
STEVE SHENG: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to today, September 10th, 2014 call on the WHOIS internationalized registration data expert working group. On the line we have Dennis, Jody, Nishit, [Naoki], Takao, Jim, and myself, Steve Sheng. So over to you Jim.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you Steve. And thank you everyone for joining us here and coming back onboard. I apologize, Steve and I were late here in pulling some of the text together over the last couple of days and getting out what we did. But I appreciate folks who jumped in and took a look at things and started to make some comments.

Just a quick logistical overall comment here for, Steve and I were checking dates and deadlines here. I'm a little nervous at the moment. We had talked about trying to be done by Los Angeles, at least the bulk of the work by then. I'm a little nervous as to whether or not we're actually going to be able to do that, unfortunately.

Steve and I have a conflict next week and we won't be able to meet next week. We have a SSAC workshop to attend to. And it will be all day on Wednesday. And that's going to put us back a week, and I believe, if I've got my calendar right, that only gives us two more opportunities to meet before the ICANN meeting, because the eighth, yeah so two more. So it's not clear to me we'll be able to meet on the eighth, we haven't really talked about people's travel plans for the ICANN meeting or the week after.

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.

And in any case, clearly we're not going to make any kind of publication cycle before the next ICANN meeting, at the rate that we're going. I don't want to feel... I mean, although I want to get this done and be out of this, I don't want to feel constrained or pressured to push and force this to be done by LA. I'm much more inclined at this point, I feel like that we're sort of coming together, and I really want to put the time and effort into trying to document and carefully being clear about everything that we're trying to say.

So I'm not inclined to pressure us to be done by LA, but I would be interesting in any comments that anyone has to make about the schedule. I don't imagine we would go very much longer than LA. I absolutely don't think there is any reason we should be running past the end of this year, even if we spread out our meetings a bit because of other trouble conflicts. But that's where I am.

Any comments from anyone? Opinions?

JODY KOLKER: This is Jody. I'm fine with that.

JIM GALVIN: Okay, so thank you Jody. I'm not hearing objection from anyone. So, you know, just quick reiteration and summary. I mean, I think we are in a pretty good place, but I want to spend the time making sure that we get this right. I want to do a really good job here, and make sure that there is no confusion. So okay.

Does that sound good to you Steve, in particular, and you know, you're prepared to follow this through with that in mind?

STEVE SHENG: I can try. I'm not sure I can follow through, but if not, I will make sure to find some other staff to give you support.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. So, yeah, we sort of indirectly made visible there that Steve has many additional responsibilities. We were kind of hoping that this would all be put aside so that we could be done here and Steve would get his time back and be free to move on to other things. So we may have an issue there, but we're going to manage that. So hopefully that will all be under control. Things will be smooth for us as we go along.

Okay. So, at this point, let's just dig into the comments that we have. How would people like to see this? I'll make a suggestion. I've added a section 3.3, so let me start with the overall, you know, sort of structure question of whether that... Does anyone think whether that's a real issue, or that we should do something different? Is it okay to have that technical challenges, section 3.3? Where we dig into specifics?

Okay. So not hearing anything, I'm assuming we're going to go forward here with that. So at that point, then I think I'm just going to page through the document here, and grab onto some of the comments that others made here, and put in. So I'm going to page through, I have some comments here to myself. And I'll ask a couple of them here on the list as we go through.

So on page five is where we first have this reference to the fact that there is more than one proposal. I was realizing in this document, while we were moving forward with the data model, we kind of overlooked going backwards, and taking out the three proposals. So we are going to move forward with just one proposal. I believe that our current consensus is in the direction of the address being appropriate to the region in which it is located.

So I'm not inclined to just start ripping out text yet, but I wanted to state that is the direction I believe we are heading, in case anybody wants to jump up and actually object to that outright. But I do want to start to clean up the text with that in mind. And that's my comment here at page five. I have that comment about do we really need this? What I really mean is, let's pick the one we're going with and we have to clean all the text up to go along with that.

