
STEVE SHENG: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to today's call, April 23rd on the WHOIS Review Team, Internationalized Registration Data Implementation working group. On the call we have Jim, Jody, Nishit, [Naoki?], and then [Dennis?] and myself. Did I miss anyone?

UNIDENTIFIED: This is [?], I'm on here as well.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. Hello [?]. Okay? So we also have in the Adobe Connect room, which you can go into that as well. And with that Jim, I'd like to hand it over to you.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Sounds good Steve, thanks very much. Welcome to everyone. You can kind of on, a long little bit of working in the background I hope, right? I was going to say hiatus, but we've all been doing on part in the background I'm sure.

So last time we met, we took some time to go through the data models suggested by SSAC in SSAC 54. And I had proposed at that time that the framework in that document might form the basis of a good straw man for us from which to work. We haven't had any discussion since then, and I haven't seen any comments on the mailing list.

I have a specific proposal to suggest going forward based still on SAC 54, but I thought I would take a moment just to see if anyone wanted to

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.

jump in and add any additional comments or questions, or perhaps even something else to suggest. So let me open the floor for discussion from anyone.

Okay. So, I have taken time to chat with Steve a little bit about what we might do going forward as a way to move our group along. We do have our interim report with our requirements which is out there. I did also check, just for completeness here, that there are no public comments yet.

Public comment period runs for another three weeks, I think, until the end of May, just about. So we'll have to wait and see what happens there. It may be that we should probably find a way... I mean, each of us may want to reach back into those communities that we're a part of that we can reach into and ask and see if there are going to be comments from folks, encouraging folks to comment on our postal address issue in particular.

I think we should seek ways to try and get some additional opinions into our discussions, rather than just listening to ourselves just talk about what's right there. So I put that out there as kind of an open action to all of us to consider how to reach back into our communities, and encourage people to comment. Anyone want to comment about that here before I move on?

Okay. So getting back to the data model, here's my suggestion for going forward. The model... I mean obviously, Sarmad was also part of this, but at least from my, speaking personally, having been a significant part of creating SAC 54, I do have an interest in moving it forward if it fits. So

I'm going to suggest moving forward with it as the basis for a straw man with the following particular things and leave it to the group to comment, shape it, or propose something different depending on what, how you think things would work best.

One observation I make about the SSAC model is that it does focus on listing data elements, and we've already taken an approach of moving forward with categories of elements, rather than trying to create an all-inclusive list of elements. So, I'd like to suggest that one of the things we do, of course, is use the framework proposed in the SSAC data model, but shift it to be based on categories, not on an all-inclusive list of elements.

I think that I like that model that we proposed here in moving forward, and want to carry that forward into the data model. So what that suggests to me, specifically, is that whereas the SSAC model is based on the events in the life-cycle on a domain name, we would just focus on collections of data elements, just as we had done in the requirements.

And then based on those collections, for each collection we would propose some data elements that would fit into there, so that we can clearly define what it is we're trying to include. And then the next question that we need to ask ourselves here is, what really needs to be included in the data model? What things do we want to specify? We'll have some suggested data elements, but what other criteria, what other requirements, what kind of detail do we want to put in these categories of requirements?

One particular question that comes up is scoping, of course. We've already said in our requirements that all elements need to in some way be flagged with language in tab. Sarmad has also put forth a very good question right at the end there, when we were just putting out our interim report about translation and transliteration requirements. Are there requirements there that we should be thinking about that maybe need to be included?

If a set of elements is translated or transliterated, does that automatically mean that some additional elements that describe what happened there need to be included? And we should consider what those are, or perhaps that might be a specific ask that we have of the translation and transliteration PDP working group. We might put to them specifically that question of answering what needs to be documented when those processes have occurred.

So, scope of language and tag, translation and transliteration, and categories versus elements are the three things that jump out of me as things that will have to add or perhaps change from the SSAC model. And so my larger than proposal, given those three things, and the way that I've characterized them, is to suggest that we ask Steve, I've actually already talked to Steve and he said that he would be willing to do this, to pull together what he can and create a straw man that we can use for our discussions, and give us something tangible to work with rather than just this theory that we're going to hear today.

So let me stop there and ask for questions, comments, support, criticisms, anything. Anybody?

NISHIT JAIN: Hi, this is Nishit Jain.

JIM GALVIN: Yes please, Nishit, go ahead.

