
STEVE SHENG: Thank you. Welcome. Good morning, good day, and good evening. Welcome to today's call on the WHOIS Review Team Internationalized Working Group.

On the line, we have Dennis, Nishit, Jim, Naoki, Jody on the line and myself, Steve Sheng. Is there anyone that I missed? I saw Takao in the Adobe Connect. Takao, are you on the line too? He's probably in the process of joining.

Okay, we have quorum so, Jim, over to you.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Steve, and thanks to everyone for jumping in and joining us yet again today. We've been on a bit of an unexpected hiatus rather than a planned one, and I take some responsibility for that. I just haven't pressed Steve to keep us organized enough to keep these things moving. But as we get into the fall here, we're now out of vacation season and I'm hoping that we'll be able to pick up and move on.

I believe up to this point that we have one particular technical issue that we've been talking about the last couple of calls that we did have. I'm the one who has been pressing for that discussion. In separating my role here as chair out from my personal position, I know that what I had done was ask of the group to revisit a decision that we had made earlier. Because the more that I had gotten into this and looked at all of these issues, I've been much more sensitive to the fact that I'm really not comfortable with the direction we're heading. So I have tried 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.

reopen that discussion and have more of it, and I guess we're going to continue that today.

I have actually talked to Steve separately. We had a bit of a discussion, and I just wanted to call that out. He helped to clarify some of my thoughts a bit. In addition, Steve has published some words for us. It was an action left over from the last meeting that we did have where he specifically addressed the question of roles and responsibilities in this process.

I have some comments on this text. He had shared it with me ahead of time, but I actually did not recommend any changes to him here. I didn't think that it was anything substantive to change, but there are some suggestions I would make as we get into a discussion.

Bringing this back around, speaking now as chair, I believe that we're very close with this document. I think overall we may be in a place where we can actually come to closure here before the upcoming ICANN meeting. I had suggested in e-mail a path forward for talking about a couple of things, and I guess I'd like to try and take the conversation that we've been having and shape it in that way.

Let me pause here first and ask if anyone has agenda bashing or any other high issues or top issues that you want to bring up here before we jump into a specific discussion. Okay, so not hearing anything, I'm going to move forward with the way that I had proposed on the mailing list. I guess, one last change again. Anyone want to suggest something different? Okay.

My concern in our work really does come from the fact that I'm not comfortable with this free-form text for postal information. But I think I have now a different suggestion for how to frame this discussion. I'd like to separate it into two things, one a much more generic technical issue. Now after having a number of different discussions with different people about the way technology exists today and the situation that we're in, I think what we have identified is the fairly substantial significant issue that's going to need some attention going forward.

What I want to suggest and remind us about is in line with what the directory services expert working group did, I think that it would be very good for us to lay out what we believe is an ideal kind of structure or framework for internationalized registration data. In other words, what we think is the ideal scenario. Then we should go down the path of talking about the issues that are present in trying to achieve that goal.

One of the major issues, in the same way that we have these motivating principles driving our recommendation – the User Capability Principle most notably – I think we have this underlying technical issue to call out and to speak to. That's what I'd like to propose as a substantial topic of discussion that we put in our document as a path that needs to be cleared, if you will. A path for future study is dealing with those technical issues that I very briefly described in my e-mail message.

It was Dennis on the mailing list who seemed to suggest he agrees with me. Let me reach out, Dennis, and just ask you to comment on how completely you agree with me or if you have any questions or concerns and just start with you, please.

DENNIS TAN: Sure, Jim. Thank you. Yes, I agree with your recommendation on how we should be framed. I think earlier in our discussion, we talked about the WHOIS Accuracy Program Specification. Along the way, I think we lost track of it. I'm glad you brought that back because that gives us [inaudible]. I see where the validation that we need to think of as a constraint, if you will – not as a requirement but a constraint – that we have to think and take into account.

