
STEVE SHENG: Welcome today, 12th of March, 2014, to our call on the registration data requirement for internationalized IRD. On the call we have Jim, Dennis, Jody, Sarmad, Naoki, and Steve myself.

Jim, over to you. I know that Dennis has a hard stop at 9:45. So just to let you know.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Thank you. Is everyone is okay if we jump right into the address issue? I'm not hearing any objections. Let's jump right into that one. I was in the middle of replying to some of the email messages, the one in particular, got distracted, ended up never sending it. So, I guess would like to have some of that discussion here.

We have this issue of a statement that says, "The language and script of an address should be appropriate in the region in which it is located. And we've a few people comment on this list with concerns about saying that... I guess, I want to press on this a little bit more myself because, to be honest, I'm still not sold on the idea that not a reasonable thing to say, and I'm trying to understand all of the discussion that was going on.

So, let's go back. It was – whose message was it that talked about having two reasons? Was that yours Jody?

STEVE SHENG: Yes it was Jody's email.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

JIM GALVIN: It was Jody's email. Okay. Let me find that message, because that was the one I was replying to at the time. Right. Okay. So, in your first comment, Jody, you say that it can be difficult for registrars to accurately determine the language of the text 100% of the time. So, I guess the question that I would ask, is that – your comment here seems to suggest that a registrar... You would not expect a registrant to help in any way to tell you what it is that they are about to enter.

Would that be true? I guess, is that the sort of normal way of doing things, and the way in which you would see it continue?

JODY KOLKER: Well, currently right now we, as a registrar, we don't do any determination of the language, etc. We just send it out basically as an ASCII to the registrant, or to the registry. I guess I didn't think of something like having a drop down or something to allow the registrant to actually pick their language that they're entering.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah. See, I guess, I mean obviously I don't have a complete picture on how some of this stuff would work, but thinking through it a little bit here, just sort of suggest out something concrete, which may or may not working in reality, but at least is the talking point here.

Part of the problem is, so you have a registrar and the Internet doesn't know any boundaries. So to the first problem that you have is that you

don't really know where your registrant is coming from. Right? They could be anybody from anywhere, trying to enter a name.

But it occurs to me, I think that we had said – we've said in some of our earlier statements, right, a registrar, you know what you support and what you don't support. And so, if you do things like, you know, a first thing a person has to enter, a registrant has to enter, is a country, because I think you need some bit of initial information in order to figure out what to do with the rest of the registration information.

And following what the UPU does, that's the one element the UPU requires to be in a globally recognized language. Normally English, but they actually do have several in their list that you can use for your country – you can state your country name. And I would think from that, that also consistent what the UPU does for addresses, once you have the country code than that tells you what the address fields need to look like, or gives you more information about what the address fields are supposed to look like.

And in fact, I guess the UPU documents don't tell you what languages to use, but they do state that you're supposed to use whatever is appropriate for that country, whatever the postal service for that country decides are the rules. And what I'm wondering is, if that doesn't give us enough information that you would know what it is to expect.

I guess that's my question, kind of thinking out loud. And I guess no one else has a better answer than I do, which is none at the moment.

JODY KOLKER: So what you're suggesting is that based on the country code, not the country code but the country, what's ever brought into that, that we would expect a list of, what do I want to say? Scripts or languages that the rest of the address will be in.

JIM GALVIN: I would think that information could be determined, and a registrar would implicitly know that. You would select and you would know what languages you're going to support from that country. And a registrant would then be expected to use one of those languages, which then I think, as you're suggesting, you could examine what it is that you received, and probably, in most cases – I mean, I guess, I don't know for sure.

This would be an interesting question to call out in a public comment period in a first draft, but probably you'd be able to figure out what script and language is in use. Or, I suppose you can ask, but... Sarmad, you have, I think more experience with these kinds of things. Any thoughts about this?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: I think if we allow this kind of [?], we are asking that [?] all the languages and scripts. And that [?] target [?]. So, I'm not sure whether this is a practical possibility.

JIM GALVIN: Well, I guess my thinking is that I'm not expecting a registrar to understand all languages and scripts, but I would expect that the

registrar would understand languages and scripts who are a region that they're targeting, that the regions they expect to do business. Now I realize in some sense that is kind of problematic on the Internet, because once you put up a website, you just don't know who is coming at you.

