

20131023_WHOIS_IRD_ID826909

Steve Sheng: Thank you. Good morning, good evening, and welcome to today, October 23's call on the WHOIS Extra Working Group Internationalized Registration Data. On the line, we have Nishit, Jody, Naoki, Zheng, Dennis, Takao, Jim and myself, Steve Sheng. The operator is still trying to dial out to Sarmad, and I will try to reach Edmund in the background.

But over to you, Jim.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Thank you, Steve, and thank you for everyone for joining us here. Excuse me. We have a -- what I did in this charter, Steve had really done all of the bulk work -- all the background work and all the extra pages here. And what I did was I made a few edits along the way here. This was -- there was some text in the beginning in the background. We don't say anything about display. I didn't add anything there. So if folks want to help out there, and just as we did for submissions, list some questions. We should do that. The deliverables are stated as part of the (inaudible) of the group, so that's pretty much a given. In the work plan, I updated the dates a bit. I did not push out the end date of May 30, but the first few dates I kind of adjusted a little bit. I actually gave us all the way up until the Christmas holiday, if you will, to produce our first draft of requirements that would then go out for public comment through most of February, and that would give us then some time to begin working on the data model. I kind of had in mind this target of getting past the requirements in time, not for the upcoming ICAN meeting, but for the next one, and then we should finish the data model in time for the following ICAN meeting. That sort of -- the dates seem to work out. You should take a look and consider whether you think we've allotted enough time to do this work. I also added a sentence here about being careful to coordinate and cooperate with other working groups. I do think that we might potentially have some issues there which might move our schedule around a bit, so I just wanted to mention that up front since this, of course, will become public and folks will see that.

Most of what I did was try to put some words into next Section 4, which I called Methodology. I'm open for other suggestions on what to call it. But I tried to put some words to all of the issues that we talked about two weeks ago as a way to capture what I think we're going to be working on. Folks are -- please do feel free to disagree or if you want to add something or you just want to shape something in a slightly different way, that would be fine, too. But I didn't do anything in the References section past it, except that I can see that Steve added the references that I had left some pointers suggesting that we need some references done. It looks like Steve took care of all of that, which is good.

So what I'll do here at this point is just open the floor for people to comment on this charter and this text. You can comment on anything, of course. As I said, the new stuff is really all in this methodology, but please, anything that you want to say. I think maybe what I'll do here is do this as a -- well, I'll ask first if anyone wants to jump in and then I'll

just go around and poll everyone and just make sure that everyone has had a chance to review it and can indicate whether they need more time or if they're comfortable or whatever changes that you want to make.

So who would like to speak up first? Okay, not seeing any hands in the Adobe Connect here. So I'm just going to start at the top of the list as it appears to me, which is alphabetical order, which means that Dennis, you get to go first.

Dennis Tan: There you go, Jim. Thank you. Steve, Jim, thank you for putting this together. What you just said about the work plan -- this is a good draft and good tentative dates to follow. Like you said, we have to be aware and working in collaboration with the other (inaudible) working groups so that we are -- we're not stepping our foot (inaudible) and we can be as efficient as possible. I don't see a problem (inaudible) approving the charter by next week and then moving along. So in general, I'm okay with this charter. I'll need a couple of days to review it entirely and provide comments to the group.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Thank you, Dennis. As far as providing comments is concerned -- and this really is to everyone since you brought this up, Dennis, too -- if -- in making future comments, folks can feel free to -- you can edit the document directly and you can just send a note to the list and say that you made changes. I assume that folks know how to look at revision history here if one actually wants to see it. What did I do -- oh, there it is. To look at revision history, if you go under File, there is an option after you see Revision History and it shows it all over there so that you can individually look at each of the changes that people made. So when someone says they've made changes to the document, you can just send a note to the mailing list and say that you've made changes. If you want to call anything substantial out, that's fine, but just as a way of pointing people back to the documents and then people can look to themselves to see what changes that you made on the document.

Okay. Let me move down to next in the list. Jody?

Jody Kolker: Thanks, Jim. I haven't had enough time to review it thoroughly yet. It looked fine, but I'd sure like to take a look at it. And I'm particularly concerned, as was the previous person, about duplicating any efforts that any other working group is doing. I guess I want to make sure that we're individualized, I guess, as much as possible.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Thank you, Jody. Naoki?

Naoki: I have -- I don't have now currently specific (inaudible). I need some days for reading this chapter well, and then I will send my comments.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Thank you. Nishit?

