

---

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: ...when they join this....

STEVE SHENG: Okay. Good afternoon and good evening. Welcome today, Wednesday, 26<sup>th</sup> of November for the WHOIS Review Team Internationalized Registration Data expert working group.

On the call, we have Jim, we have Nishit, we have [Naoki], and myself, Steven Sheng. So that's what we have. Jim, over to you.

JIM GALVIN: So, thanks Steve, and welcome everyone. We really don't have a quorum here today, but I mean I think that that's okay. We're working in a shared Google doc here. People have been reading it and reviewing it. I did have a question for one of the other participants here, [Naoki] in particular.

So, we'll just use this as an informal, I want to be careful not to declare that we've got quorum and, you know, we're declaring anything final here for this particular meeting. But let's go through what we have here and get some additional comments.

I've been on the hook for doing a thorough review. I have actually made a path through this. There is still work to be done in this document, and I've left some comment in here to myself, and really to anyone who wants to fix things up. We can go through some of the stuff that I've done here since the last time. I'm happy to take any

---

*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.*

---

questions that anybody has, recognizing though that I did just finish, literally just before this call, my review in this document, so folks really haven't had a chance to look at it.

So let me just quickly, as a reminder here, I had gotten up to section four, in the past, and I have now gone through this document, past that point and made some comments in it. So, again, there is still some detailed work to be done. I think my suggestion here is I'm going to start right at stage 19 here at section four, and go forward, and just touch on some things and get to the question that they want to ask.

But I'm happy to let anyone jump in at any point, and ask any question that they want to, or go back to anything that we want to go back to. Let me pause here before I go forward and see if anyone wants to suggest anything different than just going forward from section four.

Okay. So let's pick up there and go forward. The first thing that I noted in section four here, is that we have this extra principle called accessibility, but that's missing in our executive summary. It's a kind of a minor editorial detail, so yeah, we'll have to carry that backwards and make sure all of that stuff winds up.

There are some other wording issues in some of this that, you know, as I got into the second half I was reading, I was realizing there were some consistency issues, but I may or may not get all of those out of this particular version of the document. At some point here, let me ask a question. Steve, I think the next step at some point when we're ready is, you'll take this Google Doc and you will actually turn it into a Word doc, to put it in a proper format, would that be true?

STEVE SHENG: Yes, that's true Jim. When it gets to be at a stage for copy editing, we will, I will take that into, put it into a Word format. And to do another copy edit to your round, or have an editor who copy edits. But mostly, it's a copy editing, not substantial like content issues.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. So I understand the distinctions that you're trying to draw there. I am expecting to want to read this through once it has been reformatted. I have been especially avoiding making too many format changes here along the way, even though there are some things that kind of bug me with this, but I figure you're either going to fix those, or we'll deal with them later. So I'm fine with that. Okay.

So moving on down again to section 5.1 here. In the user capability principle in section 5.1, there is still a second bullet here that I haven't quite figured out how to resolve. Dennis made the important observation that that second bullet really doesn't, it's more of a business requirement, which I agree is sort of awkward. It's not appropriate for us to make comments like that, so I chose, I'm still trying to think about whether I can reword that into a more technical kind of proposals for registrars or not, I'm open for suggestions. Otherwise, I think I'll go with what Dennis suggests here, which is to just remove it.

I didn't want to do it right away, I figured I should give Dennis a chance to look at that and see if he has anything to say about it. Continuing to scroll here. In the next section, question. I made the observation we need references here, I believe the first one, we can use as a reference,

---

---

the translation and transliteration report, solutions report that ICANN had done, not quite as sure what to use as a reference for the second one, the second point. It feels like it needs a reference, or it certainly needs a little more explanation, because I don't think that's an obvious statement.

And I'm interested in any suggestions that anyone might have, or a reference there, or I may try and expand on that text a bit. Comments from anyone?