But in fairness, if the registrant can't enter the data properly. I think the right thing to say is that they shouldn't be able to register a domain name. I mean another reason why this requirement feels right to me is because of the validation requirements that come to. I mean, if you're going to allow anyone to enter their address information in any form that they want, or any other form that the registrar might take in, the concern that I have, and I honestly don't know the answer to this question with any kind of absolute sense, but what I'm thinking is that in order for validation to work, and registrars are going to have some obligations on validation, you're going to have to get the address in a form that makes sense for that region.

Because being able to validate that address is going to be dependent on something in that region. I mean, in the US, you do it [CROSSTALK]... in European countries, you have the same kind of thing. You've got some postal database that you query. It has to be normalized in some sense, and I'm sorry, it sounded Sarmad like you had something to say?

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Yes. I just, what I've been thinking is that for some of these [?] Arabic script, that does not mean that they have to ensure different rights for online [?], for protocol of the countries which support Arabic scripts.

And then even though the [?] ...Arabic language community and what the other language community. So the gTLD doesn't have language [?]... And so how do we determine that the Arabic script [?] in certain countries by offering perfectly [?] gTLD.

Or is that [?] and [?] bound to follow that? you know, there would be a certain way [?] there are certain [?]... I only want to offer it in [?] UDU has not been consulted here. So, I mean, not even sure how that probably value, and where that [?] define, so is that going to be part of the RAA agreement that the list of countries that want to do [?] You know, [?] sure [?].

JIM GALVIN:

Well, I'm not sure that it's something that needs to be enforced, I think that's what you're asking, right? I mean, if a registrar is going to make a particular choice, should they have to document that and then should it have to be enforced? Is that the question you're asking? [CROSSTALK]

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

It's, sorry. So for [?], or the [?] is that if you cannot enforce it, and maybe we could [?] put anything, basically we go back to a Latin only system. And to me that's a little, you know, that makes me a little uneasy because there has to be some naming requirement, it will be all the Latin scripts. And that seems to me a logical solution or activity. We'll discuss it with Steve, we discussed it a lot on the [?] point, [?] so not my idea.

But I am not quite sold on that idea. But at least the script TLD which will describe the focus, should be supported through the [?]. So we [?] ... a TLD did not support [?]. Thank you.

JIM GALVIN:

Right. So I heard you saying two things. And I'm sorry Steve, I know that you wanted to speak too, but just to make sure that we got this right here. One is your concern for, should there be a minimum set of requirements of some sort? And so that you're suggesting that one thing is to require that they always be able to expect US ASCII also as an option for registration data, so that we have a minimum requirement.

The other thing that you were suggesting is that, whatever script is supported by the TLD, it should be possible to enter registration data in that same script. And I think that those are the two things that you were suggesting. Did I get that right Sarmad?

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Yes, so what I was saying was minimally, that should be supported, and obviously there is no upper limit. We must put some [?] something, then we should [?]. And the minimum limit should not be the ASCII, it should be something that all [?], for IDN at least.

JIM GALVIN:

Okay. So, there should be some minimum, and it should be something beyond ASCII, and that's where you're getting the script from the TLD, should also be supported to. So that's your concern in the

requirements for internationalization, there should be some kind of minimum. Okay. Steve, you had something you wanted to add?

STEVE SHENG:

Sure. It seems that we have three proposals on the table, current proposals, the language or script of an address should be appropriate for the region that it is located. The second one is from Jodi, is this – certain semantic requirements. And the last one is from Sarmad, free form text, the script of address should be the same as the script of the TLD or in US ASCII.

Are those the ones on a table?

JIM GALVIN:

I believe so. I want to comment to Sarmad's proposal there that there should be the script that whatever is accepted by the TLD. That one, my concern there is that's coupling registration data with the domain name itself, and I don't think that's a good thing to do.

I mean, a TLD could support any number of different languages for any number of different reasons, especially a TLD. And they might be completely unrelated to, although I guess I don't know, one would think they should be related to where you would expect to get registration data from. I think the reality is, you can get a registrant from anywhere, is the problem, so what if I'm, it's a GTLD in Asia somewhere, it's an Asia TLD, or even Arabic, and so it really is all in Arabic, the TLD itself, and the expectation is that all the names will be in Arabic, yet I'm an American.