JIM GALVIN: Yes, thank you. I like that word “constraint” as opposed to “requirement.” I think that fits very nicely into what we're doing here because in many ways that's what the Directory Services Group had done too. They really were trying to get a picture of what's going on in the world and what's expected to go on and use that to help motivate what it was that they were proposing. So that's good. Thank you.

I do want to be careful to separate out the WHOIS validation from this technical question. The other, I think, important path forward from my point of view in what we do here is I think that the validation constraint is what motivates wanting to say something more than free-form text for postal information. I think that we can propose a recommendation that based on the constraints at validation is something that is going to be required of registrars in particular that it's appropriate to have structure applied to postal contact information.

Then we can talk about the structure that we're suggesting what we thing is most relevant that lines up with all the parts that need to line

up. So the postal regulations and the need to support the tagging by language and script of all the data elements. Those things, of course, will point us back to the technical discussion we will have already had. But using that validation constraint to motivate the need for structure I think is valuable and important.

I think it was Naoki – is that correct – who had also replied on the mailing list? I'm looking now. Yes, it was Naoki. Naoki, you had made some comments about being able to identify the script, and I replied to you making two points. Let me ask if you want to add anything to this discussion and if you want to speak to the e-mail exchange that you and I briefly had.

NAOKI KAMBE: I'd like to continue to discuss on the list.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Alright, that's fine. Anyone else want to make any comment about my suggestion about splitting out the technical issues as a larger discussion deserving its own section, if you will, and then using just validation to motivate the need for something more structured than free-form text on postal information?

JODY KOLKER: I think it's fine that we have that technical discussion within the document. I have my concerns as a registrar as to how much we can expect the registrars to perform on address validation, especially in regards to the RRA.

JIM GALVIN:

I agree with you, Jody. I'm sensitive to that too. I certainly don't want to make validation recommendations or suggestions, per se. I mean, actually not even per se. I know that I don't want to do that. I don't want to change what exists, and that's why I like the word that Dennis had proposed about constraints versus requirements. Simply being aware of the constraints of validation, I think, without saying what that validation is or needs to be is what motivates this issue of structure to the contact information.

Because I think without it, just speaking from a pure technical point of view – this is just my opinion – I just think that without structure you create ambiguous and open-ended situations. We may not know what all of that structure should be, but I think it's important for us to speak to that issue that structure is relevant. When the time comes for a PDP discussion or a policy discussion that turns into a "you will do it this way" kind of discussion, those issues will have to get resolved.

I think that's our contribution to this process is to point out that some structure has to be imposed. We might make a suggestion on that structure, but ultimately the structure will have to be decided by the PDP process that follows this work. That's what I'm thinking. Does that respond to your comment, Jody, in a way that you're comfortable with?

JODY KOLKER:

I think so, Jim.

JIM GALVIN:

Okay. Thank you. Anyone else?

As chair, let me make a clear assertion and just see if anyone wants to jump up and object. We have the note that I had sent trying to structure this discussion and this text in a certain way. I believe I really do want to put out there, are people comfortable with the idea that free-form text is not the right recommendation for postal information? That we should be recommending some kind of structure?

The structure that has been put out there so far is that the postal information should be in a form appropriate for the region in which it's located. I'm going to continue down that path with Steve to try and put some text together that does explain this. I think we now have a bit of text in different places and different e-mail messages and some of the notes from our meetings so that hopefully we can get this together and people will have yet another chance to view it. But are people comfortable with that idea that there should be structured text there?

I'm sorry. Someone is trying to speak. Yes, please, Nishit. Go ahead.

NISHIT JAIN:

With the structure, are you going to say that the contact information should be text, language, or a script? Or are you trying to say that with the structure the contact information should be [formatted] as it should be in that region?

JIM GALVIN:

I'm not sure I got the first half. Was the first half you referring to just the language and script issue, or were you saying something else?