Okay? And... So the next comment that's in here is actually one from Noki on page seven, where he is talking about the contact identifier types. And I believe the answer to that comment is yes. And if no one objects, then that's way I'll resolve that, is creating a reference to that particular section, just as you suggest there, Noki. And then we'll resolve that when we fix that. So that was a good catch, thank you.

All right. So scrolling on down from there. Yeah, so beginning in section three, scope and methodology, I added that paragraph that I highlighted there at the bottom of page 10, where I say that it needs to be written differently, I kind of wrote it in a rather direct way. I was trying to put some introduction there. What I really want there is, I want to go back and look and remind myself how the director services expert working

group described what it was doing. You know, it's a model of providing an ideal solution, or sort of the preferred solution. The context in which we want to set here is that since we're just proving expert working group recommendations, I think that we should paint the best picture that we can.

And then highlight the issues that we know exist. I'm suggesting that the overall process is the next step after our group is, when a PDP group is created, presumably, or an implementation plan is created depending on what the next action is out of this group, they will need to identify what they want to do about the open technical challenges. That will be the opportunity when they decide that there is a transition process and, you know, to lay out the specifics of what is to be implemented now versus what will be implemented later, and the steps along the way.

And so, our goal is simply to call out the questions and make it known that there are challenges that need to be addressed when it comes time to implement. And I need to find something better than those two sentences to describe all of that. Does that seem reasonable to people?

So I'm not hearing any objections. Okay. And then moving to the bottom of page 11, I see Noki that you changed domain information, and thank you for that, but I was referring actually to all of the labels. If you can change all of the labels, mostly because I realize that that is not the way you actually do it right now, but I think it's appropriate for us in this document, again, to be describing the full spectrum. So the... We have one nice work, the Japanese example, let's get it all in Japanese.

And then when we have the other example, where things are localized, I think that that's where we'll use other names. So if you could actually fix the rest of those up, that would be very helpful.

Okay. Continuing to scroll down. People can feel free to stop me if you want to get somewhere else. Okay. So moving into section 3.3.1, so section 3.3 the technical considerations. So yeah, the word transform, everybody has been saying translation and transliteration. The transform verb comes from that translation and transliteration solution study that ICANN did.

So we just have to pull in a reference to that and explain that word. That's what I want to do there. Let's see, let's move down to Noki's comment. We should divide the section of ECT and WHOIS problems. Sure. So, question Noki, do you think that we should have subsections inside of the technical protocol section? Or do you think we should split the whole thing into two sections?

NOKI: I think subsection is preferred.

JIM GALVIN: So subsection, okay. So I guess that's fine with me. I like the structure, and that has a nice advantage that it gets it into the table of contents and that makes it easy to reference and for people to go and find. So I actually like that. All right. So we'll do that in another iteration. So moving down to the bottom of page 16 here to Jodi's comment.

So, we'll have to fix the statement, but if the attribute type, which can be look or int, I think I've got that right, and as I... I mean, that particular attribute can be on any protocol element. So it's not about one language or script for the overall EPP object, it's a type attribute for each of the elements inside. That that attribute is valid for all elements. I think that's true.

Since you asked the question, it's also worth a double check, which I'll do that and make sure.

JODY KOLKER:

Well, I think you're right Jim. But to me, the statement reads that you can have, you can mix, you can put a language and script on each data element, which I don't think you can.

JIM GALVIN:

I actually thought that you could. And you're saying no. Okay.

JODY KOLKER:

I looked at the RFC, and I didn't see anywhere where you can specify a language or a script. I mean, I'm not as familiar as I'd like to be with it, but looking at the document, I couldn't find that as far as RFC 53 or 5730.

JIM GALVIN:

Oh, okay.

JODY KOLKER: That's what I don't understand.

JIM GALVIN: Now I understand the issue. I'm sorry, go ahead, who was talking?

JODY KOLKER: This is Jodi.

JIM GALVIN: No, it sounded like someone else jumped in there? Okay. You're right Jody. I'm saying that very poorly. The way that I look at... There is a way to put a tag identifier on these things, and what actually has to happen, and you're right, I have to go look up exactly how to do this and get the specification right.