Are you suggested that I'm obligated to enter my American address in Arabic?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: No, actually what I was suggesting was that it supports Arabic or ASCII. So somebody who cannot do Arabic should be able to do it in ASCII, at least. I don't think [...]...and then [...] they can also [...] should be [...] Arabic and ASCII for others who are ICANN [...].

STEVE SHENG: So Sarmad, this is Steve. I have a question of your proposal.

JIM GALVIN: Go ahead Steve.

STEVE SHENG: So following along Jim's example, an Arabic IDN TLD accepting a US based registration with a US address, I mean the US address would be in US ASCII. Is that right? Sarmad?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yes.

STEVE SHENG: Let's say a Japanese registrant wants to register this Arabic TLD. What registration, what language or what script would the registration data be in?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: So in that particular case, the registrant would allow the Japanese registrar to enter the information [?], or in English, minimally that requires literally part of, or if the registrar wants to be more diverse in Japanese, they can allow it to be in Japanese. So there is no [?] to this, but what I am supporting is [?].

STEVE SHENG: I see. So what you're saying is you're providing a kind of bottom line, and then the upper limit is up to the registrant. Correct?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Exactly.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. All right, thanks.

JIM GALVIN: So, I guess I have two comments here. The first two, Sarmad, in the bottom line, the problem that I have with bottom line in the low bar in saying that, it would be US ASCII, is to me that just feels like perpetuating the current state of affairs. If the goal here is to support a registrant and we acknowledge that registrants are not all going to speak English or know US ASCII, then even having that as a low bar doesn't feel low enough, because there were always be people from whom they can't always reach that bar.

And that's the concern that I have. I mean, we have an US ASCII today, so go ahead.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: [?] asking you, sorry. So what I'm suggesting is that low bar should include [?] not [?].

JIM GALVIN: But going to Steve's example, I mean, if I'm a Japanese registrant and I only speak Japanese, and maybe I'm studying Arabic in school, and so I have a desire to have an Arabic domain name, and you're suggesting that I have to be able to enter my registration information in US ASCII, that's really my only option, because my address probably can't be represented in Arabic, my local Japanese address.

So I somehow have to get that into US ASCII.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yes, exactly, yes. [CROSSTALK] I was actually looking for the registrar or from the registrar point of view, if [?] just ASCII, [?] not support ASCII as well as [?]. So there is a [?], I guess I see it from a different viewpoint.

JIM GALVIN: Right, right. So thank you for that. Because that brings me to my second point. Kind of taking a step back here, and trying to think about what is the first principle, trying to bring this back to first principles, and try to follow logically through this, to see what feels right. I'm just

having trouble articulating some of my concerns, but is the first principle here, looking at this from the registrant's point of view, or the registrar's point of view?

And I realize that we have to create some balance, but given that balance I still think there needs to be a bias on one side or the other. And I guess where I'm coming from, and maybe this is the problem in this discussion, where I'm coming from is, first principle is bias towards the registrant. So I'm imagining a registrant that they really only know their own language or script, whatever it is that that happens to be from, wherever they are in the world.

But even so, it still feels like that wherever I live, I now my address where I live, and I ought to be able to enter my address according to what's appropriate for the region that I'm living in, even if that means I'm renting or something like that. Somebody wrote down the address for me, I can just copy it, literally into whatever. But, from my point of view, from looking at this from a registrant point of view, I'm always going to know what my address is and how to enter it, because I know how to get mail where I am.

Or at least I can find that information pretty readily. So that I can enter it into a form. So the question here is whether or not a registrar is supposed to be able to offer services to all registrants. Because if they are, then Sarmad made a comment earlier that sure, this kind of requirement that I was suggesting about an address needs to be appropriate for the region, which suggests that some registrars, Go Daddy being the canonical example, would simply have to support all languages and scripts in order to serve the world.

But to me, that's the question. Would a registrar be expected to serve the entire world even if they're visible to the whole world? If you could only serve those customers that have the languages and scripts that you support, whatever it is that you choose to do as a business. So have I helped this discussion in any way, or does it not matter? I'm kind of getting down to a place of trying to figure out how to make forward progress here.

