STEVE SHENG: Welcome everyone to today, 4th of June, our conference call on WHOIS Internationalized Registration Data working group. On the call we have Jim, Dennis, Jody, [?], Nishit, and Takao, and myself Steve Sheng. I send out some notes, rough notes from last week. I transcribed the notes, I didn't finish them. I will finish the transcribing and the notes from last week's meeting. And so over to you Jim.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Thank you Steve. So we had a pretty good discussion last week, and I'm hopeful that we'll continue this week too, although I very much want to try to come closer here on this issue about what to do about the addresses, the three choices.

Why don't I…? I was thinking about the best way to sort of more forward with this, maybe I'll just open the floor and see if anyone wants to make a choice. Maybe that's the right thing to do. I'm hopeful I really don't need to go through and talk about the three options again. Does anybody want to jump in and start discussion and suggest that we should do one thing or the other? Or have a question about any one of them?

Thank you Steve, I see you put up in the Adobe Connect room the three choices again. So…

JODY KOLKER: Jim, this is Jody.

JIM GALVIN: Please, Jody, go ahead.

JODY KOLKER: Sure. I can start the discussion again, but I'm not sure where we're going with it. I feel that the address should be free form without any restrictions on it. But just from a registrar's standpoint, but I feel that this is a point of contention with almost everyone, I believe. I'm not sure we've come to a consensus on the point that we'd like to have, or a decision, I guess.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah, I was going to say that, hold on a second. I apologize. I've got to answer my room phone here.

                        Sorry about that folks. I'm in my hotel room, I'm not sure what that was about. Hotel checking up on me. You know, I guess I agree with you Jody, you know. It seems like it's the simplest option. My concern about the option is… Well, let's see what others think. [CROSSTALK] …discussion, let's see what others think.

NISHIT JAIN: This is Nishit, can I come?

JIM GALVIN: Please Nishit, go ahead.

NISHIT JAIN: I have a question.   When the [?]… addresses to these [?]… in all language [?]… I can make around [?] …within [singular address field?].

JIM GALVIN: Okay. So, you're in favor to…

NISHIT JAIN: That's my point. If we are saying that it will be free form text, where should these mechanisms [?] …language or a script or some of the [?] like that, where more than two scripts are allowed. So it would be, there should be some kind of [?], particular text. [We're trying to give you?] a bit later on, so that he can put in [?], mixing out [?]…

JIM GALVIN: All right.   I think the issue of tagging, we cover elsewhere in the document. I mean, we're just saying free form text has no restrictions, but the data would still have to be tagged with a language and script, and you know, encoded in such a way to move through the system. So should the implementation detail as to exactly how it's done.

So free form text includes language and script tagging.

NISHIT JAIN: Okay, then. The proposal [?] would be better off then, because it also satisfies the user compatibility problem. [?]…

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Thank you, Nishit. [?] or Takao or Dennis?

DENNIS TAN: This is Dennis, Jim.

JIM GALVIN: Dennis, please go ahead.

DENNIS TAN: I support the free form text. I still have my reservations around the tie in, I think that's something we can leave to the [?] group to recommend and decide we should tag the others.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Thank you. So, [?] or Takao.

TAKAO SUZUKI: Hi. This is Takao. I have no different opinion than Jody's.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Thank you. So, I guess that's fine. I think I'm the one that has been suggestion free form text, from which are restrictions that it should be appropriate for the region that it's located, but if we simply leave the door open, and don't have any special requirements that's assigned to, it certainly does cover everything.

My concern only with the free form text having no other restrictions, is just that it really doesn't help the accuracy problem, and it really doesn't help the validation problem. It sort of leaves that door open for what it is today. And I guess that's fine. I had kind of hope that we might be able to go a little bit further, and say a little bit more, but…

I think that's a big compromise, and I will go with it. We don't have Sarmad today and Edmund, right? Those are the only other two people who are part of our group?

STEVE SHENG: Yes. Edmund and Sarmad and also [?] from China. So those are the three persons, I mean [?] hasn't really been participating anyway, so.

JIM GALVIN: Right.

