20140305_WHOIS_ID859873

Steve Sheng: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to today's call on March 5th of the WHOIS Review Team internationalized registration data expert working group. On the line I have Jim, Jody, Nishit, Naoki, Takao and myself, Steve Sheng from staff. So I've also projected that the latest version of the documents are on Adobe Connect as well as the latest version of Google docs you can access. So let me just stop there and pass it to Jim. Jim?

Jim Galvin: So thanks, Steve. Obviously the agenda is just to go through the document. I want to add two discussions in front. One is, as long as you like all the text that's in this document, I'm very happy to give all the credit to Steve. If you don't like anything that's in there, you get to blame me. Steve and I spent some time together here talking about a bunch of things here and he's tried to capture what he and I have been talking about and some thoughts that he had and other things that he's gotten. But hopefully we're getting ourselves into a pretty decent place here with this document.

I want to talk overall about the structure of the document and what we're after in producing this document. I think that will help, at least help me, Steve and I were talking about this and I was making a proposal about this. I had meant to send it to the mailing list, but since I didn't get to doing that here, I'll just say it in words. But before I do that, Steve, if you could take a moment to talk about this presentation that is tentatively scheduled for Singapore and when is that, and to whom is that presentation supposed to be, real quickly, unless we want to not do it?

Steve Sheng: Sure. So I have requested a -- in the process of preparing for Singapore, I requested a public, a one-hour public session in Singapore to talk about various issues related to internationalized registration data. So these efforts would include this expert working group, the feasibility study that's also commissioned as part of the effort to recommend the WHOIS recommendations, and also possibly an update on the gNSO PDP.

So the working group, the purpose of the -- the title of the session right now is called Defining Internationalized Registration Data Requirements. Currently I'm envisioning each of these groups give an update of where we are in terms of progress and any issues you want to raise before the community to provide some feedback on. So that's the original intent.

One thing, one question for this group is to determine whether to present some sort of topics in the public session. This will be on Wednesday and it will be to the whole ICANN community for anyone who is interested to come. So that's kind of the -- if you could let me know early, especially if the working group is not planning to present anything, then I need to think about some backup plans in terms of arranging agendas. So that's kind of a quick plug in for that. Jim?

Jim Galvin: So another question that I have is, it's a one-hour slot, you have three groups, so I guess what, each group would get a 10 or a 15-minute presentation slot if we wanted it?

Steve Sheng: Yes.

Jim Galvin: All right. Any comments from anyone on the phone?

Jody Kolker: This is Jody, just a question. This is like a 10-minute slot that we can present what we have for comments?

Steve Sheng: It really depends, it's determined, it depends on the working group what you want to be in that presentation. I would think that surely what you suggest would be a group outline for the slides to present the current state of their work. What requirements do you have, agree on that, no problems. Maybe talk about the agenda, the work approach, some principals, requirement types, what requirements are still in the works to collect any feedback at that meeting with a plug in saying a report will be coming out sometime in end of March or April, please provide us with comments. So that (inaudible).

Jim Galvin: So thank you, Jody. Anyone else? So my suggestion -- we had thought up until this point that we might actually have an interim document that we've already published. We're clearly not going to have a document published before Singapore, but we do have two more meeting opportunities. Well, really only one, I'll be on an airplane in two weeks so I won't be able to meet with the group in two weeks. But I am feeling like it would be possible for us to give an update on where we are, the process that we've been using to date, and maybe highlight a couple of things that we know are going to be in the document. Maybe our high level requirements would be interesting to put out there just to give people a heads up on what's coming. If there's a fairly significant question that we think is in the document, we might put that up on a slide just to give the community a heads up. But primarily then, we would simply say that we're going to have an interim report very soon so that we can get early reactions from the community about the direction in which we're headed.

So I think that we could take advantage of this 10-minute slot, especially if we have a pretty good day today. I'm feeling like we're feeling pretty good about the document so far, and we ought to be able to put together 3 or 4 slides and go through the meeting.