It feels like we have [CROSSTALK]... I'm sorry Sarmad, go ahead.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Yes. So, I think what I'm saying is not any different from what you're saying. So [?] with what you're saying, because what I'm saying is that we discard [?] and we should put [?] back in to support all of the languages that [?]. But in addition to that, I'm actually [?] one more [?] at least supports the script of the TLD [?]. So I'm not sure – I don't see myself, particularly [?] on this particular I guess option.

I don't see any conflict or any different from the one that you are presenting.

JIM GALVIN:

Okay. So, to play that back. What you're suggesting Sarmad is that any registrar, before a given TLD, any registrar that wants to support that particular TLD should be obligated to support any language or script that TLD supports. So that would be a constraint on [CROSSTALK]. Go ahead Sarmad.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yes. I think you want to [?] at least.

JIM GALVIN: At least. Okay, yes. So, Jody, any comments about what I said? Do you still want to stand firm on what you're proposing?

JODY KOLKER: I think a little bit, yes, Jim. Requiring that, what it sounds like to me what we're talking about is that we're asking the registrar to validate that the customer has entered in the correct script for the region for that address. And I'm still curious about where registrars will find what is the correct script for that region? And who is maintaining that list?

Is there an ISO list out there with that? That will say this region supports these 10 scripts.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. And I guess I don't have an answer for where that list comes from, I'm sort of thinking that that's really a business question. Well, I'm asserting that it could just be a business question, because I'm not aware that such a list actually exists, although some sovereign states, if you will, do know what they consider to be their official languages and scripts.

So in the interest of forward progress, other groups, like the directory services expert working group, people normally talk about the EWG without realizing that they need to qualify it, a group that's doing the big picture replacement for WHOIS. When they've been giving out their

draft reports, they always sort of presented one position and then asked questions about it to the community, to try and get some feedback. We could, instead, document both of these ideas for this particular requirement, and make it a question to ask the community for feedback, rather than just trying to pick one of them and asking questions against it, we could just put both ideas out there, and see what kind of comments we get back from the community.

JODY KOLKER: This is Jody. I'd agree to that Jim.

STEVE SHENG: This is Steve. I think that's a good way forward. We can document all these three, and then in the discussion, lay out all of the arguments we had for it on the call, and then call out specifically in the public comments space for the community to bring.

We could also talk about this in Singapore, what the working group wants.

JIM GALVIN: Talk about it in Singapore in what sense? If this working group meets?

STEVE SHENG: Remember last time? We're saying the working group is engaged to determine whether to give an update to the community on the interim

report. If you do decide to do that, this could be one of the issues to gather some feedback.

JIM GALVIN:

Right. So we can call after people that this question will be in our draft report, and we're giving you a heads up now to think about it, and then please comment when you see the report.

STEVE SHENG:

Yes. I'm good with that. Okay. So I think Jodi, that points the obligation primarily on you and I to make sure that the text... Steve will try to create a first draft of this, but then it's up to us to make sure that it's complete for each of these two choices in the draft, before it's released. All right. That sounds good. So that, I guess, I think that takes care of the address issue.

Let's not lose track of, and make sure we include along here, Sarmad's suggestion that registrars should include, should support whatever scripts are allowed in the gTLD for the domain name, those should be allowed for input of registration data.

STEVE SHENG:

Yeah. So Jim, just to – for me to try and understand. There are three proposals, the current one, Jodi's one, and Sarmad's one. Right? And then, in the text, we just lay out all of this, and then I'll request each one of you to provide text to me to justify. Is that right?

JIM GALVIN: I believe that's right, yes.

STEVE SHENG: All right. Just to make sure.

JIM GALVIN: Lay this out as best as you can, and then we'll have to work to fix all of that up.

STEVE SHENG: I would really need to request text from three of you to make sure I get it right. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN: Okay.

STEVE SHENG: We still have two more remaining issue. One issue is regarding the registrar, and the other one is the A label. So those are the only two left in this meeting.

JIM GALVIN: Right. Thank you. So I was pulling up the – your email message here. So the registrar names, should it be in US ASCII, is currently – ICANN recognizes. I thought that the words that we had used, and I haven't looked at this in a bit here, so let me find where it says the registrar name.

Yeah, so as it was recognized by ICANN, and I think the intent from my point of view, so we should test this with folks. You're saying, Steve, that you know that it's US ASCII behind it, but I had presumed, and I guess maybe incorrectly, that in the contract, in the contractual language, ICANN would allow a registrar to represent its name, whatever its name is, the organizational name is.