NISHIT JAIN:

Yes. What I was saying is that you had mentioned to have some kind of [descriptor], not just the free-form text for the contact information. So my question was that with the structure in the contact information did you mean to just tag that information with language or a script, or do you mean to have it in a proper format according to the [inaudible] postal addressing mechanism or something like that? It should be rendered in that region.

JIM GALVIN:

Okay. Thank you for that. I believe that both issues are important. Admittedly, my focus is on the first issue, which is ensuring that all the elements of an address are properly tagged with language and script. So that's really my driving focus, my motivation for wanting to do things in this way.

But I have along the way come to an appreciation of the fact that the actual structure, if you will, of an address we have accepted to date this notion of Name, Address Line 1, Address Line 2, City, State, Province, Postal Code kind of stuff. But I've come to appreciate the realization that that's really a Western form of an address. So I think it would be appropriate in our document to call that out.

I don't know that I have a recommend about that because I'm not liking the recommendation that I think is the only relevant one to me, and that is reminding people that the structure of an address is really dependent on the country. The country gets to decide what an address looks like. A country gets to decide all by itself. In fact, the local post

office or postal agency where the physical address is located gets to decide whether an address is structured sufficiently to be useful. That's just the state of the world, whether is kind of interesting in all of this.

But I'm not prepared to make any recommendation in that regard. I just think that we just let the market figure out what it's going to do about that. But commenting on the fact that that structure is arbitrarily chosen, if you will, or exists for legacy reasons more than any kind of mandate I think is worth pointing out. That's just my view. Any response to that? Please, Jody, go ahead.

JODY KOLKER:

I guess what I'm hearing, to rephrase it to make sure that I understand what you're saying is that structure with Address Line 1-2-3, City, State, Province is Western, but suggesting that we're still keeping that same structure for every address?

JIM GALVIN:

I would suggest in our document that we not propose any change to that but we observe that choice is a Western legacy choice and we observe that the postal regulations allow other choices. So we simply point out that in an internationalization context when the community gets around to deciding what to mandate, they should really examine the fact that that particular choice for names and addresses may not be sufficient. That's what I'm suggesting.

JODY KOLKER:

Okay. We would just document that within our paper here?

JIM GALVIN: Yes, correct.

JODY KOLKER: What you're also proposing is that we would be saying – well, I'll let you continue.

JIM GALVIN: Well, no. Then the other side what I really am proposing what I do think that we should recommend is that one of the key parts of internationalization is allowing for two things. The postal address information should be in a language or script appropriate for the region it's located. That's the specific structure that we would recommend.

Then as an additional follow-on work, we'll refer back to this technical section. Because what we'll observe is that mixing scripts and languages in contact information is a common thing. A canonical example being the use of the Roman numerals 0-9, but there are examples and other reasons why this happens.

We should observe as a technical issue that current EPP standards and workflows and encoding schemes don't deal with that today, and that's an issue. We may have to just accept that for now and only take what we can take, but we need to put as future work that ICANN needs to facilitate technical communities going off and dealing with this issue and solving it.

JODY KOLKER: If I can add more, Jim?

JIM GALVIN: Please.

JODY KOLKER: Another issue, and I've spoken about this before and I think we've discussed this, is that I'm not sure where we're going as far as the requirements for the registrar as far as will the registrar be required to validate that the script entered is what is required of that region or is local to that region? There is no ISO standard or list that says this script is associated with this region or can be used with this region.

JIM GALVIN: I agree with you. There's no requirement in any ICANN context or outside of that that you have to validate that the language or script belongs in that region. Or, let me see. Let me say that differently. I think what you're saying is that the ability to perform that validation simply doesn't exist.

JODY KOLKER: Right.

JIM GALVIN: So we're recommending that the language or script should be appropriate for the region. Then I think that we need to point out the fact that although that's probably the right thing to do, in fact it's actually not possible to do that today. We need to point that out and

that in order for that step to be possible what needs to come into existence is the reference point of what languages and scripts are valid in a particular region. For some definition of region, probably country.