So let me ask two kind of related questions. I want to ask if anyone would object to being able to give a status report, and object with a caveat that if for some reason we really think we haven't gotten to the right place here by next Wednesday, that we don't have enough consensus on some interesting stuff to say, then we would not do it. But I would think that we're on a path right now to go do it. So hopefully I've made that clear. Does anyone object to that strategy?

So I'm not hearing anything, Steve. I'm a little more nervous than usual because I'm on a Skype line and I get a little worried about that, but if you're not hearing anything, does that work for you? Can we make a final decision after next Wednesday's call?

Steve Sheng: After next Wednesday, sure, that's fine.

Jim Galvin: So I think the answer is yes unless something really bad happens between now and next Wednesday is the way I would phrase it.

Steve Sheng: Okay, sounds good. So we will check this question at the end of next Wednesday and make a determination then.

Jim Galvin: Right. And we can just do that on the mailing list at that point, too. Let me take a couple of minutes to talk about overall sort of the strategy for this document. Steve and I have been talking about our objective and our goal in this working group as compared to a PDP. What are the next steps? And what is our contribution to the next steps? Since something is going to have to happen after whatever it is that we do. And part of that conversation was taking about how to phrase some of the things that we say. And whether we're just giving a "this is the right answer", or do we also speak about transition strategies and things like that? So with that for context, I have a particular proposal to make and I'm interested in people's comments, reactions, consensus, I guess

too, if that's possible. So the way I would characterize it is, I think that our goal is to state what we think is true or should be true if registration data was internationalized. And what that means is, we describe the goalposts if you will, describe the endpoint. Let's talk about the place that we want things to be.

Then there are two other obvious things that matter in the overall plan for something like this. You always need to know where you're headed. You always need to know where you are. And of course you need a plan for getting from here to there. My expectation is that we should very clearly state what we think the end is. What is the goal that we're trying to get to? And then in the discussion, as much as possible we should talk about what are the issues or open questions that we believe exist given our knowledge of where we are and how it differs from where we need to get to? And to the extent possible, we document all the questions and issues that arise if one were to try and create a path from where we are to where we're going. And to the extent possible, if there are multiple solutions for that path, we should say what we think they are. In fact, if we happen to think that there's one especially good one, we can probably document that, too.

But our recommendations are not actually to be about that path, about getting from here to there. Our recommendations are about where we should be and then we should propose something that is to evaluate all of the discussion that we have and thus make specific requirements on getting to that goal. So it would be out of scope for us to actually make a decision about the path, but we would include whatever information we can about that path in our discussion.

Does anybody have any questions or comments about that? Hopefully that makes sense and I'm interested in whether people agree or disagree with that. Steve, do you want to add anything? Did I fairly represent the question here of what you and I talked about?

Steve Sheng: Yeah, I think so, Jim. I think in terms of our current thoughts to lay out, we have the proposed requirements, which I would think is the end goal, and we document the rest now in why we see that's our correct end goal. And then we have a lengthy, we have a discussion section which I think is where we could put in all the issues going from where we are to the end goal and then highlights of those. So that's one addition to that. Thanks.

Jim Galvin: So let me offer a concrete example to explain why this distinction is kind of important. Because it's actually the one that Steve and I had gotten into when we were talking about this. And that is email addresses. The reason why we had come around, when Steve and I were talking to drawing this distinction, was because I think that for the purposes of our recommendation, we would state that an email address should be permitted to be an internationalized email address as defined by the appropriate RFC.

However, what's interesting is, that email address will not work in today's system. Not universally. You have a universal acceptance problem and that is that the local part is not allowed to be encoded and has actually a restricted character set for what's allowed to be there in email address. So there most definitely has to be a transition path from one to the other.

It's interesting that an email address of today would be valid in an internationalized email address data elements. The problem that you have is if you take in internationalized email addresses, in order for that to be a sensible thing for a registrar in particular to do, you would need an upgraded email system. Because you need an email system that will actually accept and deliver internationalized email addresses and those do not universally exist today. In fact, there's very few of them as compared to the number of emails that are possible to have.

And the other interesting side of that then is if you take in an address, and even if a registrar were to upgrade their email system, so they have a downstream consequence of being internationalized, even if your have it and your system will deliver it, if that message needs to pass through any kind of gateway system to get to its recipient, it might also not get delivered. Because the interim system might not be able to send it.