So this would be, that the name itself would be preform text, and ICANN would be recognizing that. so, not that it should be US ASCII, it should be whatever signs the contract.

STEVE SHENG: My understanding right now is always English. There is a translation of the name to English. But I think in principle I would agree with you that, if the contract, whatever the legal name in the contract, right?

JIM GALVIN: So maybe we need to say two things. One that the name here should be whatever, I think that it should be tightly coupled with whatever is in the contract, and then we need a sub-requirement, if you will, a related requirement, a colliery or something, which simply says that obviously the contract should except the registrar to identify them self in whatever their proper name is for the region in which they are located.

STEVE SHENG: Right.

JIM GALVIN: So that should be a suggestion to Legal, ICANN Legal in particular, that just because the contract is in English, they shouldn't be required to make the company name be in English too.

STEVE SHENG: Right. Sounds good. I like to hear Alan's feedback.

JODY KOLKER: I'm sorry, Jim. Did you say that you wanted it in English also? Whatever language they say in the contract, and then in English also?

JIM GALVIN: No, actually. I'm saying that in the data element, the name should be whatever is in the contract, and then we should also make a statement that the contract should allow the registrar to use their name in their local language or script.

JODY KOLKER: Okay.

JIM GALVIN: I mean, I don't know. There may be legal reasons why that's a bad idea, but let's put it out there and somebody will say something. But, you know, I just – coming at this from the first principle of a registrant, or even a registrar, why can't I be who I am? Right? Why are you telling me I have to be something else? That's just kind of where I'm coming from in making that suggestion for a requirement.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. That sounds good to me, any other feedback on this? Okay. Hearing, I will just keep this requirement as it is, but modify it in a way to align with the discussion here.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah. We just need to add a little bit to the description text.

STEVE SHENG: Okay.

JIM GALVIN: And then the next one is the A label support for domain names.

STEVE SHENG: Domain servers.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah, for domain names and name servers.

STEVE SHENG: We originally have this to add to both U Label and A Label, and Jim, later, you proposed that we only need to support A Label. And then, now he was saying why we should support A Label. So that's the discussion context.

JIM GALVIN:

So, let me take a moment just to say why I thought we should drop the A Label, and then Naoki, I would appreciate if you would comment again why we should leave it in and include it back. This goes to my comments last week about we should define – we should define the goal and the objective that we're trying to reach.

And from my point of view, that means that I should be able to use whatever is, if I'm a registrant or an organization, I get to use the language or script that I'm working in. I shouldn't have to do any of these translations or encodings. I mean, if they're needed, somebody else should do them, because I shouldn't be obligated to go past what I know how to do.

And then as far as having both an U Label and an A Label, even if a registrar puts it in, or if the registry puts it in... If the registrar puts it in, and the registry is going to have to check it. If the registry wants to put it in, because that's what's going to put in the DNS, and that's fine. It eliminates the registrar doing it, and it eliminates the check, it's not clear to me why one should...

If you put them both there, then you always have to keep them synchronized and make sure that they're always the same, unless you leave it to a registry in particular to decide to stick it out there because they want it, and it's easier for them to use it that way, but then it becomes a local implementation issue, and it's not part of any standard requirement that anyone needs to meet.

So my feeling is that the U Label is where we're trying to get to. I should only have to use the name in its real form, everything else is incidental to implementation and should be a local matter, because the A Label is not useful in general, except in that context.

Anyway, that was my motivation for kicking it out. So Naoki? Naoki?

NAOKI KAMBE: Yes. I have no opposition.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Him, this is Sarmad. I'd also like to get into the queue, sorry.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. So Sarmad, thank you. Naoki, go ahead.

NAOKI KAMBE: I have no opposition [?]. I'm not a part of the document, and I found that even, as you say, and I have no reason now. Thank you.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Thank you Naoki. Sarmad?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Just a comment that the U Label [?] is sometimes not unique, because it carries [?]. So I am not sure whether it's just U Label, somebody who is reading it could be able to see what it [?] or what it actually is.

JIM GALVIN: But wouldn't that need to be...? The U Label would need to be normalized by some appropriate [?] variance? Right?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yes, but there may be a possibility that each [?] has its own [?]...

STEVE SHENG: This is Steve. I have a question.

JIM GALVIN: Please steve, go ahead.