STEVE SHENG: It's almost a RFC type of reference.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah, I agree with you Steve. I sort of had this perception in my mind that this kind of issue has been talked about somewhere, I would like a nice, simple, clean reference. It feels like something that's probably talked about somewhere in some of the Unicode documents, right?

STEVE SHENG: Yeah, I would imagine that.

JIM GALVIN: So anyway, nothing obvious jumped out at me, and I couldn't think of anything right off the top of my head, but I do think we should have something to say there. I may go looking through this Unicode documents, and see if I can find a suitable reference there. Okay.

---

Continuing to scroll down. So, [Naoki] makes a comment here in the discussion about names. And I left it in at the moment, [Naoki], you're right. I think I do agree with you that it is duplicative. I had left it in because, at the time that I was going through this, I wanted to read through some of the rest here to see what I thought of things. And you know what? Google Docs dropped a comment of mine.

I remember that I actually had, a comment, okay, I'm going to put this comment back in here, right here at the next paragraph, two paragraphs after your comment there [Naoki]. Why did my comment get lost?

STEVEN SHENG: Which [inaudible] this? I mean, which page are we on?

JIM GALVIN: I'm on page 22.

STEVEN SHENG: 22.

JIM GALVIN: There is another paragraph that I wanted to remove.

STEVEN SHENG: Yeah, yes.

---

JIM GALVIN:

And hold on a second while I get my comment in and then it will show up for people. It is actually sitting there in the paragraph... Okay, so I just put my comment out there. So similar to what [Naoki] did up here, in flagging this paragraph about being duplicative and needing to be removed, what I, I kind of read through all of these discussion sections here, in this category. So I'm in section 6.1, and on page 22 here. And when I came across this first one, I kind of left some things alone as I started to get in some of the others, and think about what I wanted to do here for a model.

What I observed is that, I think we only need a discussion in this section 6.1, we need these discussion paragraphs, and I agree, I think I want to remove what [Naoki] has here, and I believe that I want to remove the paragraph after next that I had suggested here. Anyway, I think we only need discussion in all of this 6.1 stuff, because this is where we're making a judgment, if you will, and we need to sort of explain our judgment.

If you scroll down to through the rest of this, you get into section 6.2, where its requirements for other data elements, and in fact, in those cases, where there are specific standards, if you will, and documents to refer to, I removed much of the discussion. Much of them didn't have the discussion to start with, but for most of them after that, I removed the discussions because it felt like we don't really need one.

That seems pretty straightforward. There is a document for how to do these things, just put that out there. And that's the way it was. So I am looking for people to think about that and offer some agreement on that point. You know, should we go back and add even some obvious, if

---

you will, discussions in section 6.2. But I think only most of the elements here in 6.1 need some discussion, which is there, and I think that that's a good thing.

Anyway, having said that, let me just go back up to the top. Discard this. So section 6.1 begins with a paragraph that [Naoki] flagged to remove, and another paragraph with all of the bullet points underneath it, but I was flagging to remove, and I believe that that is where I'm going to go with this. So the other thing to think about, and the reason for removing them, in my mind anyway, and just to see if people are agreeing with this rationale.

We have already the technical consideration section in the principles which have appeared before all of this. So, I think that, whatever discussion there is to be had, has already happened above. This is why I agree with [Naoki's] comment here about removing that paragraph. I think the model for this section six should simply be a statement with any necessary additional discussion that we might need, a little bit of rationale, again only in section 6.1, but I think all of the rest of the discussion is already happened, and we don't need to repeat that here.

Hopefully that makes sense to people. That sort of is the model that I have and the structure that I have in my mind. Any comments or questions about that from anyone?

STEVE SHENG:

That's fine with me Jim.

---

NISHIT JAIN: Hi this is Nishit. It is fine with me too.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. So good, I'm hoping that all of that makes sense. I have not yet drafted text for the rationale for choosing proposal one in the address information, in the contact information address, and I will get to that and add that. Oh I see, we have Takao with us too, he's in the document. Are you also on the call?