But all of these issues are issues that we can bring up and discuss in the discussion area. We should comment on the fact that these problems exist. We still think that the right answer is internationalized email address, and we need to tell people that that is the goal, that's what you need to get to, and these are the consequences of that. So when the time comes for some PDP to decide to adopt all of the recommendations that we have about it, they'll have to include some kind of transition and deal with that as transition issues about upgrading the email address from what it was to what it could be in email systems to go with it.

So that's kind of the concrete example that got us up to making this split in deciding what our scope was versus other possible scopes. Having said that, anyone have any comments or questions about it? Even about that particular issue, too, because we're going to have to document that issue in the document. Anyone?

Dennis Tan: This is Dennis for the queue, Jim.

Jim Galvin: Yes, please. Go ahead.

Dennis Tan: I agree completely what you just said and the way we can split what we put as a requirement. I agree that it should be the deal, the angle as you portrayed, and we can document all the discussions, all the issues, problems, the path as part of the whole document. But the requirements, we can keep it as what is optimal for the objectives to enable internationalized data. So I'm fine with the approach.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Thank you. Anyone else? Takao, please, go ahead.

Takao Suzuki: Yes, I agree it's good to have that. I agree.

Jim Galvin: Thank you. Naoki? Jody?

Jody Kolker: Yes, I agree I believe in principle.

Jim Galvin: It occurs to me that email issue is going to be an interesting one when the time comes and it strikes me as something which would be worth putting as part of the presentation to call it out so people can watch for it in the document. But we can see about that later. I think with that, I would suggest that we move to reviewing the document. And what I would suggest is to hand this to Steve to take us through the document.

Steve Sheng: Sure.

Jim Galvin: Yeah, I was trying to decide whether paging through it with you is the right thing or letting people bring up issues if they have them. Let's take the approach that -- let's go with the items that were brought up in email and jump to those and talk about them since clearly they are on top of people's minds. Then if you could step through items that are substantive as opposed to editorial, unless someone wants to take us back to something because you skipped over something, so we can try to get through as much of this as possible. Okay?

Steve Sheng: Sure, sounds good. So there are a few, I notice a few points brought up in the email. Let me see, I'm scrolling here, in the Adobe Connect. So in earlier sections there isn't too much to discuss. So I'm -- the two high level kind of requirements that Jim brought up in email, Jim, I see some acknowledgement and support from the working group. Maybe the working group can quickly glean through these high level proposed requirements as Jim put them on the mailing list and provide some feedback. So that will be one.

The other thing will be focusing on the address. There are several discussions on the locale or the region and the associated issues with that. So those are the two things I gather from the email

discussion. Is it okay that we go through the high level requirements first and have people give feedback?

Jim Galvin: I think so. If no one objects, why don't we jump right to 5.1 here, registrants being required to input registration data in a language or script that he or she is skilled at. If there's no objections, anybody want to jump in and comment?

Steve Sheng: I have removed the synch button so you can scroll through it yourself if you are on Adobe Connect. This is section 5.1.

Jim Galvin: So what I was after in creating these high level requirements and why they came out is because it occurred to me that they were common to multiple elements, multiple element categories, for one. And so they had broad applicability. And that really was kind of the issue that I was after. It occurred to me that we should just put them right at the top and that way we don't have to repeat them throughout. And they also seemed kind of important.

So one of the questions to come up on the mailing list is about knowing about the mixed script issue and the fact that a mixed script or language can be used in an element. I think my response to that now is we might want to tweak the words here a bit. I have to think about it a little bit more to see what we should change this thing to. But this is really, it's just a requirement that the elements have to be tagged, but it doesn't -- not trying to say explicitly how one tags the data. So what I'm thinking about from an implementation point of view when you take something like an address, which could have mixed script and/or language indicated in it, is the script and language would be part of the encoding process. It's usually part of the encoding. So when you're actually encoding the address, explicitly that information would appear.