STEVE SHENG: So it's mostly Sarmad and Edmund. You know, it seems that people are coalescing around proposal three, then perhaps if you can send the email saying, we try to call a consensus on the mailing list. So that we can hear those two other persons who are not present on the call today.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. So, I guess that's up to me, and we'll, as part of putting up the notes we can call up, if that's what our consensus is. You know, I didn't

expect to sort of come to closure quite so quickly. To be honest with you, I had not looked further. Do we have any other open issues please?

I was thinking this is, we're pretty well settled on everything else, aren't we?

STEVE SHENG: Yeah, I think… I mean, again, there are only minor issues but I will defer to the working group.

JIM GALVIN: I'm sorry… Yes, please, Nishit.

NISHIT JAIN: Steve, my suggestion regarding this electing one of the proposals out of three would be, we go for [?] proposal, and I think that we have to come to a consensus for that. So if we are selecting [one] out of three, we can put the rest of the two proposals and can, in the document, and can [?] and that [?]…group has decided to go with this particular proposal, and what all the questions was taking place regarding those other two proposals.

JIM GALVIN: So that's a good suggestion, Nishit, thank you. I like that. We should include our rational for how we got to this proposal, and some discussion about the other two just so that if there are… This is an

EN

especially good thing to do, I think, because our work is really just recommendations, it would be followed at some point by a PDP process that will cause it to become an official policy, and folks will be down to implement.

So, we can provide a [?] and some help in that discussion, in case folks want to revisit the recommendations. Okay. I think with that, and with the translation and transliteration issues, we're going to leave those to be handled by the other group. Because we do have a question… I think we have to leave open the question of what to do when there is more than one version of the data, if there is translation and transliteration.

And so we'll have to explicitly leave this as an open question for that other working group, the PDP translation and transliteration working group, to answer that question about whether the two forms would be [?] if it does turn out to be two forms. Anyway, with that, I believe…

I'm going to have to go back and do a careful walk through the document, at least for myself, to confirm whether or not there are any additional issues. I think we're pretty well set at this point, so I'm going to need to go back and look through it, and we'll start to draft final documents for everyone to review. Is there any issue that anyone else has, that they recall, that they want to bring up to discuss now?

STEVE SHENG: Jim, this is Steve. I would like to be added to the queue.

EN

JIM GALVIN: Yes Steve, go ahead please.

STEVE SHENG: One thing, we have a current document and we also have a data model, that's kind of two separate documents. Would you like me to merge these two together, kind of like having a draft final report format so that we could go through them together at once instead of going through separate documents? So that's the first question.

JIM GALVIN: I think a single work product is a good thing. I don't know if anyone else has any other preference. I don't know of any compelling reason why it couldn't be two brief documents, if we chose to do that, but producing one final work product feels best to me. Anyone want to offer a different view?

So I think with the silence, Steve, yeah. Pull the two parts together.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. Good. Another question I have, regard free form text in type and tagging, just to follow up on Nishit's comment. Is it so free form that we could allow arbitrary scripts in the address, then the tagging for a given address field, we would need to allow multiple tags, right? Any number of tags, because you could have the one address, Chinese, Arabic, Cyrillic, only in one thing, right? Because that is the requirement data. Is that the intention of the working group?

JIM GALVIN: I believe that's correct, because we had quite a lot of discussion about postal addresses, and the… The easy example is that someone might use the Arabic numerals, zero to nine, it is common to use those in an address, even in other languages and scripts, they still frequently use those. So it's all about the data having to be encoded. The registrar is going to have to take it in and encode it in order to store and pass it up to the registry so that it's not the data element that needs to be tagged, the language and script.

So data is going to have to be encoded using the Punycode encoding system that the ITF has specified, in order to have separate objects that could be different languages and scripts inside it.

STEVE SHENG: Okay.

JODY KOLKER: Jim, this is Jody for the queue.

JIM GALVIN: Please Jody, go ahead.