This is probably at some level in the end here to take all of this in it really has to be written down so that we can look through it. I mean, are you comfortable with what we're saying at the moment?

JODY KOLKER:

I'm comfortable with listing the technical challenges around what we're expecting for the international as far as why this can't be done currently, I guess, is because EPP doesn't support it because there's no accepted standard for regions and scripts. I'm not sure what the third one was. Well, the workflow changes that would be required by registrars to validate this is going to be quite heavy actually.

JIM GALVIN:

Yes.

JODY KOLKER:

Contact validation for registrars is becoming a very big piece of our workflow, and that's why I'm a little bit concerned about how much we're adding to this.

JIM GALVIN:

I agree. I'm aware of what you're talking about, and I want to be sensitive to that. Again, this falls into the category of constraint rather

than requirement. We need to be sensitive to what's going on and what's happening. I'm comfortable making recommends that align with what's happening around us, but that just means it's important for us to put the recommendation in context so that if that context changes, then people have a natural reason for changing the recommendation or for not accepting it and not wanting to go in that direction. Obviously, any work product we produce is simply a moment in time.

Okay. Stepping back again, I do sense that there's some caution with respect to going down this path. So I'm comfortable with the idea that people certainly want to see this written down in black and white before they make a final decision. But I believe I sense that people are comfortable with – and I guess I'll just put my own name out there. I mean, I've been pressing kind of hard on this point of view and moving forward with it.

People seem to be coming around to the idea that it doesn't sound bad, it maybe sounds good, but everybody wants to see it written down before we make a final commitment. Would that be fair? Anyone want object to that or want to comment on that?

JODY KOLKER: I think that's fair to write it down, and we could start commenting on it from there.

TAKAO SUZUKI: I agree.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Takao.

NISHIT JAIN: [inaudible]

JIM GALVIN: Good. Thank you, Nishit. Dennis?

DENNIS TAN: Yeah, I agree.

JIM GALVIN: Okay, so that's good. Maybe that's enough on that discussion then for right now. What I'd like to do here is jump into looking at the text that Steve wrote about roles and responsibilities. I haven't figured out exactly where we would use this text yet. I don't know, Steve, if you have a particular suggestion about that at the moment.

I do believe that I like this text, and I think it helps to put into context the framework in which we were working. For me, it describes the overall system in a way that helps to motivate our first principles, the User Capability Principle in particular.

The only comment that I made to Steve separately about this text, and I'll make it here now, is that in talking about the responsible he makes the comment about the consumers being in the best position for translation and transliteration.

My concern is I think I want to reword that a little bit to be a little bit softer in the sense that I don't want to get ahead of the Translation and Transliteration PDP Working Group, which is speaking specifically to the question of who should do translation and transliteration and why and in fact if there should be a single language and script in use or not. I want to be careful not to try and get ahead of that group in any decision that it might make.

Other than that, I like this description, and I want to find a place to put it in our document. I haven't decided or figured out where that might be myself, so any suggestions that others have? Any comments that anyone has on the text that Steve wrote?

STEVE SHENG:

Hi, Jim. What I wrote here, I went through the transcript of the discussions in particular about assigning responsibilities. In our discussion, we mostly focused on the data producer and consumer. What I added here is also added intermediary because this is an accepted term in this space, intermediaries as receiving and publishing the information. That's the first thing I added to the discussion.

In terms of the responsibilities, what I hear from the last call is the data producer should be able to submit data not obligated to submit it in English but in a language and script they are most familiar with. And they have the responsibility to submit the most accurate data.

Then the intermediary, the data consumer has the responsibility to transform. By transform, what I mean is translate or transliterate the data as he or she needs suitable for his or her purposes because they

have the most incentive to do so. In order to do that, the responsibility of the intermediary is to be able to accept the input, tag it in a way and publish it so that it allows for the processing by the other data consumers.

Those are what I gathered from the discussion last week. Then I patched the roles and responsibilities here just to provide some context to this [inaudible].