So I think one of the comments that was on the mailing list seemed to suggest that a data element could only have one script or language indicated and you wouldn't know what it really referred to. But I think if it's mixed, you need a way internally just to deal with the fact that you have to encode it so that you can see each part of it in what language or script it's in. I have to think about better words to use to describe all of that. We should probably add an explanatory paragraph in 5.1.2 to say all of that. But having said that, does that answer the questions that have come up on the list with respect to the tagging issue? Anybody have any other questions?

Jody Kolker: Jim, this is Jody.

Jim Galvin: Please, Jody, go ahead.

Jody Kolker: I'm not sure that we've answered the question. We've talked about having, that you could have multiple scripts in there. So tagging the field with one single script really wouldn't work very well, would it?

Jim Galvin: Right. And I -- my response is the data itself is tagged. You have to encode the data and so maybe the tagging of the element is that there's a tag that says it's encoded data and you indicate the encoding that was used and then all of the existing coding options that have been defined at least in the idea, then the script is part of the encoding process. So as part of decoding, you get to see what the script is. And you simply have free form text which is encoded so that -- encoded in parts, and you can see all the language and script that's used as part of decoding it. I'm probably not making this very clear.

Jody Kolker: So there really wouldn't be a tag associated with it. It would be self-tagged basically?

Jim Galvin: Yes. Yes that's a fair way to phrase it also. I have to sit down and think about what the right way is to use some words to describe this because I want to make it a technically accurate description. But Steve, maybe for right now we need just sort of an editor's note there in 5.1.2 that says we need to add an explanation about how mixed scripts work in a data element.

Steve Sheng:	Okay.
Jim Galvin:	Is that actually something that you can -- can you be editing in real time while the stuff is displayed, or not?
Steve Sheng:	No, I took a note of it.
Jim Galvin:	I just wondered if I should wait for that. Would that help for right now, Jody?
Jody Kolker:	I think so.
Jim Galvin:	Does anyone have any other comments about these high level requirements?
Dennis Tan:	Jim, this is Dennis for the queue.
Jim Galvin:	Yes, that was Nishit?
Dennis Tan:	Dennis.
Jim Galvin:	Oh, Dennis, please, go ahead.
Dennis Tan:	So I'm reading through the requirement for the (inaudible) principle and the use -- so the rest would use the script in which they are most skilled. I was going through the 2013 RAA and under the WHOIS accuracy program specification section 1A, the registrar is to validate the person with the data for all fields required under subsection 321 of the agreement in a proper format for the applicable country or territory. So now I'm not sure whether format includes the language in the (inaudible) territory and would that be conflicting with allowing or putting, we are putting a requirement where the registrant can choose any language they are most skilled in? I don't have very clear, I assume there is a conflict, but maybe it's just me. But I just wanted to put it out there for consideration.
Jim Galvin:	No, you ask a good question. Let me just think about that for a moment. Right, so the way these high level requirements should work, and now looking at the text that's here, Steve, and I think that you and I talked about this, but we didn't get these words in here. There needs to be a little bit of a description here in front of the high level requirement, so between 5.1 and 5.1.1 should be a little paragraph. This will address part of what Den is asking. We need to state that unless otherwise clarified in a specific element, that these are the default requirements for any textual element. That's one thing.
	And then I think the second half, the other thing I'm thinking about in response to what you said, Den, what you're asking about, is then in the name fields I still believe that a registrant should be able to use whatever language or script they're skilled at for entering the name. They're obviously going to be constrained by what a registrar supports, so that will constrain their choice of registrar. But with respect to an address, in the address area we would say exactly what you're calling out from the RAA which is that the address should be in a language or script which is appropriate for the region represented. And I think that's the requirement and it's an appropriate requirement because it allows you to do the data validation that's referenced in the section that you called out.
	I think those two things answer your question, what you were saying. Are you -- do you believe that or do you still have a question?
Dennis Tan:	No, I believe that, Jim. Thanks.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Den, it would be helpful, Steve, if you didn't get that note, if Den if you could send to that to Steve. Let's actually call out that reference in the contract, in the agreement so that we can tie all these ends together as part of the discussion.

Steve Sheng: Yes, Dennis, if you could send that to the list, that would be very helpful.