Okay, I'm not hearing...

TAKAO SUZUKI: Yes, sorry.

JIM GALVIN: Okay, good.

TAKAO SUZUKI: Sorry. I've been listening, but I have been having technical difficulty. Sorry about that.

JIM GALVIN: Not a problem, not a problem. Since we're recording this and it all gets noted, I wanted to note for the record that you were here.

Okay. I'm scrolling through this document at this point, moving past things. Let's see. So, one structural change that I made, everything I think is editorial, betting all the way down to, I've moved down to page



---

29 now, in section 6.2.3 email address. There was some discussion in here about the email address and the operational discussion of internationalized email address.

And what I did was, it's deleted from here, and that's because I moved it up to the technical considerations section that appears earlier in the document, which I did not start here with today. I added another section at the bottom of technical considerations, way up at the top, for email address, and I moved all of that discussion up to there. Okay. Again, consistent with a model that this particular section of the document should simply be a statement of what we want, any additional clarifying rationale that we need, but in principle, all of the discussion that needed to be had about these choices has already happened above.

And I believe that this is a, this operational issue of internationalized email addresses is important to call out, and it's a technical consideration, just like the other technical considerations that we have at the top. So, if anyone has any comments about that, as a substantive change, please speak up, as I continue to scroll down here.  
[CROSSTALK]

So Nishit, I hear you were saying something. It sounds like Steve stepped on you a bit there, but Nishit, please go ahead.

NISHIT JAIN:

Okay. My point is here, on the page where you have changed the internationalized, localized [inaudible] the localized [inaudible] because then we have, [inaudible] the internationalized registry,

---

internationalized domain names, we don't really see about that localized domain name. It talked about internationalized domain names. So here, [inaudible] that's internationalized domain names, so I believe it doesn't need any change over here to replace that internationalized, localized registration data.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. So, I believe you're telling me that you don't like the change that I made here, the change from internationalized to localized. Is that correct?

NISHIT JAIN: So yes. So if you leave that trying to, registrants are allowed to submit localized [inaudible] registration data, others requires that [inaudible] on these things and comments [inaudible] of the internationalized [inaudible]. You've got, on the internationalized registration, [inaudible] and get it, [inaudible] both forms will exist, both the localized form as well as the form in the common [inaudible] with our [inaudible].

JIM GALVIN: So, I changed it to localized, which I guess is kind of inventing a phrase here. And now I forget who did it. It was somebody else who had called this out, and had flagged the word, the use of internationalized and said, "Shouldn't this be localized?" And just kind of flagged them all the way down and said that.

Now I forget who it was that did that. There is probably a way in the history to find out who did it. But setting that aside, I think all of these

---

things I think I would want to remove, and I don't think that this whole discussion belongs here anymore. This was text that was here in the interim report, in the draft report, that we had published earlier this year, and were looking for comments. So I think that if we simply remove all of this, and all of these bullets, because I don't think these questions, you know, they're not relevant anymore, and it is not appropriate for us to have these questions and these discussion in here, because in the previous paragraph, we already state that this discussion is out of scope because there is a PDP that's already dealing with this issue.

So I think the short answer to your comment and question, Nishit, is to say that, I mean, do you agree that we can just remove this? And if you do, then we don't really have to answer your question.

NISHIT JAIN:

I don't think so Jim, because I believe some of, almost all of these portion have some relevance, and it would be better to just put it as it is, so that these portions would be considered later on [inaudible].

JIM GALVIN:

When you say, "Considered later on," do you mean, by the PDP working group? Or by us in some way?

NISHIT JAIN:

Maybe by the PDP working group, or maybe the other, but [inaudible] maybe formed to solve this type of internationalized [inaudible].

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Steve, you wanted to say something?