JODY KOLKER: When you say that the free form text would have to be Punycode encoded, do you mean when it's sent to the registrar or to the registry, or when it is used in WHOIS? And does that mean an address field, for

instance, an address field in Russian will be XM dash, dash, whatever the address is? It will begin with XM dash, dash?

JIM GALVIN: I believe that the registrant will enter into the local form, the registrar will take it in, and yes, the registrar will have to code it, will have to step through the text, encode it, and that will have to store the encoded form. And that's also the form that they will pass up to the registry, and the registry will also then pushing it out the other side for directory services, so that that part of the problem…

Yeah, I think you would, I would expect, as I sort of just think through this, that the encoded form is what would be passed on to the directory services client, so that if it wanted to deploy it in its local form, it would have to be coded and that it could display it, or it could simply display the XM dash, dash, if it couldn't be coded, or didn't have the appropriate fonts in order to, you know, represent the characters.

JODY KOLKER: That sounds great to me Jim. This has been a problem that's been on a radar for a long time, and we've kind of batted it around, I mean, for years, at Go Daddy, is how do we handle registrant data that is entered in various scripts? Since the WHOIS port 43 WHOIS only supports ASCII. Are we suggesting that this should be the standard that then the contact data should be encoded when it's sent to the registry, encoded in Punycode so that it could be supported in WHOIS, and then it's up to the WHOIS client, whoever is receiving the data, to un-encode it, or display it as it is encoded?

JIM GALVIN: That's what I'm suggesting, yes.

STEVE SHENG: This is Steve, I would like to be added to the queue.

JIM GALVIN: Please Steve, go ahead.

STEVE SHENG: I have some concerns for this proposal, because in order to have Punycode encode, the string needs to be IDN valid, right? That itself excludes a lot of things that may otherwise be suitable in an address role. So it's a much smaller subset that are suitable for domain names, that are IDN valid, that's…

So in other words, an address may not be, you know, IDNA valid. So that's my…

JIM GALVIN: Yeah, you're right. That's an interesting question. Is it true that an address cannot be represented…? Is it possible that there are addresses? Do you have an example of one that's not IDNA valid?

STEVE SHENG: I can dig through. I think, so for example, things to do with combining [?], they're with non-joiners. The IDNA has some pretty strict

processing rules for those that may or may not work for an address. But I will really defer to Sarmad on this because he is the expert. I think this mostly applies to Arabic, and also [?], for Chinese, it's probably okay.

JIM GALVIN: Right. So let's just make a note and keep that as a question. So, if you take that as an action to please check that out and let us know. I'll have to dig in myself too and check this.

TAKAO SUZUKI: This is Takao. Could you me in the queue?

JIM GALVIN: Yes, please, Takao, go ahead.

TAKAO SUZUKI: Actually, you guys just brought up a very good point, and we just, [?] said that it should be in free form, but once we try to introduce the Punycode as a way, you know, do you also need to worry about the normalization here? Or it's a really free form, I'm trying to figure it out.

JIM GALVIN: Well, in order to encode it, you would have to normalize it.

TAKAO SUZUKI: Right.

JIM GALVIN: Okay, and so I mean yeah. All of that comes with suggesting the data has to be encoded, all of that comes with that…

TAKAO SUZUKI: …everything, yeah.

JIM GALVIN: Right, that's correct.   And so another consequence, if you will, or another requirement that comes with it, is that languages and scripts will have to be clearly defined. So those tables will have to come into existence too. You know, that will all get sorted out when people get into looking at implementation details, but you know, I mean, if you don't have that, you won't need to be able to do the encoding.

TAKAO SUZUKI: Okay.

NISHIT JAIN: I think… This is Nishit.

JIM GALVIN: Please, Nishit, go ahead.

NISHIT JAIN: So, I have a question. I'm not clear with the [?]… encoding to encode the [?] text. See, I believe that [?]…to encode Unicode at the domain name level, to the ASCII presentation. Will it be used, can it be used for

encoding of the normal text like the addressing? Will it be okay for that?

JIM GALVIN: I mean, I think so. I think it's a good question for each of us to take back and explore with any, you know, technical people, and of your developers. We should each take some time to go back and talk to some folks and make sure that we have a consensus, at least amongst ourselves, that this is all implementable.

