. It could be automated pretty much all of the time. The expectation is that that's something that could be done automatically, as part of your programming. And they've rehearsed all the things that you're talking about, I mean, does the phone number look like a phone number, is it a real phone number, is the e-mail address -- does it look like an e-mail address? That kind of thing, does an address get the right number of characters. In terms of some of the requirements we are putting up here, for an address, I would imagine you could also check that the address is in a script or a language that's valid for the region in which it's located. Those kinds of things.

Operational validation is a little bit different. I wouldn't expect operational validation to fall under a registry at all. Operational validation refers to, is the value that you have, does it work? So a phone number. Can you call it and does somebody answer? An e-mail address, can I send it a notice and, you know, get a reply, for example? Or a physical address do -- I have some reference by which I can state to some level of confidence that it represents a real physical location. All of those things, with the operational validations, that's a lot of validation problem that's being talked about on the ICANN context, right. That's the validation problem that scares everybody, and if I were registrar it would scare me too, because you can't -- physical validation are -- or let me say -- validation of a physical address is relatively straightforward in many countries; take the U.S., for example, and very challenging in many other countries.

And I think China and even Japan fall into that category, notwithstanding some of your underdeveloped countries like, you know, Africa, and certain part of India, for example. So I don't know where all that's going to go. Identity validation is taking all of the data elements that you have and confirming that they actually represent a physical embodiment of an organization or a person. And that typically involves a manual process, some third party thing which is going to have to go out and make sure that all the parts fit together. If I call the phone number, is it really the person it claims to be at the other end of the phone.

So, having given that, I think the answer to your question is syntactic validations, you know, registries are going to do that, just like registrars -- operational validation, registrars will have to do some of that, and that's where all of the new requirements are now being developed and

seeded. There are some things in the new registrar agreements that push people in a certain direction, and push certain registrars in a certain direction. And as far as I know there is no one with specific identity validation requirements right now. The new gTLDs have them, but they are not part of ICANN's general requirements. So, is that helpful.

Jody Kolker: It is. The only part that I was concerned about, that I was asking about, or curious about was the syntactic -- the syntactic validation. And it sounds like--

Jim Galvin: Yeah.

Jody Kolker: --registry has already handled that and it doesn't matter the script that's sent in.

Jim Galvin: Well, handle is relative term. Some of it you inherit from the XML that used the PDP (ph), right. So you get some of the syntactic validation there. Other things are a little more semantic than syntactic, and so you're going to have to do some coding to check them. You know, like the e-mail address, the details of the e-mail address, does it really conform to an internationalized address. Right now we don't -- you know, for example, in our registry, we don't allow internationalized e-mail address, it has to be -- the local part, it has to be, you know, ASCII, an "at" sign and then -- and IDN. So this is a new requirement here, that even we would have to do, and I'm sure others will have the same problem, but that's -- that kind of syntax was above what XML gives you.

Jody Kolker: Okay. And I think from a paper of suggestion that we were trying to do. I think it's important to state, you know, that this may be difficult for registrars and registries to implement, and that there should be, you know -- how do I want to say this? To make sure we are pointing out that we know that this is not easy to be changed, what we are -- what we are suggesting is -- could be difficult for registrars and/or registries to implement. Or, not difficult but could take a lot of work (inaudible).

Jim Galvin: I agree with you. Well my -- I agree with you, Jody. And my suggestion for how we word this, Steve, is what we want to do is tell people to evaluate the work effort that may be required to make this change, especially if their current implementations is US-ASCII base.

Jody Kolker: Mm-hmm.

Jim Galvin: So let's not prejudge whether people think it's easy or hard. Even though it probably is hard. So did you get that, Steve?

Steve Sheng: No. Sorry.

Jim Galvin: The comment about, there are going to be specific places in here where we know we are making change -- we are suggesting changes from the status quo, and in those places where we currently expect that things are implemented based on US-ASCII only, we should encourage registries and registrars in particular, but everyone to consider the difficulty of changing their implementations to support more than just US-ASCII.

Steve Sheng: In a sense this -- almost like a specific section called, implications for these proposed requirements, and then you have input -- implement, potential implications to registrants, and the difficulty he might face and to registries. And that's how I, you know, was thinking about this. Instead of having bits and pieces everywhere in the document, let's put it in one section so that people will immediately call people's attention, for them to dive into it.

Jim Galvin: So let me suggest that we have a section called Implementation Notes.

Steve Sheng: Ah!

Jim Galvin: Rather than implications, so implementation notes.

Steve Sheng: Implementation notes. I would need -- I can -- I'm happy to write that, but I would really need points from Jody and, you know, who else, and any other registrants. And then from Zheng Wang (ph), from Naoki, and who are on the registry side, so I can -- to be the (inaudible) implementation notes. Would you be able to help?