NISHIT JAIN: I have gone through this document and this is really a good document to start with. So, what I understood from this is, this document mentioned about domain names registration data model, and that the model is just an abstract construct and which is not used ever as it is. Is that profile of [?] model.

So I think what we need to discuss is about the profile of internationalized registration data model [?].

JIM GALVIN: Okay. So if I understood what you were discussing, you're thinking that internationalized registration data is a profile of the data that's proposed in the SSAC document. Is that what I heard you say?

NISHIT JAIN: Yes. Like there [?] in this document is [?], and the data model is just list of the data elements. But the actual thing which would be is a profile of the data model. And so, in the document, for example, a profile is also given. So we have to move forward on the same line, and based on other approach of the categories, who specified that data model for internationalized registration data.

JIM GALVIN: Right. So, I guess rather than trying to create something, creating a profile, if you will, of the model that is in the SSAC document, I'd rather create the internationalized registration data model. And the goal being for it to be the only data model, not that it should be a profile of something else. Does that sound reasonable to you? I mean, is that a path you would like to go down or do you want to stick to doing a profile?

NISHIT JAIN: I don't know. At this moment in time, I'm not clear how that practical data model would look like, but I don't know. [?] how that particular internationalized data model looks like.

STEVE SHENG: This is Steve, if I may come in?

JIM GALVIN: Yes please, Steve, go ahead.

STEVE SHENG: I think this question is related to the question that is, what is exactly included in this data model? Also specific to this data model is, so I think on that point, as we're starting to work in this area, it would be very helpful to get some guidance from the expert here. In the Appendix A of the SSAC 54, it goes through very detailed, what the

element is, the format. Is it the [?] label, the minimum and maximum length, the [carnality], and whether a language or script pack is needed.

Is that the level of detail that we want to go into? I mean... So those also specify those markup language, what a profile, and the [?] using UGF 8. So I think if the working group can provide some feedback on what is exactly in that model, what needs to be included.

Those will be really helpful guidance for me too, when I do the straw man. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN: Okay, thank you. Nishit do you want to comment?

NISHIT JAIN: Yes. One more thing I want to say. First of all, Steve mention that what actually we're being able to say, our data model is it some kind of concept, or description, or do we need [?]...?

JIM GALVIN: I'll reply from my point of view on whether it's an XML document or not. I know that my intent, at least, my reason for agreeing with the XML presentation in the SSAC document, was more about convenience and the fact that that's what EPP uses. It was not at all intended to be per scripted in any way.

It just seemed like the logical, convenient choice. We can certainly do something different here, that would be okay with me. Anyway, I guess

that's all I can say about that. Other than that, I agree with you. let's just get a straw man together and see what we've got, and talk about how far we want to go and what we want to do with it. Anybody else what to comment?

JODY KOLKER: This is Jody. Just for a queue.

JIM GALVIN: Please Jody, go ahead.

JODY KOLKER: I'm fine with getting a straw man together so that we at least have something to throw to comment on. I think it's a good start. That's all I have to say.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Steve did ask the specific question of how much detail to put in our requirements. I think Nishit asked the same question in a related way. The SSAC document does go to some level of detail. I don't know whether that's good or bad. I don't really have a strong opinion about that. I guess that's for this group to decide how far they want to go.

I guess the one thing that I would suggest is maybe just I guess put forward what's there for now. And the group can always decide to back off if we don't want quite that level of detail. There are reasons why

the level of detail might not be the appropriate thing for this group to recommend, but we can talk about that once we have it in front of us.

STEVE SHENG: That's good. What I gather is, I provide as much detail as possible, and then in the working group, we can always decide to take it out later. It's better to get everything in now and take it out later. Is that right?

JIM GALVIN: I think so. And my form of taking it out actually, just to be clear, is I would probably turn it into a question which says, yeah... Like issues of carnality, for example, you know maybe this group would say, "This is a question that needs to be answered, we're just choosing not to answer it here." Because it feels like the kind of thing that a PDP group are the actual implementers who are going to be constrained by whatever is said here, should sit down and talk together and decide what they want the limits to be.

Out role would be to identify a limit should be set here.

STEVE SHENG: True. Sounds good.

JIM GALVIN: I mean, it's just a suggestion, but we can see how it all looks.

STEVE SHENG: Yeah. The other things is one of the principles we have is in the interim report, is complicity and reusability. To that end, I think when working on a better model, I would largely consult what is currently, you know, can be implicitly derived from the output of the registration data records [?] from registries and registrars.