STEVE SHENG: Right. I think this question has been sent to the GNSO PDP translation and transliteration. So, we can send these questions to them again. They are properly the proper venue to address these questions. So I think we can, you know, compose an email, listing these issues, just flag it to them because in their proposing translation and transliteration, and these are the issues that they need to address.

So that's my thought on this paragraph, that's why I agreed to remove it. On the issue of internationalized versus localized, it just is important, right, because we have been calling all of these effort, internationalized registration data. And then, in the previous versions, in the original IRD effort, we define it, you know, somewhat different from this report. So, I think we have a terminology issue here on what to call them. And this terminology could be throughout the document too, so we need to decide once and for all what do you call it, and then how to deal with it. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN: Okay, thank you for that. I'm thinking for the moment. Anyone else want to add something?

---

STEVE SHENG: Nishit has a good point. We're calling internationalized domain names, not localized domain names. I wonder, you know, the proper term should really be localized domain names. But I guess, I was thinking how did IGF determine that it be internationalized domain names?

JIM GALVIN: Yes, I'm realizing all of that now. It's interesting, though I understand now Nishit, so thank you Steve your extra context there. Let's see, I want to say two things. One thing is easy. So, since I participate in the translation and transliteration PDP working group, I know that these questions are all in that group, and have been discussed and are a part of their work.

So at this point, I believe that they have received the questions, not just from us, but from others, and I'm comfortable in that respect, simply removing this paragraph and not worrying about it. Let me pause at that point to see if anyone disagrees with the fact that we don't have to take any action with respect of notifying the TNT PDP group about this stuff.

I'm separating the deletion question. So the first part is, we don't have to take any action with respect to telling the PDP group to do anything. Now, on the issue of removing it, I do think that we should remove it because there is no discussion for us to have here really on these questions, and we're not really discussing these questions, we're just focused on the requirements of the data.

And we're not looking for input either. We had included these questions originally in part, I believe, to solicit input from other groups,

---

related to these issues to help frame, help influence our decision as to what to do about internationalized data. So, let me put as a question, does anyone disagree with... Let's see, Nishit, you had said you disagreed with removing these questions and this paragraph.

I want to come back to your question of internationalized versus localized. I still want to deal with that issue. It applies throughout the document. But let me first ask the question of, is it okay, does anyone object to removing this paragraph? Nishit, do you still object to that?

NISHIT JAIN:

No, as these questions have already been discussed in that [inaudible] PDP working group, and not [inaudible]...

JIM GALVIN:

Okay, good, thank you. Then with that, this localized versus internationalized, and I now realize that... Well, I agreed with whoever it was before, who had suggested that we change that term here, I know realize that the two of us having decided to do that and had gone and done it to the document, we're flipping the definitions of these terms. And although I think we've got it right this time, I think they are better labeled as localized not internationalized, I do recognize, you're right Steve, that common usage is to call it internationalized data.

So, it's interesting that this is what people have done. We're taking essentially local data, calling it the internationalized form, and that's kind of interesting. But I guess we should try not to change common usage. So, if we were to leave these words in, I would leave them as

---

internationalized and I don't want to go back to the rest of the document, and change it to be localized. I want to leave it, calling it internationalized data, whenever it's in its local form, because that's the common usage.

Anyone disagree with that? Does what I said make sense?

STEVE SHENG:

Yes, that makes sense, except, here is the tension. In this document we talk about internationalization versus localization. So what I see is the standard term of [inaudible] using use in the ICANN community, is somewhat conflicts with how the terms are used by linguistic community. And that's kind of the tension, and we just have to pick one, probably the internationalized. But and then change it throughout. So we have to recognize that tension, right?

Because I mean, in some sense, it is localized domain names. I mean, but... Because in the... Even in the EPP, right? OLC stands for the UTFA, right? The unrestricted UTFA, where INT specifies for the regular, seven byte type of registration data. That's my sense.