Jim Galvin: Yes. Absolutely. I mean -- I think right we have one implementation note to make.

Steve Sheng: Right.

Jim Galvin: Which is to observe that changing from US-ASCII to allow any language or script certainly is going to require a change to many parts of an implementation.

Steve Sheng: Noted. I will reach to you and Jody and, who else, what others want separately throughout this action, because this is -- it goes to an area that I'm not -- I don't know, so I really need to rely on you to tell me the -- what are these issues, just so that I can write them down.

Jim Galvin: Okay.

Steve Sheng: But I note your point, Jim.

Jim Galvin: Yeah. I may suggest that when you reach out to us you actually send the message to the mailing list so that we keep everyone involved, but you can address it in the beginning to anyone of us if you want a specific person to comment on something, so that others can comment too.

Steve Sheng: Sure. And but--

Takao Suzuki: I have a question.

Steve Sheng: Go ahead.

Takao Suzuki: So I just want to confirm -- so the way -- the way we are trying to go is to -- you know, kind of suggest or, you know, go towards like rewriting the backend (ph) but do we have a thought about, like potentially just trying to keep the existing backend, and then, you know, do like -- something like the way -- the Web down with IDN implementation. Just -- I don't think that's the case, but I'm just asking. In other words, yeah, like a -- using now like a pin code, for instance, and then allows the order backed to stay as is, right. And then just wondering if there's any directions that are potentially, (inaudible) that way.

Jim Galvin: Well, I think--

Takao Suzuki: I don't think that's the case, but I was just checking.

Jim Galvin: No. It's a good question, Takao, so -- this is Jim again -- I make the observation that domain names have a special concern, because the DNS is -- you need something in a normalized form in order to do DNS signings.

Takao Suzuki: Totally.

Jim Galvin: I'm sorry?

Takao Suzuki: I totally agree, yeah.

Jim Galvin: So there is this requirement to have both an A label and a U label.

Takao Suzuki: Mm-hmm.

Jim Galvin: Because, you know, the name itself for presentation purposes, the way it's visible to the user of course, would be U label version, but you need the A label version internally in order to put into your DNS servers, and also to do all of your DNS signings and such. So you have the requirements there to always have full versions of it, or have one of them, and always be able to create the other one when you need it. That was actually a question that I had in the document here, about domain names, should we always require that both commands, or should we require one of them, and be clear about that? Or maybe we don't have to require either one, but we have to observe that there has to be a value that could be masked one way or the other.

But that's than everything else. I'm not sure, honestly, about other things, and I think that's a question that we need to continue to think about, and maybe we want to ask as part of our interim report. If I get an address, you know, should I be required to have it in two forms? The local form and whatever standard form I want to create. Then I would also offer that isn't that a question for the Translation and Transliteration PDP Working Group to answer.

Takao Suzuki: No. I was like more really thinking about, you know, from the -- like what Jody mentioned, right, this is a big task for everyone, and then having some sort of -- that might be a solution, but I'm realizing that we talk about it, the e-mail address, and so forth, so I don't think that's really realistic, going the same, but it may work like noting that we, you know, thought about it. That's all. Thank you.

Steve Sheng: Thanks, Takao. What you are really getting at is where these internationalizations happen. Is it kind of pushed through the end, or it's happened more towards the core? That's how I interpret your question, with regard to implementation. Thank you for the point. Now we are--

Jim Galvin: I have a question.

Steve Sheng: Go ahead, I'm sorry.

Jim Galvin: Yeah. I'm sorry. So the question is, is Takao asking about when or where, with respect to internationalization.

Steve Sheng: Where, right. Because you could store everything backend as Puny (ph) code, or anything, and then you rely on applications to do transformations, right. To do a localization, so everything--

Takao Suzuki: Yes. Correct. Correct, except that the Puny code, I don't think Puny code works, so.

Steve Sheng: Anyway--

Jim Galvin: Anyway, yeah. If exactly -- I'm going to follow up with that in writing.

Takao Suzuki: Yeah. please--

Jim Galvin: Thank you.

Steve Sheng: Jim, we are 10 minutes to the hour. How do you want to wrap up the call, the next steps?

Jim Galvin: Okay. So we've had some really good discussion, you've certainly gathered up some good points. You had some editorial suggestions for the documents. I guess one action we need is the revised documents to look at.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Sure.

Jim Galvin: Let me ask, Steve, our goal here is to try and get an interim report out prior to Singapore. What deadlines are we facing, so that that gets into the ICANN process in a sensible way?

Steve Sheng: Jim. I think the Singapore publication deadline is early in March. So we are looking at two weeks. So probably two cycles. Two review cycles. Two more review cycles.