It certainly wouldn't be helpful to be suggesting a requirement that nobody can actually execute. So we each represent, in principle, in different constituencies, just as a context. I mean, we're not formally representing those… But I think it's, in this particular case, important to talk with your own folks internally, and perhaps reach out and ask others about this.

So that we all believe that we're doing something that actually can work here. So Steve, if I guess, a few questions ago it sounded like you had a few questions that you wanted to ask, and you only started with the first one here about the encoding and using Punycode.

STEVE SHENG: No, no. That was my only question.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Does anyone else have any questions at all or issue that they want to raise at this point? So not hearing anything, I think the action

EN

for right now, which is, an action for Steve, he's going to put together the document in a draft final form, and give us a chance to go through it in detail again.   And make sure that if we don't have any open questions, we have everything covered.

I would also suggest… [CROSSTALK]…

NISHIT JAIN: [?]… questions in it.   So it would be good if we go to all of those questions and try to understand.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Did you want to do that now?

NISHIT JAIN: It's around a lot of [?]… So it would be good if we just do it on the email.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. So you're talking about questions that appear, I'm going to find the page here. Page 17? So you're talking about the translation and transliteration questions?

NISHIT JAIN: No. I'm referring to [?]…document. And we have the script down some of the questions that our working group is expected to discuss, which we have not yet, I think, discussed. It would be better if we go to the

questions. I'm just looking right now, open the chart and I found out some of the questions [?]…

JIM GALVIN:

Yes, thank you. Obviously we should, you're absolutely right. We need to confirm with our charter that we have done all of the work that we've been asked to do. So we should include that action too. That's probably something Steve, you and I can take a look at. And then bring an action to the work group at our next meeting here, if we need to. So that's that, and address document, Steve, address final document.

You're going to pull the pieces together for us, and then each of us will have to do a careful review to see what open questions or concerns that we might have where it might be incomplete. So begin the process of finishing that off. We'll check out the charter Steve, and I do think for each of us, as members of this work party, it is important for us to be taking, to consider whether or not our recommendations are actually possible.

And, you know, each of us should reach into our communities, either just internally, or you know, find some folks to talk to, just to make sure that we're not setting up something here which really is not doable and doesn't make sense. So I think that's it for right now. Unless anybody has anything else that's for action, we can, we should plan to meet again next week.

Well, first I should ask Steve, when do you think we'll be able to get a document out to us?

STEVE SHENG:	I think next week should be fine. I should be able to do it by this Friday. When is next week? Yeah, I think next week will be fine. Yeah. I can get a document out by Monday, next Monday at the latest.
JIM GALVIN:	Okay. I think that sounds fine to me. That gives us each a couple of days. Are folks okay with that? Having it… If Steve gets a document out by Monday the 9th, we'll have approximately two days to review it, and have a meeting next Wednesday. Anyone want to propose a different plan?
NISHIT JAIN:	This is Nishit. I'm okay with this.
JIM GALVIN:	Okay. Thank you.
JODY KOLKER:	This is Jody. I'm okay with it.
JIM GALVIN:	Good. Good, thanks. Okay. So let's go with that. And I don't believe we have any other business, so I'm going to suggest that we adjourn early for today, and we each get back about 20 minutes in our day. So Steve, over to you to adjourn us.

STEVE SHENG:	Thank you Jim. One last item I would like to request some help is, if I could have a few members provide me some justification for option three.

JIM GALVIN:	You mean for proposal three?

STEVE SHENG:	Proposal three, yeah.

JIM GALVIN:	Okay. Can we take that to the mailing list? Yeah, put this request on the mailing list, propose to provide some text.

STEVE SHENG:	Yeah. Is that okay?

JODY KOLKER:	Yeah, that sounds great to mean.

STEVE SHENG:	Yup. Okay, thank you everyone. Operator could you close the recording? Operator? Operator, could you close the call?

OPERATOR:	Yes, I will turn the recording off.

STEVE SHENG: Okay, thank you. Okay, thank you everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]