Jim Galvin: Okay, any other discussion on high level requirements? Okay, one thing I'd like to go back to just very briefly, in section 4, the sentence right before the proposed requirements, there's an editor's note about backwards compatibility. I just wanted to call out for people that at least in my mind, this question about backwards compatibility, that's really what I was after when I was giving the structure of our document and our scope. The point about we should speak about the endpoints and that's what we should say. The intent there is that backwards compatibility is not a primary driver for our recommendations. Our goal is to speak to what we think is right and then in the discussion talk about any backwards compatibility issues. So what I wanted in that section 4, that last thing, I was thinking that we need to find a way to create a principle about the goalposts and backwards compatibility not being a primary driver. And I hadn't come up with a nice, classy phrase for it yet, but that's how I expect to fill out that little piece of text. Anybody have any questions or comments about that?

Okay, then jumping forward to 5.2 and 5.2.1 in particular where we have the name, 5.2 is where we have the name and address stuff and 5.2.1 is the name. The person and organization name. Any -- there's an awful lot of text in here which I think I want to clean up and do a little bit differently. But for right now, just kind of left all of that in there as a way to just try to get all the points in here right now that we want to put in here. But any comments or questions here about the name, the 5.2.1?

Probably one of the more important changes we made is in the proposed requirements we simply state that it should be free form text. Because we dropped the clause "limited only by what registrar supports". Because instead, we added some text talking about the fact that yeah, registrars are only going to support certain languages and scripts, and that will be a business decision. So that will, that might constrain the choice of registrar on behalf of the user, but that's appropriate. The requirement is still that it's essentially free form text for your name because your name should be allowed to be whatever your name is. I encourage people to read that discussion, and if you want to phrase that differently, editorialize that in any way, please do, and send comments back to the list.

Steve Sheng: Jim, I just want to add onto that, I think the most really useful feedback is to provide an alternative text. Because that way, having text, we find with people it's much more easy to have discussion. This is the working group and staff is trying to (inaudible) discussions in proven text. But sometimes there's information lost in the discussion and the text itself and the working group is not happy about certain text. The best way is to communicate that directly to the mailing list with proposed text. That would make the job for staff much easier. Thanks.

Jim Galvin: Yeah, thank you for that, Steve. I know in talking to Steve that in the early stages of putting stuff together, Steve is happy to take bullet points, concepts, and do his best to expand it into text. But as we get -- it's always more helpful to take full text if you want to provide it, but it's especially important as we try to get to some sense of a finished product that if you want to change something in the text, it's best to provide revised text and to redline a document.

Okay, let's move onto 5.1.2, the address of registrant technical and administrative contact. And a question that's been brought up on the list is this issue of how you know what the region is, so what defines the region? And two, is there somewhere a mapping between the region and the script or text, script or language which is allowed? And it might be a mapping in both ways. I believe those are the two question that were on the list. Is that correct, Steve?

Steve Sheng: I think so.