So now that you've called this out and asked this question, you've made me realized that this is not represented well. It's not that you can specify separately the language or script, the deal is you can put a tag on things, and that tag has to be a label which actually embodies both the language and script together itself. That's the way this is done. That's kind of the technical issue, and it's an interesting point in XML in general as to whether or not you want to be able to split those apart, or you want to create a registry of labels where each label represents a language and script pair.

So that's the issue. And I'll have, I mean, even myself. I don't work with this stuff every day, so I have to go back and look up the details so that

we can explain this right. So that was a good catch and I will expand on that to make that both clearer and certainly accurate.

JODY KOLKER:

Okay.

JIM GALVIN:

Okay. I think that's it. I mean, those are the comments that are there for 3.3.1. If there is nothing else in that section, we'll move on to the next one here, which is actually quite short. That was the one section, really didn't expand on that. I got to writing the thematic sentence, but not did not expand on the technical and what needs to go there. But I presume that we all understand what has to be filled out and described there.

And this is where we'll get to say more about the fact that the labels that are used are, represent a pair, both the language and the script. But the point here is that, you know, in order to, validation is what requires, and what are to really properly do validation here, and make sure you've got the right language and script involved, you have to have something to compare it to. And so the obvious challenge that exists is the fact that a registry of such things is not there.

And so that needs to come into existence. And the suggestion here, the recommendation that comes out of this, is that ICANN should facilitate the creation, and then of course, development of precisely that registry. So that, you know, registrars and others can make use of it in an efficient way. Okay.

And then the workload changes, no one else had any real comment in that section at the moment.

JODY KOLKER: Jim, this is Jody.

JIM GALVIN: Please, Jody, go ahead.

JODY KOLKER: As far as the workflow changes are required at registrars, are we suggesting in here that someone will have to take a standardization look at how addresses are to be sent to the registries? As far as, you know, region specific script and language?

JIM GALVIN: I see two problem spaces, and you know, let me see if I can... And I honestly, I truly do not have a bias in terms of the solution space here. Okay? But I do see two problem spaces. We're going to describe the problem in terms of solutions, unfortunately because it's just easiest for me to think about it that way, okay?

So there is the registrar side of it, which is the presentation to the user, or the request from the user of their address. What's the right way to do that? Right? In today's market, we have basically the Western construct of, put up a form, right? Address line one, line two, state,

postal code, that kind of stuff, and put it there. I don't think that's going to work in the future.

If you're going to truly internationalize and you want to represent the best part of the market, that's not a general solution. You need to know the country that a registrant is coming from, and then you need to ask them for the appropriate information to that country, which presumes that you kind of know what that is. Now, that to me is the workload change.

Now on the other hand, a potential solution here in the space is that, not all registrars work all over the world, right? I mean, Go Daddy that has the greatest burden here in this space, but other registrars have very limited business scope. So it may be that they can just drop a form out there that because they're only interested in talking with certain registrants anyway. And if you don't fit into that model, you can't fill out the form, that doesn't worry them.

But that's one problem space. Does that make sense?

JODY KOLKER:

Yes.

JIM GALVIN:

Okay. The second part of the problem space is, what does the registry store? And in this case, I'm thinking about the ability to support search. Okay? Because the ability to support search means that you have to be able to create indices in a database. And to be able to create indices, you've got to have a structure on the data.

And if I'm going to have structure on the data, if I've already bought into the idea that the Western construct of address line, two, city, state, and postal code isn't going to work, that turns out to be the structure of the database that's used. And if that's not the structure of the database we're going to use, just exactly what is the structure of the database?

And obviously that's important because it determines what's available to those indices to make searching work. And I don't really know the answer there, but I observe that it's a problem space. Make sense?

JODY KOLKER: Okay.

JIM GALVIN: And that actually effects registry, registrars too to the extent that, you know, com, net, and jobs, and what is it? Com, net, jobs, those are the only three that are in the registries. And while they continue to be within registries, the registrars have got all of the data. So they actually have that problem too for now. So now that I've gone through saying all of that, what's interesting is that is what I really need to, this text needs to be expanded to kind of say all of that too.

I think that would be helpful. Would that be correct?