JIM GALVIN:

Yeah, I'm going back up to the top here to add a comment to give this some thought. And when I try to go back and do get another careful read here, I hear you Steve. There is this tension between localization and internationalization. It occurs to me that what we're really talking about here, is that the internationalized form of the data is, let's see.

---

We have to separate some of these things. The internationalized form of the data is if local representation as submitted by the registrants.

We do have word elsewhere in this document, where we say that when we are given these dates, the Japanese example, and we give the US ASCII English example of the display of registration data, we make this observation that any localized form could be an internationalized form.

STEVE SHENG:

Yes. That's exactly what, this is kind of confused and circular thing is. I agree with you completely on that.

JIM GALVIN:

Yeah, so we have this tension, we're not going to resolve it here on this call, but I do think that we're going to have to give this document a careful read, probably more than once yet, and probably speak about this distinction. I'm not quite sure how yet, but we're going to have to double check all of our usage of those terms.

Anyone disagree that this is an important issue to be aware of? And that we do want to carefully double check our documents and make sure that we do this properly? In silence, I'm believing then that people agree with this little discussion we just had here between Nishit, and Steve, and myself, that we [CROSSTALK] to be careful of. Yeah.

So okay. We'll try to be more careful about that when we, keep that in mind when we do another pass over this. Okay. So where we? Okay, so Nishit, you brought us back to page 22. Does that resolve your questions from that page at this time?



NISHIT JAIN: Yes.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. And I was actually, we were way up at 29 is where the email address is talked about, and I talked about moving that text up, so I'm going back to page 29 and scrolling down from there, looking for substantive changes that I made that I want to talk about. Okay.

Now I'm all the way down to section seven, the proposed data model, and here is where I do have a specific question for [Naoki] but let me pause here, everyone okay jumping down to section seven on page 31? Anyone want to jump back for anything?

And feel free, at some later time, as you get a chance to read some of this and look at what I'm doing in the document, you know, I'm using the suggestion mode in this document as opposed to the editing mode, so you can see changes that I'm making, and feel free to add comments and make similar changes to the document.

Okay. Beginning of the data model. I really only have, this is really my last substantive question, and [Naoki], I had raised a comment at one point about whether or not we had... As we get into the XML here, and the markup, whether or not we had actually checked that to see if it was accurate. And [Naoki] you had made a comment that it wasn't, and then you kind of did some wholesale replacement of some of this stuff, and I wonder if that meant that...

---

The examples that you have down here in section 7.3, so I've actually scrolled all the way down to page 41. Since you had replaced a lot of this, does this mean that all of this is accurate, because it works with some parser that you've used? Or do you still think that this needs to be checked in some way? That's a question to [Naoki].

[NAOKI]: [Inaudible]... I think, but I ask someone to review. Let me double check.

STEVE SHENG: [CROSSTALK] ...XML syntax, including the schema, right?

[NAOKI]: Yes.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. Good.

JIM GALVIN: So [Naoki] has done one pass over the details of this, and the question is whether we have anyone else who can do a pass over this. I don't have access to an environment that would let me do that. Does anyone else have the ability to do that? I guess we need to post the question to the list, and see if we can get someone else who will double check with [Naoki] to make sure that all of this works.

---

STEVE SHENG: I have, I think I have an XML, I could do a check. I know when I wrote the earlier [inaudible] draft, Francisco and I had to put some schema in the drafts, and then we did all of those checks, so I can check it.

JIM GALVIN: That will be good Steve, if you can do that. And if you can't just let us know and we'll see what we can do here and see what we can figure out, but maybe you can get back with Francisco, see if he's got some stuff around.

Yeah. I'm just obviously doing the obvious thing here, in that we don't want to do anything obviously bad or wrong here, if we can help it. So okay. That's actually my last substantive comment, based on what I've done. Again, there are still some comments in here to myself and some questions, so there is still some detailed work to be done. But I'm now getting to a place where I'm comfortable.