Jim Galvin:	Okay, let's take the region question first. From my point of view, and I think I said this on the list, and I'll just say it again here and see if there's still any questions about it, although I observe that Den made an interesting point that I think Den, based on the clause that you were quoting earlier, the region is, at least in the agreement, expressly defined as the country, the value for the country field, the country data element. But separate from that, what I said on the list is I think the region is defined by the totality of the address. We can pick the country, we can say its postal code or something like that, or the city or state. But I don't really have a strong opinion. I'm not sure I actually know for certain what the best answer is. So I'm really interested in other comments or questions. I would say the whole address, Den, I believe the clause that you had said just to use the country. What are other people's experiences? What do other people think? I have no basis for a particular bias at this point.
Nishit Jain:	Hi, this is Nishit.
Jim Galvin:	Please, Nishit, go ahead.
Nishit Jain:	First of all I want to say that I agree with what Jody said (inaudible). It appears to be a very complicated process in terms of the address input by users. And that's why the country (inaudible). And also in looking to decide a language or script for a particular region because there could be more than one language or script (inaudible) in that region.
Jim Galvin:	Okay. So I heard you saying you agree with the question that Jody was asking about knowing the mapping between the region or language and I have some thoughts about that. But I'm not sure that I understood your feeling about what part of the address defines the region. I think you said the country is not enough information, but it wasn't clear to me that you had a specific suggestion on how much of the address you need in order to know what the region is.
Nishit Jain:	Exactly. What I am saying is (inaudible) language or the script (inaudible) not going to work because (inaudible) more than one language or script (inaudible).
Jim Galvin:	Okay, so we agree that country by itself is not sufficient. And that's why I'm suggesting that we need to write some discussion that simply says the address as a whole needs to be considered when defining the region. And my feeling is that that will kind of fall out according to market forces of some sort or other policy considerations that will come to bear. But we don't have to say what those are right now. That's my current thinking but I'm happy to be swayed to a different place, so I have no particular bias here at the moment.
Takao Suzuki:	This is Takao, could you put me in queue?
Jim Galvin:	Yes, Takao, please go ahead.
Takao Suzuki:	The definition of region, just so you know, from Microsoft in my previous job and then now with GoDaddy, we use the term definition because when you say country, that can be a geopolitical issue for some regions in the world. Such as Taiwan. So that is why Microsoft avoids to use the term region. I'm sorry, country. And that's kind of what we are working on in GoDaddy, too. So I just wanted to mention this. So when you say we ask for customers to enter their country name, instead of asking for country we say region/country also. That way people will not complain when country names show up that are not agreed, totally agreed around the world. So that's just one comment. And then in terms of not being country/region, yes, there are -- I agree with Jim, there's just no way one country can be mapped to a single language. So we have to get into the detail, I agree. Thanks.

Jim Galvin: Okay, thank you for that. Anyone else have any comments or thoughts about the region question? Okay, so let me speak to this mapping question. How do we know what languages and scripts are available in a region or not, that Jody asked and others have now confirmed, is also a question. If I can describe what I'm thinking about with respect to that issue, I think that -- I don't think that mapping needs to be carefully defined. I think that we should describe that there's some things that need to exist. I mean the following things apply. A registrar of course is going to exist to serve a particular target market. Presumably the registrar is going to know that market and even though they're on the internet, and so there are no geopolitical boundaries, nonetheless, they're going to have a particular region, if you will, that they want to serve. And they're going to want to provide whatever language and script is appropriate for that region and for their target market. And that means they're probably going to not only accept input in whatever form is appropriate for that market, but also provide content in an appropriate form for that market.

So the answer to the mapping question from that perspective is, it's market driven. At the other end we have the registry. The registry of course is going to have some target markets. The registry is going to be motivated to incentivize registrars to support that target market and find registrars that will create content and provide input methods that support the script and language that the registry is most interested in serving. And they have a mechanism to incentivize registrars to provide that support. And that applies to the registration data.

Now there's a relationship with which scripts the registry wants to support for domain names. It would seem reasonable that a registry is going to have a set of scripts that it's supporting for a domain name for a particular TLD and it's probably logical to assume that they're going to be reaching into markets in which that script is common. And those markets that might be more than one language that is supported by that script, if that's more than one region, and a registry is going to want to do all of that to incentivize registrars to support it, and it will be most valuable to those markets and those markets will then move towards taking advantage of those registrars and the registry that supports them.

In addition, the registry is going to be constrained on the domain side, domain name side, by whatever their contract allows of ICANN. Since they are actually required to document and be approved to offer certain scripts for domain names. So in response to the question of what is that mapping and how do you know what it is? I think that there are some guiding perspectives here that will define that. I don't think that has to be predefined. I think that will simply fall out from the market. And I guess what I would suggest is that we have to find a way to describe all of this in this section or probably up in the high level requirements is probably where it goes. We need some sort of discussion about how languages and scripts are chosen and who supports them and when and why. And we need to talk about that some.

So that's my perspective on that. I don't know if that's helpful or if that still leaves a question or if you want something different. But let me turn it around. We're getting close to five minutes up on the hour here, just to do a time check, but let me let others speak. So, Jody, since you asked the question on the list, have I helped or hurt your question?