Jim Galvin: Okay. So two more meetings. All right. Let me ask that you confirm that, and get an actual date for us, so we know.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Jim Galvin: I think our goal at the moment is get this document in a place where we can share it, so that we can begin to gather some comments. I guess this means putting it out for a 30-day comment period. This is sort of standard for how long, this interim report comment period should be, Steve?

Steve Sheng: The minimum is 21 days, and then followed by a 21-day reply period, so that's 42 days. But if you want to you can we can -- it's really up to the Working Group. I mean, if the Working Group wants comments to be 40 days, that's fine, but the 21 days is usually the absolute minimum.

Jim Galvin: Right. So the same three weeks. What I'm wondering about is -- I guess I'm just being cautious in my mind about whether or not we'll be moving forward while we are waiting for comments to come in. And what work we are going to have. But I guess we'll cross -- we'll figure that out when it happens. I don't know that I have a strong opinion right now about how long the comment period should be. I think my first gut reaction is keeping it short so I would go with the three weeks, and three-week reply period, unless there's some particular motivation for making it longer, if anybody has any particular suggestions.

I guess if we release it before Singapore, which probably makes the comment period 30 days, because the week of the ICANN meeting is not really a fair week to expect people to do things.

Steve Sheng: Yeah. Jim, the deadline is March 3rd, for Singapore publications.

Jim Galvin: So, we really only have next week So we have one more meeting available to us, and that will give you a few days to polish off the documents and then get it submitted.

Jody Kolker: Yes. If you are -- if you want to submit it by this time, then I will really need input from everybody, so that you know, -- for example, I would request people to read it through once again, and just try to identify anything that is not clear because -- I mean, this is going to be looked on very critically by the community, and anything that is not clearly stated, really -- you know, diminish the work here, and also the implementation section -- implementation note section is really critical to get it right. So I would really rely on you to make those right. Steve, we are going to try to aim for it, for meeting that.

Jim Galvin: Okay. So let's -- can we get a revised document from you by Friday?

Steve Sheng: Yes. Do you mean with the implementation notes section?

Jim Galvin: Whatever you have put together--

Steve Sheng: Okay. Sure.

Jim Galvin: --and make it available, and then it's on the rest of us to read this document, and provide any additional text that it needs, clarifications.

Steve Sheng: Mm-hmm.

Jim Galvin: So that we can have a final review next Wednesday.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Jim Galvin: And then you can polish it off and publish it as interim draft report for discussions.

Steve Sheng: Sure. (Inaudible)--

Jim Galvin: I'm sure that anything we don't get exactly right, people will be quick to tell us. So it won't be a problem.

Steve Sheng: Agreed.

Jim Galvin: Yeah. We'll get it right the next time around.

Steve Sheng: Yeah. And I'm thinking--

Jim Galvin: Okay.

Steve Sheng: I'm just thinking about what John Clinton (ph) is going to respond to this report. So that's the kind of particular (inaudible) that I'm thinking about. All right.

Jim Galvin: That's okay. I'd rather get, you know, critical comment for an interim report because then we actually have a very real chance of doing something more solid that people will respect a little better the next time around.

Steve Sheng: That's true.

Jim Galvin: I don't want to be too far wrong if I can help it, but there you go.

Steve Sheng: Okay. All right, sounds good.

Jim Galvin: I ask one question in my note about whether or not we want to ask the Translation and Transliteration Working Group, if we want to pass on to them our user capability principle, and ask for their comments about that, this is sort of -- we are headed down this path, giving them that heads-up, they meet on Thursday, so I'll be in that meeting tomorrow. And I'm wondering if people have any comments about whether or not I should bring to that Group our principle of user capability for their consideration. Any comments? Well we are (inaudible) again, so I don't think I'm going to jump to doing that if people don't think that's a good thing to do. Or, we can wait and talk about it some more.

So maybe I'll pose this question directly through the mailing list and see if we get some discussion, and I won't do anything about this tomorrow. Okay. So I think we have an action plan, and we've kind of wrapped today. Any other business from anyone? Nothing? Okay, then let me turn it over to you, Steve, to wrap this up.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Jim. Thank you for the call today. The action is, I will take the input received on this call and produce a revised version of the document by Friday of this week. I will probably reach out to some of you individually and then confirm that on the mailing list, the discussions we have, particularly with respect to the implementation notes section. So those are the -- and then by next week we will -- our next meeting is going to do a final review of this document, so through Friday and next Wednesday, 1st, the Working Group Members to look this -- at this document quickly, and then we will meet next week to review it.

Okay. That's all I have. And operator, could you stop the recording?

Operator: The recording has been stopped.

Steve Sheng: Thank you. And good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, wherever you are. Thank you, again.

Jim Galvin: Bye, everyone.

Unidentified Participant: Bye.

Unidentified Participant: Goodbye.