STEVE SHENG: Sarmad, are you saying there could be two U Labels that are virtually indistinguishable on the end user?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yes, yes.

STEVE SHENG: And that a copy and paste not do the job to [?] figure out the underlying A Label. So in other words...

SARMAD HUSSAIN: [?] you may have [?]... exactly [?] domain names, and that will confuse the user.

JIM GALVIN: So they have different A Labels, but they will be digitally indistinguishable as U Labels.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Exactly.

STEVE SHENG: Good point.

JODY KOLKER: That is a good point.

JIM GALVIN: So where is the pain point here?

STEVE SHENG: I guess the pain point would be...

SARMAD HUSSAIN: So you would probably be... So what I'm saying is that an user, an end user, may end up [?] records, which apparently to him or her, is going to look like exactly the same name labels, but they will have different [?].

JIM GALVIN: Right. So I'm just walking through this a little bit. I mean, I guess the problem, I do appreciate the problem space. But at some... The user would not... A registrant would not ordinarily be expected to enter an A Label. So I'm trying to, if we require the A Label too, I'm just understanding what problem we're solving, and yeah, just exactly that.

What problem are we solving? I mean, it's always true that an Internet user could enter in their web browser, you know, either variant, and one of them would work and one of them won't. And an user may or may not know the difference and understand that.

But in any case, an user is never going to use the A Label. So, I'm just trying to understand from the point of view of the registration system, and the registry database, what problem is requiring the A Label solving for the user?

TAKAO SUZUKI: This is Takao. Put me in the queue too.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: It makes the.... [CROSSTALK]

JIM GALVIN: So Sarmad first and then Takao.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Sorry.

JIM GALVIN: No, I was just saying, Sarmad first and then Takao. Go ahead please Sarmad.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: So I'm just saying that having an A Label will make the domain name visually unique. So I'm not listed the date here, I'm just saying that [?] ... a reasonable [?]... generated by the registrant.

JIM GALVIN: So I do understand that the A Label makes it visually unique, but to who at what time? An ordinary Internet user is never going to see that A Label and will know, and at what point does a registrant need to see it? At what point does it make a difference to the registrant?

STEVE SHENG: Jim, a law enforcement, seeing those two labels identical, so you know, he would try to do a copy and paste, and that could get wrong. That he may actually not look at the right A Label. So he'll get the wrong A Label.

JIM GALVIN: Right. I mean, law enforcement would have tools from converting to and from A Labels, for comparison purposes, and I would hope that they would do that. Let me go to Takao here. He's been patient.

TAKAO SUZUKI: No problem. Thank you. Actually I was going to mention the same thing. So if you enter, or A1 data in two forms, in this case U Label and A Label, I was wondering how and who is going to be responsible for making sure they're in sync, and what if they're not in sync, how we're going to deal with that? That was my question.

I'm saying that I guess, you know, I'm with Jim. It just seem to make sense that we just need to bring the one form, which is U Label.

JIM GALVIN: Right. Thank you. I mean, I guess that's my question too, just stated in a slightly different form. I mean, I understand what you're saying Sarmad, and you're exactly right, about the problem space and the visually indistinguishable, but the A Label is only internal to the system as far as I can tell, and the system doesn't need that.

It's never going to be confused. When you're trying to display it, you might want to display the A Label version, because then you can clearly see that the two things are different, but no ordinary user is going to care about that either. That's something that I would expect, the example that Steve used, which is very good as law enforcement.

They're going to have tools for looking at these things. Or at least, they're going to have to look at tools to look at these things, because otherwise they can get it wrong.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: This is Sarmad. I would like to talk please.

JIM GALVIN: So please, go ahead Sarmad.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yeah. So I'm just thinking, did somebody get the printout of the [?].
How could they be able to determine which particularly [?] and you know, maybe the two [?] have different administrative context. So how I would know which of this [?] be collected?

JIM GALVIN: And I agree with that. And the only observation that I make is that I think that's a presentation issue, and if you're going to do the presentation, you're going to print it, then part of doing that is, let me add some extra information out here to help you out. That's where I'm coming from with this.