JODY KOLKER: Yes.

JIM GALVIN:

I mean, you know, down the road, one possible solution could be here that the domain name ecosystem, if you will, simply decides that it's going to take address in this form, or maybe it's going to say, you know, "Here's an open box. Just type in whatever here. And we'll just store it as a flat string and somehow learn to represent [inaudible] returns, if you will." You know, sort of the standard, old time computer science problem, right?

I don't know. Just making stuff up here. Okay. That gets us to the end of that new text. Let's keep scrolling down here, to see I don't actually remember offhand what other comments I made later on. Yeah. If there is anything new. Oh, here is a comment. No, that's an old comment. Okay.

Oh, here is a good question for the group. So, moving to the bottom of page 25. We have section 6.1.4 and 6.1.5, country followed by country code. And I'm suddenly thinking to myself, should these things be required to match? Because we don't say that here. That seems like a sensible thing to do to me, you know, that those things should match. However, what struck me is that well, maybe not.

Maybe we don't want to pick those two out. We may want to have, we may want to let the requirements of those things to match to fall out of the validation of the address. Because arguably, I mean, all of the address components need to fit together. So there is a matching thing here which goes between country and country code. And then there is the whether or not the address is operationally valid at all.

And so the question that I have here for the group is, do we want to speak to this issue at all? I think we could reasonably say nothing, but I also think we could reasonably say that the country and country code have to match. And then the secondary question too, if we say they have to match is, do we want to say anything interesting about the postal code?

Comments?

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

JIM GALVIN: Jody, please go ahead.

JODY KOLKER: I'm not sure if it's within our, what do I want to say? Whatever we've been given to produce here, to produce a verification engine like that, I think that that's been covered by a RAA, and I'm not sure that we want to get into the validation of country and country code, because if we do that, should we get into the validation of city within a postal, within a region, city within a state, street within a state, or street within a city? That kind of thing.

Where do we stop? I guess is my question.

JIM GALVIN: So my quick response is, I agree with you actually. I don't want to use the word validate.

JODY KOLKER: Or verify.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah, or verify. Certainly, I would say that it's not within our remit. It's not within the scope of our charter. We can certainly mention that we're thinking in that context when it kind of comes up. So for example, the business about the language and script should be appropriate to the region, setting up validation to be more effective. So in this case, so I think that answers the question to me, that I had before about whether or not we should care about whether or not these pieces all fit together, meaning the address, country, postal code.

So this is really a matching thing, not a validation thing. You know, arguably country and country code should certainly match, they should be the same. That's not about whether there is a right value and they're aligned with anything else in the address, but these two obviously could reasonably have a requirement to match. Do we want to suggest that? Explicitly not suggest it?

Say anything at all about the fact that we're not going to say anything about it.

TAKAO SUZUKI: Takao, please put me in the queue.

JIM GALVIN: So Takao, please, go ahead.

TAKAO SUZUKI: So, the issue here is that the country and the country code are talking about the same thing, and then just different way of defining it. And then yes, they have to match. And then my question is, if they don't match, what shall we do? It's not clear to me. So it seems, in this particular case, it seems to mention that they should match. And then I agree that we should put the prioritization, but meanwhile I just wanted to know what to do if they don't match.

JIM GALVIN: Well, my answer to what we do if they don't match is, I don't think that we need to speak to that, because I think it falls into the same category as if we're saying that an address has to be appropriate for the region, and we're not going to speak to the issue of, what do you do if it's inappropriate? I think that's for some other policy to decide.

We just make particular technical requirements and somebody else sets up the business rules for how you implement that. So I would say that we could reasonably say that the country code should match, because they should. What you do if they don't match? I think that's a business rule and that will be decided later.

TAKAO SUZUKI: Okay.

JIM GALVIN: And so, Jody, any reaction to saying that these two things should match, and explicitly not speaking to any kind of verification or validation of the data, just that these two things should be the same, whatever they are.

JODY KOLKER: I think that I just rather not address that, just because I feel like that it's outside of the scope of what we've been asked to do, even though it seems to be minor.