Jody Kolker: Well to reiterate, I guess what it sounds like is that the language and script of an address should be appropriate for the region that it's located. It sounds like it's a proposed requirement, but yet we're using the word should and not must. So it sounds like it's up to the registrar to decide which region or which script is appropriate for which region. And in the end, if the customer happens to enter in a script that's not appropriate for the region, it will still be accepted.

Jim Galvin: So now you bring up an important distinction. The should versus must issue, I associate that more with the IETF than I do with ICANN kind of documentation, but that's an important distinction to make about how we're going to write our recommendations. I -- to the extent that we're providing or describing the goalposts, there's no real should. Everything that's a should is kind of a must, everything is a requirement. This is what it's supposed to look like and how it's supposed to work.

On the other hand, given that we're only writing recommendations, because there needs to be some other decision point that makes it, that obligates contracted parties to work in this way, whether that's a PDP or just an ICANN decision, and I'm sort of leaving it open at the moment, then everything we say should be a should. And there's no such thing as a must in the document. So how would you like it to be phrased in the document I guess is my question. Or how should the document phrase all of its recommendations on this particular issue of should versus must?

Jody Kolker: Well for this particular issue, a proposed requirement in the language and script of an address should be appropriate for the region as located, that one is just very hard for me to explain my feeling on I guess. It just seems it's a requirement -- if we say that it's a free form text that we could leave it as a free form text. But the customer or the registrant could put in whatever language or script that they would like to have their address displayed in.

Jim Galvin: Well I'll fall back on UPU rules, so the Postal Union and what it says about addresses. I mean a different way to come at this is the fact that if I was -- well if I was in the US for example, it would in fact be wrong to enter your address in Chinese. And to try to give your American US address in Chinese, in any kind of version of Chinese, because the post office wouldn't deliver it. It's not something they know and understand. And that's kind of what we're trying to do here is model that after Postal Union requirements. There's a detail Steve and I were talking about that he's going to be double checking with Postal Union requirements, but basically the Postal Union has essentially these words that we're using here. So a registrar in fact I would expect, if they were selling a name with an address which was intended to be in the US, they should only allow the collection of US Asci characters. And if somebody tries to put anything but US Ascii in the address field and encode anything else, it should be rejected as an invalid address. That's part of what data validation means, too. So that's another approach and way to look at this.

Jody Kolker: I agree with what you're saying, Jim. That is such a huge change to what we have though. It could be very -- there's a lot of -- there will be a great deal of change required by the registrars to support something like that. That if you are in the US it can only be in US Ascii. If you have a Chinese address, the only script that can be allowed is maybe the Latin numbers and the Chinese address. And the Chinese characters for that address I should say. Is that -- am I phrasing that correctly?

Jim Galvin: I believe so. And I agree with you. And registries are going to have this issue, too. Let's see, it might be a softer requirement on registries, but registrars, I think it's a requirement that registrars have to move to anyway. It's not clear to me how you do any of the validation and how you would do registrant validation and meet the requirements without doing this. I mean I could be wrong, but that's -- I mean I think registrars are being pushed in that direction anyway, even if they haven't quite seen that yet.

Jody Kolker: Are you referring to the RAA that's more the registrars are being pushed into?

Jim Galvin: Yes. You have to know if it's a valid address. You have to do the semantic validation. If we think back to the validation types that SSAC defined, syntax validation, semantic validation and identity validation, or it's actually operational. So I'm sorry, syntaxes validation, operational validation and identity validation. You are being obligated to certain operational requirements. Does the address actually, is it actually a deliverable address? Does it represent something that works? And to that extent, if you go down that path and that's what's in the RAA, as I understand it, maybe the details are yet to be specified, but my expectation would be that this requirement that we're describing here falls right out of that.

A US address has to be in US Ascii characters, a French address has to be in Latin characters but with the extra French characters that are allowed by the French language. Same with Italian and Spanish. And in China you would only be able to use simplified or traditional Chinese characters for writing your address, because that's what the postal service would require and presumably

that's the only thing that you can check against some kind of postal database to see if the address is real or not.

Nishit Jain: This is Nishit for the queue.

Jim Galvin: Please, Nishit, go ahead.

Nishit Jain: Okay, (inaudible - off mike).

Steve Sheng: Nishit, we couldn't hear you, your question really.