We've got a pretty stable thing going on here, and we really are in the home stretch at this point. So this would be the time for folks to step up and disagree. If you don't believe we're seriously in the home stretch, this would be the time to speak up. And I guess, let me start with this call here. Anyone would disagree with the idea that we're in the home stretch here?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Nope.

---

JIM GALVIN: So, I think what I want to do then is I need to send a note to the list, and remind people to go and look at this document. See if everyone else on our team here agrees that we're in the homestretch, and I still have a little bit of detailed work to do here, and I want to continue to do that. Given that we're in the homestretch, I think that as long as I can take some time and put it in and get this done, we ought to be able to turn this over to you Steve, sometime soon.

Measured in a small number of weeks here, I need to allow sometime on the mailing list, at least a week or so, for people to comment. I'll see if we can get positive acknowledgement from everyone who is supposed to be part of this group, to say on the list, that they're comfortable with where we are. And then if I can, I'll continue to do my detailed review, when I get that done, we'll get positive acknowledgement from people, and then Steve, if you can turn this into a final document for us, over which we'll do one last, you know, copy edit work. But we should be good.

STEVE SHENG: Sounds good.

JIM GALVIN: I mean, at this point, I don't see any reason why we shouldn't be done in time to make all of the deadlines for Singapore, which I'm guessing are probably middle of January?

STEVE SHENG: Yeah.

JIM GALVIN:                               Something like that? Would that be true Steve?

STEVE SHENG:                             Yeah, yeah.

JIM GALVIN:                               So, that will be good, and so maybe there would be some opportunity for some announcements or whatever, I don't know. How would that work Steve? Do you have access to that, for the agenda planning for the meeting?

STEVE SHENG:                             Yeah, I mean, we can request 10 slots in terms of presenting the reports, right?

JIM GALVIN:                               How do you think we should do that? I mean, what be an appropriate way to do that? I don't know that we need a formal agenda spot just to talk about this document, do we? I mean, could it be incorporated in something else? I mean, what would you recommend?

STEVE SHENG:                             Yes, it would probably be incorporated in one of the WHOIS activities, but yeah. So we can request a 20 minute slot. I mean, when the report is published, obviously it goes with an announcement, public comment,

---

those type of things. But yeah. As long as... We can figure out the exact machinery to make the publication, and the [inaudible]...

JIM GALVIN: In terms of timing, would you put in a request now for a presentation time? Or do you have to wait until you final do have a final document before you do that?

STEVE SHENG: I probably need to have a final document. I need to, if this goes on public comment, then we can talk about it in Singapore.

JIM GALVIN: Okay.

STEVE SHENG: But if this is not open for public comment in January, then that would be challenging.

JIM GALVIN: Fair enough. Okay. That's good, thank you for that. All right. I think that's it from me. Any other business from anyone else?

STEVE SHENG: Nope.

---

JIM GALVIN:                   Okay. Then I'm going to immediately send a note to the list about getting people to recognize that we are in the homestretch here, and alert them to start giving this a careful review themselves. But I'm not going to press the point too harshly. I'll deal with that after I think I'm done with the work that I'm doing, then we'll press to get a positive acknowledgement from everyone, Steve, before you step forward.

STEVE SHENG:                Okay, sounds good.

JIM GALVIN:                   I don't think at the moment, I'm going to ask for another call. I'll wait for other folks on the list, when I think that I'm done with my, with the work that I want to do here, we'll see if people think we need another call to talk about anything. So at the moment, I'm going to suggest that we not have any further calls with this group. Anyone here want to object to that?

I'll say this on the list as part of suggesting the document is in the homestretch, so that folks on the mailing list, of course, can speak up if they, if they do the review and they want to have some discussion about something, they can request that and then we'll make that happen.

So okay. Last call, any other business?

STEVE SHENG:                No.

JIM GALVIN: Then thank you everyone, and over to you Steve to adjourn.

STEVE SHENG: Yeah, well since this is going to be [inaudible]...

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes the recording is being stopped right now.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**