Nishit Jain: Thank you, Jim. I haven't gone through the (inaudible), but I was just looking through the requirement and I have a concern (inaudible) a requirement. In fact, when we said that the user will submit data in his native language which will -- or they'll get translated or translated (inaudible) script or language. But considering the global nature of the international (inaudible) both of these languages are (inaudible). Right? It says the [same] registration data. Will he be able to (inaudible) native language? Is it yet to be decided?

Jim Galvin: So thank you for that question. It is something that concerns me, too. In here, I'm not suggesting -- it sounds like you were suggesting that we might make a requirement that something be in a single script. The answer to that question is expressly within the scope of the translation and transliteration PDP process. So it's my intent to only make reference to that decision in this document. I do think that we are going to have to work

closely with this group in particular -- the translation and transliteration group. I -- speaking personally, I'm most concerned about our relationship with that group. I think, based on the issues report, that the two comments made here in our charter are the only things that they're going to be focused on, but until they've actually written their charter and gone through that process, it's really not clear. So going back to what I thought I heard (inaudible) suggesting a couple of weeks ago, I tried to suggest here that I think what we would be focused on is which data elements would be internationalized, what I means to internationalize them, and then the question of when and where they would be translated or transliterated -- if that's appropriate -- would be in scope of the other working groups. That's what I'm thinking at the moment, but I'm certainly open for other suggestions and other comments from people. Does that speak to your question? Do you have any other -- do you want to change that?

Nishit Jain: Yes. Sort of. But in case (inaudible) we need to decide (inaudible) and then we have to decide when and where the transliteration needs to be done.

Jim Galvin: Well, that's a question in my mind. Should we be responsible for when and where the transliteration or translation occurs? Or is that in scope for the other group? That's an open question in my mind. Which would you prefer?

Nishit Jain: I think that we are the ones who are going to decide (inaudible) and the transliteration and translation group are going -- or are looking toward how this one takes (inaudible) the addresses are going to get translated or transliterated. And I think it's really (inaudible) who'll decide when this transliteration and translation are -- will be applied.

Dennis Tan: This is Dennis. If I may comment. I think that was Nishit commenting?

Jim Galvin: Yes.

Dennis Tan: I think what I get -- and I think I agree -- I tend to agree with him is that our charter is to define what is going to be -- if that's the case, what is going to be translated or transliterated, and the [GNSOPDP] work is going to be more of the how it's going to be translated or transliterated. So it's a -- I see separate workstreams. We define the what and the other group will define the how. And like I said, Jim, this is open question and I think we have to keep it open and keep it in our radar, if you will.

Jim Galvin: So thank you, Dennis and Nishit. I guess the questions that I would -- that I have in my mind, though, is who decides when or where, or is that included in how? And let me make my question very specific -- the problem space that I'm interested in by making the question very specific. So if we say that the address, for example, is to be translated or transliterated -- if that decision is made, who decides whether the registrant is supposed to do it -- the registrar is supposed to do it or if the registry is supposed to do it? Or perhaps, the user who wants to look at the data is supposed to use it and everybody else just takes in whatever comes along and works with it. So Dennis, any comment about that?

Dennis Tan: I think that's for us to define -- what you just described.

Jim Galvin: So we would define the when and where is what you're suggesting.

Dennis Tan: I think so. That would be our recommendation -- who is to do it or -- it's a little bit complicated.

Jim Galvin: Yes. Well, I agree with that. It's a little complicated.

