WHOIS Review Team IRD Expert Working Call

**Date:** 4 December 2013, 9:00am EST, 6:00am PST

**Participants:** Jim Galvin (Chair), Sarmad Hussain, Nishit Jain , Naoki Kambe, Jody Kolker, Takao Suzuki, Dennis Tan, Edmon Chung, Steve Sheng.

**Notes:**

The WG discussed our relationship with other WGs. In particular with GNSO PDP, and EWG:

* with respect to GNSO PDP on translation and transliteration. The distinction could be that the working group would
* The WG articulated some principles: 1) taking the users input capability (keyboard) when determining the internationalization requirements.
* The WG discussed the work approach, and favored to focus on categories of data rather than data elements themselves
  + This is because data elements can change from time to time, but the categories are more or less stable.
  + Some categories discussed are under the control of registrant v.s. registry and registar elements.
  + Some discussions on whether to define categories by data elements or by usage.
  + A process to consider new element requirements.
  + The different categories discussed so far are:
    - Dates:
    - Contact information:
    - Phone numbers:
    - Statuses
    - Identifier elements
    - [incomplete list]

**Decisions:**

- The WG decides that it is better to focus on categories of data elements, rather than specific data elements.

**Action items:**

- WG continue to brainstorm data elements and categories.

**ADIGO CONNECT CHATS:**

Edmon: not against categorizing as a principle direction, BUT it may depend on how / what the categories could/might be

Edmon: while i understand the motivation to distinguishing between whether registRANTS can "control" certain elements, am not sure if that is the right way to categorize as that may differ between registries and could change over time AND more important whether the element should/could be internationalized and how is still relevant regardless of whether the registRANT, registRAR or registRY for that matter "controls" it

Edmon: i mean i am not aginst it as a starting point but lets explore it further before committing

Takao Suzuki: Edmon, would you like to speak on the phone, or is your voice not working? Not sure everyone is reading your comments.

Edmon: am in an enviroment where it would be a bit disruptive if i spoke out loud :-P

Edmon: i am guessing/hoping steve/jim would review the discussion here as well

Edmon: also, on the topic of "statuses" i believe they should have the possibility of being intternationalized as well as a registry policy even if it is not "controlled" by the registrant. e.g. the registRANT might want to see what the status of their domain is and the registRANT might want to see it in their local language

Edmon: yes it is possible, but it may be ok to keep it in numeric digits

Edmon: thanks takao

Edmon: hmm... re phone numbers, it is possible to represent in chinese characters and i think i have seen them in arabic digits as well

Edmon: i am guessing it can be done in indic languages too

Edmon: just because the requirements for escrow or otherwise must be in numeric digits, that does not mean whois display for human consumption cannot be internationalized. think headers for emails for exmaple

Edmon: header field names i mean

Edmon: no worries jim thanks :-)

Edmon: thinking of these items, i suddenly come to a different thought about what our approach should be... rather than saying whether a particular element could/should/couldnot/shouldnot be and how it is to be internationalized, perhaps we just just focus on IF it is going to be internationalized what requirements they should be?... anyway just a preliminary thought, again we should explore further before committing.