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Character Sets

• Profiling the use of JSON to UTF-8
Language Designation

• Proposal to have a 'lang' JSON value to indicate the containing JSON object has content of a specified language.
  – Multiple 'lang' values in a response
• Current known use case: contact information collected in multiple languages by some registries
• Other use cases?
• Is this satisfactory?
Desired Language

• Two proposals
  – Use a query parameter
  – Use the HTTP Accept header

• Which do we use?
Script & Character Set Designation

• Expressed on the list
  – JSON values to express script.
  – JSON values to express character set.

• Doesn't specifying UTF-8 obviate these needs?
IDNs
(appendix C of JSON-Response)

• Domain lookups are lookups, not searches
• Query input is A-label
  – Up to client software to translate Unicode into A-label
• Responses contain A-label variants
• Would a list of non-variants be useful in the response?
• Would the matching U-label be useful in the response?
Postal Addresses  
(appendix D of JSON-Response)

The postal address data listed in the entity object class (Section 4) does not necessarily represent location. The intent of this information is to provide a means to send postal mail to an entity. While in some cases it may also be the location of the entity, there is no guarantee that the two are the same. Accurate representation of location is topic unto itself, and registries wishing to show location of object instances should use the 'geo' or 'held' URI types as mentioned in Appendix A.3.

Additionally, the postal address data represented in this document does not follow any specific standard for postal addresses because many registries do not keep postal address data in an internationalized standard form. Publication of such data in a format that suggests an internationalized standard form when such data is not known to be well-formed for that purpose would be misleading.
I18N experts,
we need your brains!

Or at the very least a review of our
documents