- Dennis Tan: Yes. I've read the [GNSOPDP] documents and they're also doing the same questions. Who is going to do it? At what point that information is supposed to be consumed or --
- Jim Galvin: Okay. Nishit, do you have a -- what would be your preference in answer to that question? Who does the when and where?
- Nishit Jain: I'm sorry to (inaudible) that it should be us (inaudible) going through this when and where in the transliteration and translation when we've done it before. It's we who are (inaudible) to decide (inaudible).
- Jim Galvin: Okay. Anyone else want to comment on the preference for the when and where? I think one of the things that we're going to have to do, not hearing anyone comment here, is I will have to take as an action here -- Steve, I guess maybe you and I together -- to talk to the GNSO and the chair of this other group. I think this is an issue where we're really going to need to coordinate. I don't know if the GNSO has an opinion about this -- about whether they should be the ones answering that question. I sense that, since there's been no objections, that we have a preference for wanting to have something to say about that. We're going to have to harmonize that point in some way, so --
- Steve Sheng: Sure.
- Jim Galvin: Let's take as an action to leave that as a question for the moment. I don't think that's a gating question. We can continue our work at the moment and talk about that, but I think that's clearly an action that we have to take on. I'm sure there'll be an opportunity when we're in Buenos Aires to meet with the right people and have some discussion about it, so that would be a good thing, too.
- Unidentified Participant: I agree.
- Steve Sheng: Sure. Jim, perhaps one way to facilitate that is to -- currently the GNSO Council has not approved a charter for the working group, so there's no working group yet because there's no cost to the community unless you approve the charter first. So right now it would be difficult to figure out who to actually talk to. In Buenos Aires, we can have a presentation to the GNSO Council on what we are doing, what we are chartered for, and then raise a few questions with the GNSO Council and seek some clarifications. So that would be one suggestion.
- Jim Galvin: I think that's an excellent suggestion, Steve. I know that the GNSO has put out a call for the drafting team for the charter.
- Steve Sheng: Right.
- Jim Galvin: So --
- Steve Sheng: The draft -- it's only the drafting team. It's not the working team.
- Jim Galvin: Right.
- Steve Sheng: We could also talk to the chair of the drafting team.
- Jim Galvin: Yes. We had said that last time a couple weeks ago, and I hadn't tried to reach out to him. I was waiting for some more specifics about what we want to talk about and what we need to be concerned about. This is a good time to get involved with them since they're drafting the charter, as are we, although we'll be a little bit further along. So --
- Steve Sheng: Sure.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Let's --

Unidentified Participant: So perhaps (inaudible) if I may suggest, we could invite the chair of that drafting team to come next week to have a discussion with (inaudible) as a whole.

Jim Galvin: Let me suggest a slightly different action. Let's do two things. I had taken as an action two weeks ago to reach out to the chair, and I hadn't done that, but clearly, I think that that's becoming more important -- let him know that we're building up some questions -- so we have at least this one -- and tell him what that is with respect to where we want to go. And then also talk about making a -- asking the GNSO Council for 5 or 10 minutes to tell them about what we're doing, just to emphasize the need to coordinate our work with their translation and transliteration PDP process.

Unidentified Participant: Sure. Okay. I note those two action items.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Nishit, is there anything else that you wanted to say about the charter?

Nishit Jain: No.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Thank you for that. Moving down the list, Takao?

Takao Suzuki: At this moment, nothing to add. I just have one question about the Section 3 -- the -- so next week, 10/30, it says approve charter. I kind of want to understand the exact event -- what that means.

Jim Galvin: Well, from my point of view -- well, maybe I should let Steve answer that. Steve, I'm not certain what the actual formality of that process is. What does that actually mean?

Steve Sheng: (Inaudible) originally drafted, my understanding was the working group that reached an agreement on the charter and approved the charter as a working group so that everyone is on the same page before we have a -- before we start working. So that was my intention when I approved the charter. I wasn't -- another organization external to us to approve -- to review and approve the charter.

Takao Suzuki: Got it. Thank you. That was the only question so far that I had.

Jim Galvin: Thanks.

Takao Suzuki: Again, I also need some time to review this and then send my comments.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Thank you. And last but certainly not least, we have Zheng. And I apologize. Did I say that correctly?

Zheng Wang: I agree that the translation review is very important for the registration to have consistency and accuracy. And I -- made my suggestions and comments on the document after I reviewed it completely. Thank you.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Thank you. So what I'm going to summarize as at the moment is we have a working draft of the charter. We will seek to come to closure on that by next week -- next Wednesday -- and Steve, if I can ask if you can make sure to publish an action list on our mailing list that just tells people that's the schedule.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