Looking out their output, we could implicitly derive what their data model is, and kind of use that as a starting basis to enable as much of it use and keep it simple. Does that sound like a good approach?

JIM GALVIN: So my comment about that is, I think, Steve, and maybe you recall this because I think you did this work, didn't you? That was the basis for how we created the data element list that was in the SSAC document. And I believe [Weird?] did something similar, didn't they? As part of creating the profile that they're using for their directory services output.

So I guess my larger question, my real question here is I think that that work has been done. I mean, I'm trying not to create new work for you. But do you remember that differently?

STEVE SHENG: Let me see. Yeah, so I think, to some extent that work has been done. In terms of the data elements, we're just focusing on a category, not each element per se. Maybe it's needed to go through them, just one more time again, anything that can be [?]... So that's my...

JIM GALVIN: So maybe as part of putting forward the data model that's in the SSAC document, let me ask that you compare that list of elements to what we have in our categories, in our interim report. And call out any discrepancy, and differences for us. And then that would be something we should visit here, in this group, and decide what we want to do.

STEVE SHENG: Yup, I can do that.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. So, again, my suggestion is that we try to build out a straw man of the data model, at least something to give us something tangible to begin to talk about questions to consider. What actually has to be included in this? Of course, we may want to revisit the format, or how detailed we want to be, what gets included, how much detail we provide.

Do we only speak to the requirements in the requirements document, or do we add more information as part of the data model? But we can answer those questions when we have something tangible in front of us to talk about, and then actually see what we have. So I think with that, unless there is other questions or comments, I'm thinking we have a relatively short call today.

And we'll focus on waiting to see a straw man to have our next meeting. Any comments or questions here from anybody? Anything we missed here? I mean, I think that brings us to a close here. Steve, you and I

were planning before, did I miss anything? Did I cover everything we talked about?

STEVE SHENG: Yes. Another action item is for the working group members to reach through to your respective communities you have in contact with, to get them feedback on the Internet report.

JIM GALVIN: Yes, please, that's a good one. I do want to try to get some community feedback, especially on the postal address issue. It would be good to get some public comments out there. So anything anyone could do to reach out to folks to comment about that, those three choices. I think would be helpful to us.

We clearly don't have, even in our group, a real majority as to which of those options to choose. So, it would be very helpful, if not important, to get some other points of view here for us to consider.

STEVE SHENG: Yeah. And Jim, also in the report, we have highlighted some questions for the GNSO group to consider. Would it be possible for you to bring those list of issues to their attention?

JIM GALVIN: We're talking about the T and T group?

STEVE SHENG: Yeah, yes.

JIM GALVIN: I like that acronym. You know, you say that too fast, it's T and T, but TNT, the explosive working group. I think we had actually, you're right Steve. I think the last time we met, I was asking the question specifically how this group felt about my bringing that message to the T and T group, and making sure they took that on as an action to address.

Do folks have any comment about that? Any opinion? Maybe I should ask explicitly if there is any objections to doing that? And Sarmad, you're part of the other T and T group too, so between the two of us, we can certainly bring a perspective to that group on the questions.

So I'm not hearing any objections. So I think I'll take that as an action to call out to the T and T group, to please add to their agenda...

SARMAD HUSSAIN Steve, [?]

JIM GALVIN: Yes please, Sarmad, go ahead.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: [?] thinking, do we [need] any higher level information which we may need to collect through the [?]? Is that something which would also [?]? So for example, if there is a language [?]... and that data goes to

the [?] capsulated within a larger structure. Is that larger structure also part of our [?] or our scope?

JIM GALVIN: Well, I guess for me... Do you have a specific example to help?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Right. So I guess an example would be [?]... Arabic [?] ...Latin... [?] data related to each other, and [?] within the larger structure, which since there is [?]... LACNIC and then [?]... So there is this higher level [?]... particular information [?]... structure.

STEVE SHENG: This is Steve. I'm having hard time hearing you. Would it be possible to put that in the chat room, whatever you want to speak?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: [?]... Okay. Sorry, I'll try to do that.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah, I'm having trouble understanding you too, but I think Sarmad, are you asking... I think you're asking the same question that you put in email before, aren't you? Or are you asking a different question, because if it's a different question, then I'm not fully understanding.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: It's a different question.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah, I apologize Sarmad. There is something about your microphone, your talking just, it sounds so washed out. It's like all the same and everything runs together. It's very unusual.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: [?]...Adobe Connect, I'll see if I can make a comment here.