Nishit Jain: I'll repeat it. So what I'm asking is, you are saying that a person would be able to enter a Chinese address in Chinese if the address belongs in China. So my question is, what will happen in countries like India where there are more than (inaudible) region of that country?

Steve Sheng: Sorry, Nishit, would it be possible to type your question either on the chat box or in an email? I'm still having a hard time hearing you.

Jim Galvin: I'm sorry, so Jim just came back. I don't know if you saw my notes in the chat room, I missed completely what Nishit said, but Steve, if you followed through --

Steve Sheng: No, I also asked Nishit to type it in because it's very difficult for me to hear. So what I'm hearing from this requirement is some experts think this is too restrictive. Right? Is that where things are? I'm trying to figure out what to do from here.

Jim Galvin: Yeah, I'm not sure what to do from here either. I mean I think Jody is asking a really good question about what this means. I gave my interpretation of what I think it means. Jody, I don't know if you have a reaction to that. Maybe folks want to take some time to go back and think about that and look at some of the agreements and the wording that's used there and the wording that's in the future contracts. So that people feel like they have a more informed opinion about what it means. And I think that's fine. We have to do our best here to try cover all bases. I don't see anything in the chat room here from Nishit, but let me reach back to Jody. Do you want to comment here about a path forward at the moment?

Jody Kolker: Yeah. Jim, my comment would be that, or my opinion is that it's very restrictive compared to what we have now. I understand that the RAA may be moving us towards that. I'm not sure that we're going to get there completely. I guess I'd like some time to think about this a little bit. My opinion is that it's very restrictive to say that a Chinese address needs to be in Chinese. Or a US needs to be in a US address. I understand the point that you're making with the UPU and I agree with that to a point. It's just such a change from what we currently have that it's getting hard to wrap my arms around as far as accepting it.

Jim Galvin: Right. And my, the only comment that I would add to that is I agree it's a lot, it's a big change, but these are the points that we would bring up in the discussion and then again, we always have to keep in mind that ultimately there will be some kind of PDP that's going to look at this and decide what the contractual obligation really needs to be on parties. So my expectation is that all of this will get a second chance for some review by a very broad community.

But this becomes one of those interesting issues that we could bring up in our status report. Although maybe not, because sometimes if you can't completely cover an issue, and 10 minute is not really a lot of time, you don't really want to bring the issue up because you can overtake an entire presentation and that's not necessarily a good thing either.

Jody Kolker: I agree with that, Jim. I think in 10 minutes bringing this issue up is going to cause a lot of discussion and will take your whole hour if that's what you're given for discussions. I think it's a very large issue.

Jim Galvin: It really is the top of the hour. I know it's after the top of the hour and I want to be respectful of people's time here. So I don't think we're making a decision right now as to what to do here, Steve. I think we are going to have to add more clarity, but folks are going to need some more time to think about what this means to them so that we can better figure out what it is we need to say and how to say it.

Steve Sheng: Yes, thank you, Jim for that guidance. Also, with that also a request to the working group. One thing the working group can think about is besides this particular point, what other points do you feel in the document you disagree or you think needs clarification? Because that's very important guidance as editors to keep track of things. And if possible, also provide those text with clarification because again, it's real important to provide text to working group documents.

Would it be possible to provide some feedback this week so that by next Wednesday's call we'll kind of know what the issues are, what are the text that needs to be added, and if we have a chance maybe some text already added, already been proposed for discussion. Is that okay for next Wednesday's call?

Jim Galvin: I think so, Steve. Let's take that as an action to go forward with that. And if I may, let me take one quick moment to reply to Nishit's comments in the chat room here. Just like with a name where it's free form text and it's self-described, data elements, the information inside an address could be self-described also. And again, a registrar in taking the input would have to check all of the encoded data and make sure that any script that's used is valid for that region. And if that's not enough of an answer for right now, given the time I think we'll have to wait and we'll have to pick this up, Nishit's question, next time around. Okay, any other business?

Steve Sheng: No, I don't have anything. It would be really helpful for people to go on the mailing list to propose text if you are not satisfied so that we can have all of these in the discussion. Okay?