- Jim Galvin: Folks should take the time that they need to review it. If it turns out that you need more time past next Wednesday, please just say so and let folks know. But absent that, we'll seek to come to some agreement by next Wednesday. Please do feel free to edit the document directly and then just post a note to the list if you made changes when you've done something so we all know to go back and look and see what we've done. And Steve and I have two actions. We'll talk first to the chair of the charter group for the translation and transliteration, and two, we'll seek to get a small amount of time on the GNSO Council agenda, which we probably need to reach out and make happen sooner rather than later, Steve, knowing how their agenda gets put together --
- Steve Sheng: Yes.
- Jim Galvin: To make sure that we get a little bit of time just to tell them what we're doing so that we can make sure that we're coordinated --
- Steve Sheng: Sure.
- Jim Galvin: And they're aware. Okay. Any discussion on that? Alright. So the next thing that was on the agenda here was the discussion of the working group mode, and this gets to the -- you said sharing (inaudible) here, Steve. Did you want to say more about the confidentiality issue that we were talking about or --
- Steve Sheng: Yes.
- Jim Galvin: Do you have -- okay. So let me just hand back to you to say what it is that you need to tell us.
- Steve Sheng: Yes. So I just sent an e-mail to the working group. I had an action item to look into whether the mailing -- our mailing list should be publicly archived and accessible -- the (inaudible) should be accessible or should be closed -- whether the meeting recording should be publicly posted, whether the transcript should be publicly posted and the notes should be posted. So I've done some research and also consulted our senior staff, and our findings are, in general, there are two ways to do things -- open and closed. So the WHOIS expert working group is relatively a closed group. For example, it does not publish internal deliberations. It only publishes reports for face-to-face meetings and the regular reports. All other working groups -- like the GNSO ATRT-type of working groups -- they are generally very open and publish, for example, the reporting of the meetings, the transcripts, and then the mailing list is open for people to see the archive. They could not contribute, but it's open to archive. So we had a discussion on the working group model, and the feedback we got is the closed model -- for example, the [EWG] -- got criticism from the community for kind of not transparent enough and that the members would consider it's kind of a black box and then they come up with their reports. And it will take -- it takes time to deal with these (inaudible) and, in some case, requests. So -- and judging from that, the sensitivity nature of things -- it doesn't seem that keeping it closed -- the benefit of keeping it closed outweighs the cost of keeping it closed. So from a staff perspective, we would recommend to keep it open. That's consistent with the GNSO working group standards and with the past efforts from (inaudible). So that's our recommendation, but we want to hear the working group -- your thoughts on this -- and we will do what the working group wants. So thanks.
- Jim Galvin: Okay. Thank you, Steve. So anyone on the group -- anyone want to speak out? I -- so what I heard from Steve's recommendation is that we should -- our phone calls, I guess, would be private, I think. Isn't that correct, Steve? It would just be us on the teleconferences but we would otherwise be open? Is that what you're really saying?

- Steve Sheng: Yes. So the phone calls will be private. Others could not join. There are things like ATRT that others can join, but I think it's good to keep our phone calls -- just to keep it ourselves. But we do publish, Jim -- the regular working group -- we do publish transcript and the action items from the phone call and the recordings. So -- but in a way, there is a trace to it as well.
- Jim Galvin: That's fine. So just as a point of clarity, I want to just state explicitly what I think that you had said. While we're actually working, that would be closed. So our teleconference -- if we should happen to find some time to meet, I suppose -- if a number of us are -- happen to be at an ICAN meeting, I'm sure we could probably find an opportunity to get together, too. Those could all be closed discussions. But we would otherwise be open, meaning the archive and the mailing list is readable, recordings will be posted publicly, some recent minutes will be posted, any interim work products would -- well, there's a question. Would interim work products be available or would we be allowed to keep those to ourselves just as we keep our teleconferences to ourselves?
- Steve Sheng: Um, I think that's an open question. Interim working product means the work product that you (inaudible) comment?
- Jim Galvin: Yes, but it's in a draft stage where we don't even have consensus ourselves on what we're doing.
- Steve Sheng: Oh yes. I think those are private. I think that when it goes to public are the ones that the working group has consensus and then it goes to public comment. Those will be public posted.
- Jim Galvin: Okay. So again, just starting over just to be clear. Probably best to start with what's the closed stuff. Our teleconferences and our work in progress would remain private just for ourselves and -- but everything else would be open, meaning mailing list archives, recordings, meetings summaries -- would all be visible and accessible to folks. Now an interesting sidebit here is if we use the mailing list to distribute documents, that means that works in progress would in fact be visible to people.
- Steve Sheng: Right.
- Jim Galvin: But I guess that's okay. That's consistent with -- the teleconferences are visible to people, too, so they get to see what you're talking about and how you're working anyway, so that's fine. Okay. Anybody have any comments on that? So that's what I heard Steve's proposal to be. Anyone need any clarity with respect to that proposal? Let me ask that first and then I'll ask if there are any objections to it. Any clarity with respect to that proposal?
- Dennis Tan: Just (inaudible) one qualification. So they will be able to see the mailing list. Are they going to be -- people outside our working group will not be able to respond or send e-mails to the mailing list, too?
- Steve Sheng: They would not be able to.
- Dennis Tan: Okay. So if they have any questions, who will they reach out to?
- Steve Sheng: That's a good question.
- Jim Galvin: Well -- so this is Jim. And I apologize. Who is speaking?
- Dennis Tan: Dennis.