JIM GALVIN: Yes. So I hear Sarmad saying yes to Steve there about putting it in the Adobe Connect. Maybe we'll wait a moment here to get Sarmad a chance to type that.

STEVE SHENG: Or we can follow up on the email conversation as well, if the time, if Sarmad needs more time to propose...

JIM GALVIN: Oh yeah. I see that Sarmad is not actually in the Adobe Connect room yet. Sarmad, would it be okay to follow up on email?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yes, of course. No problem.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. I heard him say yes of course. All right. Okay, with that any other business from anyone? Then one last question to you Steve, when do you think you'll have a straw man document out before us? Before our next meeting on next Wednesday? Is Monday too soon? End of business Monday?

STEVE SHENG: Yeah, let's say close of business Monday. And then if I couldn't get it out, I will, I can send out what I have. And then alert the group. Is that okay?

JIM GALVIN: Okay. That sounds good to me. All right, with that, I would say we're adjourned. Let me turn it over to you Steve to close up the meeting.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you. The action item from today's call are for everybody in the working group to reach out to your respected communities, to get some comments for the interim report. An action item for Steve is to provide a straw man proposal based on the SSAC 54, and studying the IRD interim report.

And Sarmad will provide his comment by email. And then we will, I will aim to produce the straw man by Monday next week. So that's all I have. Did I miss anything?

JIM GALVIN: No, although I did notice that Sarmad did join the Adobe Connect and is actually typing in the chat room at the moment.

STEVE SHENG: Okay.

JIM GALVIN: So I guess we can stay in the Adobe Connect for a little while, right? Even if the call ends?

STEVE SHENG: Yeah, we can.

JIM GALVIN: Oh, I see his question now. He just typed it into... So, what I would add, Sarmad, is that I think that that question, we should make that part of, well no. I was going to say make it part of the translation transliteration question that you had before, but... I was going to say no, maybe it's separate. But my reason for saying it's part of it, is because in order to be available in multiple languages, something or someone had to translate or transliterate it, even if it was the registrant.

So it feels to me like it's still related to that original question. Maybe we just need to, as part of the original question, you had asked about translation and transliteration, and net attacks to go with that operation, we need to indicate whether the information was provided

by the registrant, in multiple languages, or perhaps it was translated or transliteration.

Oh, the earlier question is the element level. Yes, I understand that. Oh, at the record level with multiple elements.

I'm thinking about our postal address issue that we have in watching what you're typing here Sarmad. I'm thinking about the postal address issue in our requirements document. I can imagine someone putting their address both in a local form and in a more international form.

Would that be an example? Or did you have something else in mind?

Right. So as part of the query, you want to know which languages are supported by the IRD.

Meta text can tell that, but that presumes you can query for that information.

Well, I have a perspective about how this works, which other folks may have a different perspective, but... In thinking of the context of the [weird] working group, one of the motivations for what the [weird] working group is doing is leveraging the HTTP protocol, so they're moving to essentially a web based system in colloquial terms, or directory services.

And one of the benefits of that is you inherit all of the meta information exchange that you get with the web. So, you're always told about the language tags and the script tags. The question here is that's a layer above where I think you're asking at the moment. Because this language and tag information would be inside the data itself, and the

question is whether that would be promoted out to the application so that HTTP could include it there.

That's a technical question. I've got to think about that. I don't know if anyone else has an opinion or comment about that. That's a good question Sarmad. I don't have a solid answer at the moment. Anyone else have a comment?

So, Steve, just like Sarmad's previous question that he sent an email, let's make sure that we capture this question.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. It's in the Adobe Connect, so it's part of the notes.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah, but I think it's part of the data model, so it's a question that we have to decide if we're going to address it, and if so, what we'll say, and if not, I do think they're important questions and so we should figure out what to do with the question if we're not going to answer it.

STEVE SHENG: Okay.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Anything else Sarmad? I think I understand your question now, sort of talking out loud while you've been typing. Are you comfortable that I understood what you're, the point that you're trying to make? Yes. Okay. All right.

So one last chance for any other business from anyone? All right. Steve, you've already given us our summary actions again. I added the one here about let's make sure we don't lose Sarmad's two questions here. And let me turn it over to you to close us down.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you. [?] could you stop the recording?

UNIDENTIFIED: The recording has been stopped.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you. And thank you for joining our call today. We will resume next week. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]