JIM GALVIN: Thank you for that, Steve. Any questions or comments from anyone? Suggestions on where we might use this text? Okay, well, I'm not yet sure where to use this, but as I dig into this document with Steve here to move forward I want to find a place to put it. I think that it's helpful clarifying text. That's just my personal view. If no one objects, then we'll do our best to find a spot for it to make sure it's there.

NISHIT JAIN: Hi.

JIM GALVIN: Please, Nishit, go ahead.

NISHIT JAIN: My suggestion would be that can we put it in a [inaudible] of the users of WHOIS registration data? Then we can mention it in [inaudible]

degrees under [inaudible] the consumer and the intermediary, the registrars and registries [inaudible] and then roles and responsibilities.

JIM GALVIN: Okay, thank you. That works for me. I'm happy with that. Steve, any comments from you about that?

STEVE SHENG: Yeah, that seems to be fine. Yeah, this would be a good place.

JIM GALVIN: So we can start with that, and we'll develop everything else around it. Thank you for that, Nishit.

STEVE SHENG: Yeah, obviously, the text is kind of rough. It needs to go through a round of serious editing. But if people can comment either here on what the general idea is what you have agreed on in the past, that would be good. Then when we have the actual edited text in front of people, there's also an opportunity to comment. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. With all of that, that's it from me as far as a proposed agenda at the moment in discussion for today. Let me open the floor for any other business. I have an item for any other business, but let me ask if anyone else does first.

Steve, a quick procedural question for you.

STEVE SHENG: Yes?

JIM GALVIN: We did get some comments when we did our initial output and asked for public comments.

STEVE SHENG: Yes.

JIM GALVIN: We have to reply to those in some formal way, right? Don't we have to include? We have to make sure that the final publication has to include all of that as an appendix or something, doesn't it?

STEVE SHENG: Yes. We need to that, yeah.

JIM GALVIN: Okay.

STEVE SHENG: Obviously, the administrative responsibility will fall on me to do it. What we can do is we can list all those comments as separate appendices, or

we can summarize them and put them as one appendix. What do people choose, prefer?

JIM GALVIN: My recollection is there weren't that many comments. So I'm inclined toward a single appendix. We might put a summary or a bulleted list of the issues that were highlighted and then our response to those issues. Then we should probably just include in total the comments that we did get. My recollection is it wasn't that great, so it would be okay to do that without expanding our document too much.

STEVE SHENG: There are a total of four comments from the Business Constituency, from the Verisign, from Intellectual Property Constituency, and from ALAC. So those are a total of four comments.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah, so we could probably just include them in whole, but I would probably create an appendix that does an executive summary kind of thing in front of it and then just tack on all the comments.

STEVE SHENG: Okay.

JIM GALVIN: I think that's what I would do.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. Sounds good.

JIM GALVIN: Any other suggestions from anyone else? Okay.

I guess that's it for me. We'll meet again next week. Steve and I will make a point of getting together so that we can begin to get everything into this document that we want, and hopefully we're in a state of simply reviewing our final pages as it were leading up to the L.A. meeting. I'm hopeful and really want to focus on a target of being done by the time we get to Los Angeles.

It would be nice if we could actually get it published and out the door before Los Angeles, but I know that we're running up against. We've got about maybe four weeks, three or four more meetings to do that because otherwise the publication cycle will be too close to the meeting and it will have to come after. Not that that's a terrible thing, but we'll see if we can move things along before then.

I think that's it. I suggest that we adjourn so, Steve, let me turn it over to you to end the meeting.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you. We will meet again next week. I'll send a request for that. Then we have an action item to find a place – to edit the current text on the screen – find a place in the document. I'll work with Jim to produce some text for the technical consideration section. Then we'll produce a

document for the group to review, aiming to have it done before the Los Angeles meeting.

With that, good evening, good morning, or good afternoon, and the meeting is adjourned. Thank you. Operator, could you stop the recording?

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]