- Jim Galvin: Dennis. Okay. Thank you. I thought that's who it was, but I'm trying to make sure I got everybody's voice here. My expectation would be if people have issues or questions, they know who's on the working group and they should be able to reach out to anyone that they're comfortable reaching out to. I suppose you could expect that they might reach out to you personally if they know that you're the author of something in particular, but we're an open group. If we're going to open up our recordings and stuff, they should have the privilege of reaching out to any one of us and we should be receptive to comments if we -- that people want to offer to us.
- Unidentified Participant: Sure. Should we establish a process as to where if somebody received a question, comment, we should reply to that person and cc the working group as well so that everybody is aware of what's going on outside the working group? Does that make sense?
- Jim Galvin: It does make sense. Thank you. I think -- let me suggest something a little different and see what you think of this. I don't -- as an operating principle, I don't think that we want to open up the working group to the community at large to participate. We were selected to produce something. The community will get its opportunity to comment when we put out our first draft for them to comment. So with that in mind, I would suggest that we don't really want to formalize in any way this process of dealing with the external community. I think that we should welcome people to come in contact with people -- individuals on the working group -- and I think that we should all just take as our own responsibility to bring any input back to the group that we think is relevant and important for the group to talk about. I don't think I want to formalize that because formalizing it in the way that you described suggests to me that we're involving the community at large directly in the operation of the group and I would suggest against that. What do you think about that?
- Unidentified Participant: I agree. That's fine.
- Jim Galvin: Okay. Any other comments about the points or questions or clarification with respect to the proposal? Okay. So does anyone object to the operating principles in the proposal? And one last time, in case you were on mute because I didn't hear anything? Okay. Excuse me. So Steve, let me suggest, if you would, that we send a note to our list and say that -- with those bulletpoints and say that this is the way that we're going to be operating so that the couple of people who aren't with us get that and for the historical records since we've now decided the archive will be open for people to read.
- Steve Sheng: Thank you, Jim. I'll do that. And then the -- all the previous meetings notes and recordings will be posted to the [Wiki] as well for the operating principle.
- Jim Galvin: Excellent. Thank you. That sounds great.
- Steve Sheng: Okay. Thank you. Bye. Now [I'll send] a link to the [Wiki] once it's populated. Thanks.
- Jim Galvin: Okay. So with respect to the working mode, I don't think there's anything else to say about that. What I want to try to do in general here is I'll work with Steve to make sure that we keep a working task list about what we're doing and we'll try to progress through that as we move from week to week and we'll keep that visible on the mailing list, too. I think in terms of this current working draft charter, the most obvious next task and action item here is to start with the GNSO (inaudible) joint report and begin to look at what the list of elements are that would constitute registration data so that we can consider then what requirements might be appropriate for internationalizing that. So I think the first thing that I'd like to do is begin to understand what data elements are a part of registration data, and we can start with that document and the (inaudible) document and the references that it has. Anyone have anything they want to add to that or suggest

something a little different? So not hearing anything. Steve, would it -- could I ask you to just pull together those two lists and make sure that they get distributed to our list? Would that be okay?

- Steve Sheng: The two lists of data elements?
- Jim Galvin: Yes.
- Steve Sheng: Okay.
- Jim Galvin: As the starting point.
- Steve Sheng: Okay. Sure. The data elements from the IRD working group and the (inaudible) inventory, right?
- Jim Galvin: Yes. You produced that inventory, right? That they used? Didn't it -- didn't you?
- Steve Sheng: Yes. I did part of work. It was also some [CCTLD] work as well.
- Jim Galvin: Right.
- Steve Sheng: But I think UK and [CND].
- Jim Galvin: Okay.
- Steve Sheng: The data elements pulled from the (inaudible) --
- Jim Galvin: Yes. Thank you. That's -- we should include that, too.
- Steve Sheng: Okay. Alright. I can do that.
- Jim Galvin: Okay. So that leaves us with two agenda items for the next meeting. Coming to closure on the charter and then beginning to review elements and see if we can begin to think about what requirements that we need for those elements and we should have a list of elements that we can work with -- begin to work with. So I think that's all that I would want to say about our working mode and our plan. Anyone have anything they want to add? Questions? And so last item for the agenda today was the JP WHOIS experience. I thought that we had done that last time, Steve.
- Steve Sheng: Did we? I -- I'm sorry. I may have (inaudible) was a carryover action item. I may have forgotten that. What do others recall? Sorry, Jim.
- Jim Galvin: So I thought that we had the document there and we had some discussion about it and some of the details. There was one action out of that -- there was one question left from that which was where the translation and transliteration occurred, as I recall. It's stored in both English and Japanese, but precisely where the translation was done was an open question from that discussion last time. And I wish I could remember who asked the question. Give me a moment here. Okay. I need to find the -- you sent me, Steve, the transcript. Apologize, folks. Just give me a moment to get this document open again here.
- Steve Sheng: Jim, I put the [JPIS] document in the Adobe Connect in case people want to view that.
- Jim Galvin: Thank you, Steve.
- Steve Sheng: And I have -- I'll sync the document so you can just move it at your leisure as well.