JIM GALVIN: Anyone else have a comment?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm fine with that.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. So I'm not hard over about this, it was just something that came to my mind. Less work is always better than more. To the extent that we're not actually speaking, I mean, validation and verification is really not in our remit, it's probably best that we don't say anything about that. So I'm just going to make that a reply here for this. I'm not going to click on resolve here just yet, because I want to leave the comment in there so I don't forget as we're going through this later, and we'll clean it up later.

Okay. Scrolling on down through the document again here. I think that might be the end of the comments. I don't recall if there is anything else down here. Oh no, now we're into the data model. Yeah, I'm into the data model. I didn't make any comments on the data model. Oh, no I'm not. I'm in 6, 7. Okay. So Noki ran the SML through a parser, I gather, and found that there are issues with it.

Noki can you help us clean it up? Could you, you know, edit this in such a way as to clean it up? I'm down at the bottom of page 39 here, top of page 40.

NOKI: Yes. This is Noki. This [inaudible]... with the [inaudible] guarantee, but if I have a [inaudible] schema, I can write [inaudible]...

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Do you need someone to provide you with a schema? Or could you put something together.

NOKI: I can propose, domain schema.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. If you can do that to check this, that would be good. You know, I just want to make sure, that as much as possible, you know let's just make sure there is no obvious syntax errors or anything like that in this. Okay?

NOKI: Okay.

JIM GALVIN: All right, thank you, I appreciate that. And that takes us to the bottom of the document. All right, I didn't do anything in the appendixes, so that's fine there. Okay. From my point of view, that's as much as I had for today because that's as much as I had gotten done and put in there. So I will take as an action to continue what I'm doing here, and expand and prepare additional text, and add some more out there. And then alert people when there is another chunk of things to look at and review.

Does anyone have any other comments or questions they want to ask about the text as it is right now? Okay, hearing nothing... Jodi, go ahead.

JODY KOLKER: Sorry, I was on mute. I just have a general question. So, we will be taking out, I didn't speak up before but I want to make sure that I understand, we will be taking out the three proposal that we have for preform text, etc. for the address. And only be proposing that the region, that it must match the script and language must match what's applicable for that region, or what they will accept for that region.

JIM GALVIN: Yes. That's the model that we're going to recommend.

STEVE SHENG: But Jim, are we going to, I think, are we going to take out any of those three models?

JIM GALVIN: Fair question. I guess my plan was to take them out. I'm thinking we're going to put out there what we think is the right model and provide the justification for it. If people feel differently.

JODY KOLKER: This is Jodi. Yeah, I feel that we should be explaining the three different models and why we've chose the model. I think that if you leave one model in there, there will be questions as to, did you ever consider another model? I think that having those pros and cons in there are good. I mean, I'm not sure that I totally agree with the, having had the region match, or the script and the language, match the region, just because of operational issues that that's going to be put on the registries and the registrars.

If that's enforceable.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. I'm good with that. I don't really have a vested particular bias here in that respect, so I'm fine with putting it all together. What I'm going to seek to do is structure it a little bit differently, to kind of put the recommendation out, and then I will put the others down as

ultimate models that were discussed, and we'll keep the discussion about the pros and cons of those.

I want to sort of lead in and emphasize the pros and cons of the, I'll call it the preferred model. That seems okay right now for folks?

JODY GALVIN: This is Jody. For me it does.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Thank you Jody. Okay, so once again, any other comments or questions from anyone about the text that we have here right now overall? Okay. So with that, I'm prepared to move to adjournment. Just a reminder, we won't meet next week because I'm not available. And not to be overly chair's prerogative, but I figured, at the moment, I'm driving sort of what we're doing here.

So it feels like meeting without me will not be as productive as a meeting with me. If anyone wants to object, then step up and do this, I'm happy to step aside and let the meeting happen. So not hearing any objections, so we won't meet next week. Folks should feel free to look through this document, and edit text, and make changes. The one thing that I really don't like about Google Doc is, it's rather difficult to track when other people are changing things.