I mean, again, if we put the A Label in there, it's just inside the system. It's just inside the registry. I don't know how that helps the user who wants to print it, or law enforcement who wants to look at it, because they're not going to see that version of the data. I mean, if you want it to be visible on the directory services side, now something just occurred to me, whoever is providing the directory service, whether that's the registrar in a thin registry, or in a thick registry, then perhaps on display and presentation, they should not only include the U Label version because that's what's in the database, but they should actually do the

encoding and put the A Label out there for you also, so that it's very clear what's there.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: So that's I think what I am also forgetting and couldn't we just add at least a note debug [?] that on the presentation side, it may be clearer if the A Label is also presented alongside, especially for the case of [?].

JIM GALVIN: I actually, now that I think about it, and we talked about, I think that's an excellent suggestion. I absolutely think that that needs to be included here. So did you capture that Steve?

STEVE SHENG: Just to make sure. So in terms of the mission, only require people to submit new label, right? In terms of presentation, present A Label, sorry, U Label along with A Label.

JIM GALVIN: Yes.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. Anybody want to test the consensus on this?

JIM GALVIN: Any other comments from anyone? Anyone disagreeing?

JODY KOLKER: I agree with that.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. We're coming up to the top of the hour here. We're getting a document which is getting pretty close now. We attached Steve's, I guess we dealt with Steve's three questions here. Let me take a moment to ask if there is any other business before I talk about next steps going forward. Anyone?

TAKAO SUZUKI: I have one question.

JIM GALVIN: Please go ahead.

TAKAO SUZUKI: [?] have to obtain the next ICANN meeting in Singapore?

JIM GALVIN: I don't believe so, no.

TAKAO SUZUKI: I see, thank you.

JIM GALVIN: We should probably take notes on the mailing list if all of us will be there, or a majority of us. Perhaps Steve, it might be an opportunity for an ad hoc meeting, or should we plan to not meet during the ICANN meeting? What do you think about the logistics Steve?

STEVE SHENG: Yeah. I think if there is enough voters to be there, it's good to arrange a meeting. So if five of you are going to be there, logistically it's okay to arrange a meeting. No problem.

JIM GALVIN: We'll do something ad hoc on the mailing list. We'll see if we've got a quorum of people so that we can continue some discussions. Anyway, any other business before I try to wrap up here? Okay. I'm actually not available to meet next week. I will actually physically be on an airplane, and I will be on my way to Singapore on Wednesday.

I actually miss Wednesday, leave on Tuesday and arrive on Thursday. The date line is such a lovely thing. So, but I'm okay if the group wants to meet, if that would be helpful. I just, Steve would need you to, or anyone else who wants to try and help him walk through things...

STEVE SHENG: I'm mostly on the airplane too.

JODY KOLKER: I would not be available next week either.

STEVE SHENG: Yeah. But I think we're done with the document of the issues. It's just that we resolve the issues and people just need to read through and make sure they're okay with it. So there is no outstanding issues on the document. But people need to take one more time to make that determination.

JIM GALVIN: Right. So that's what I would like to do. I know that I would like to get the document [?] so, let me ask Steve that you do, your final pass over the document, and do what you're going to do to it, cleaning up the comments that are there, leaving comments in where you know that you want help in a Google doc, and then point us all at the document again so that we can all take an opportunity to read through it one time, and give it one last read and see where we are, try to resolve any remaining comments or questions that you might have after you've done what you can do.

What I would like to do is, we will have an opportunity to give a status update for this working group during the ICANN meeting. I will take, as an action, to work with Steve to draft up some talking points, if you will, about where we are. And then distribute it to the group so that everyone could see it, so that we can have some consensus that I'm speaking okay with respect to the group.

I guess, ideally, if this document has really come to closure here, it's now the week of ICANN, so there is no publication activity that's going to take place, but immediately after the ICANN meeting, as soon as

practical, if we're good with the document, and my update doesn't cause any kind of uproar, that causes us to want to modify something last minute, I would say that we'll have an interim report published as soon as the ICANN meeting is over.

And Steve can put it together and put it into the publication system, the comments system. Does all that sound okay with you Steve?

STEVE SHENG: Yes.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Comments from anyone? Okay. No objections? Okay, then I apologize for a couple of extra minutes for people. We're a couple of minutes over. But thank you very much, I think we've done some great work here. This has been excellent. We'll look for an ad hoc meeting in Singapore, otherwise we'll plan to meet the week after the Singapore meeting, will be our next meeting.

So we're adjourned, back over to you Steve.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you. Stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]