Jim Galvin: Actually, I take it back. It was not in the last transcript. I think it was in the one before that. Oh no. Here it is. I found it. So Naoki was saying that the data is always stored in both formats.

Unidentified Participant: And is this done in -- at the (inaudible) or (inaudible)?

Jim Galvin: Yes. And that was the question.

Unidentified Participant: Oh okay.

Jim Galvin: And it was Takao who had asked the question. And Naoki was going to see if he could get an answer for us.

Unidentified Participant: Okay.

Jim Galvin: So Naoki was saying that we accept two languages, but we don't automatically translate. And actually -- so now I'm getting down here so -- and Takao was saying that he wanted to do some investigation and he would report back about this. So Takao, is there anything -- I'm guessing that since no one has jumped in here up to this point really that we don't have any additional information about this. But that's a question that we -- I think we would all like to understand. I know that I would like to understand it. The question is where is the translation and transliteration done? Is the registrant simply expected to input both English and Japanese? And what happens if only one is entered? So Naoki, could we ask you to clarify that for us?

Naoki: Are you asking me the current implementation?

Jim Galvin: Yes.

Naoki: Currently, we save in both formats -- English and Japanese. And also, we may save separately elements in -- separately English and Japanese.

Jim Galvin: Is the registrant expected to enter both the English and Japanese?

Naoki: Yes. That's correct. Separately (inaudible).

Jim Galvin: And is there any check of whether or not what they entered actually matches? Is there any check as to whether the English and the Japanese are actually equivalent or do you just take whatever they put there?

Naoki: We check carefully on Japanese (inaudible) and the -- but English (inaudible) data.

Jim Galvin: So the authoritative data is the Japanese data and you provide the English version just as advice. You use it just for display purposes for the WHOIS. Is that correct?

Naoki: Yes.

Jim Galvin: Okay. And you don't check to see if the English actually matches the Japanese. You just use it as is. Is that correct?

Naoki: English item is used on WHOIS data and if somebody finds the English information is incorrect, he or she asks us (inaudible) is incorrect. And we check that English item and we ask (inaudible).

- Jim Galvin: Okay. So you use the mutual -- seems pretty typical ICAN model of -- the data is used as-is, but if somebody complains, then you address that complaint. Is that correct?
- Naoki: Yes.
- Jim Galvin: Okay. So I believe that answers the outstanding question that we had from last time. Anyone have any other questions about the Japanese example? Okay. I think with that, we're getting close to the top of the hour here. I'm going to suggest that we adjourn this meeting. And we have our two action items for next week. So let me first do a last call. Does anyone who -- have anything they want to add for today's meeting? Okay. Hearing nothing, then I'm going to suggest that we move to adjourn and let me pass it back to you, Steve, for the formalities.
- Steve Sheng: Thank you for a productive call. The action items I've noted is, first, Jim and Steve to reach out to the GNSO chartering group on the translation and transliteration working group have a conversation with the chair. And then also Jim and Steve to request a slot on the GNSO weekend agenda in Buenos Aires. Third, Steve to publish the decision that the working group deliberation methods will be open with the following details. The teleconference and working group interim reports are closed. Everything else will be open. This includes the mailing list archive, the recordings, the meeting notes, and they will be posted in [Wiki] that will shortly be populated and the link will be sent to the working group. So that's the third action item. The last action item is -- actually two more. The working group members will review the current charter and provide comments, either directly on the [Google Docs] or on the mailing list, and the deadline for that is Wednesday -- before our call Wednesday next week. The next action item is Steve will compile a list of data elements from the IRD report, from (inaudible) 54, and from the (inaudible) document on data object inventory. So those are the five action items I noted. Did I miss anything? Okay. With that, thank you for coming to this call. Wish you have a good morning or a good evening.
- Jim Galvin: Thank you.