So, I don't have any problem with people just doing some cleanup here and there, if you find little editorial things that you want to change. But if you make a substantial change, and I guess the adjustment there is to what is substantive, it would be helpful if you put a comment around

the text, and indicate in the comment that you change something in here, just to call it out for the rest of us.

I'm inclined to leave the document in Google Docs, and you know, folks can keep up with it and make their comments and changes there, but if you do make any kind of substantive change, highlight it in some way so that we can see it. Since red lining is not especially effective or efficient in a Google Doc.

STEVE SHENG: Jim, this is Steve. The Google Doc, there is a feature called, "See Revision History." That will show revisions done by everybody, what changes each person did to a document, and those are, you know, it's probably not as good as Word, but it does have those functions.

JIM GALVIN: Right, thank you for that. Go ahead, it sounded like Dennis speaking.

DENNIS TAN: Yeah Jim. Just to add on Steve, the Google Doc also had a mode. So I think most of us are in editing mode, and it would then change to suggesting that kind of works with let us work and track changes. So it will highlight what you are changing on the document and not [inaudible].

If somebody wants to add language, let everyone know what changes you are suggesting instead of editing [inaudible].

JIM GALVIN: Really? That's something new. Now I'm looking up here at the top and I see this mode thing. Is that something that only the owner can do? Because I don't seem to be able to do anything there.

STEVE SHENG: What mode?

DENNIS TAN: For example, right now I see editing, right? I'm changing it to suggesting and I start typing, and my edits are in a green box. And there is also a comment added to the left where it says, "Dennis Tan at..." Well, and whatever things I added. And I guess somebody can approve or reject the editing. But the problem is that you have to change to suggesting mode, otherwise if you do it in editing mode, just go directly to the document without any marks, or earmarks, or whatever.

STEVE SHENG: I like edit to suggestion mode.

DENNIS TAN: Oh, okay, so maybe because I'm in Chrome, and that's another feature for Chrome.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. I'm in Chrome too.

DENNIS TAN: You're in Chrome too? Okay. So, on the very top you see all of our initials, right? So I think people already looking at the document and then you have the comment box and the share box. So below that bar, there is the mode bar and you can take editing, suggesting, and viewing. Do you have that?

JIM GALVIN: I actually just found it now. I found the button where it lets me change it. I was in a display before that wouldn't let me change it. I changed mine to suggesting. Does it not change the whole document then when that happens? Or does it only change it for me?

DENNIS TAN: So why don't we test it Jim? What page are you in right now? And Steve, I can see what you are suggesting.

JIM GALVIN: I'm on the title page.

DENNIS TAN: You're on the title page...

JIM GALVIN: What I mean is, go to the top of the document. I changed my mode to suggesting. Does that change it for everybody? Or just for me?

DENNIS TAN: I'm typing as of now. Do you see...

JIM GALVIN: I did. You put draft in front of draft and it put it over there. I changed the mode of the document.

STEVE SHENG: Yeah, oh good.

JIM GALVIN: Outstanding Dennis. That must be a relatively new feature.

DENNIS TAN: I think it's new. I don't recall seeing it before.

STEVE SHENG: I don't seem to know how to change it though. So let me...

DENNIS TAN: I wondered if I just do the, yup. It works like Word track changes. So over ran draft with lower case, and you can see the, right?

JIM GALVIN: See it exactly. Awesome.

DENNIS TAN: Yes, I see that now it's already testing it too. So yeah, if we could use suggesting when I want to keep track of the languages that we are adding, or suggest [inaudible], we should use this feature.

JIM GALVIN: That is just outstanding. So thank you for that Dennis. I had not known that that feature existed, and yeah. So I changed the document suggesting, let's all try and keep it that way, and that will satisfy the concern. Good.

Okay. So anything else from anyone? All right, so our next meeting will be in two weeks, and you know, let's continue to give this document as thorough review as we can. Please add and make changes in this suggesting mode, and that will be a good thing. So Steve, over to you to adjourn.

STEVE SHENG: Was there someone trying to speak? Okay, hearing none. The meeting is adjourned. Our next meeting will be in two weeks, on Wednesday in two weeks. And with that, thank you very much. Could you stop the recording?

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]
