

20131030_WHOISIRD_ID828782

Jim Galvin: So, this is the WHOIS IRD expert working group meeting. What's the standard greeting? Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Thanks for joining us. I'm Jim Galvin, the chair of this group. I think we're going to get started here. There is a draft agenda purposed in our meeting room here. So, we have our -- oh, I should do a roll call first obviously. That was on the agenda here. We have Sheng with us, Jody, Dennis, Nishit, and Naoki. Did I miss anyone? Okay.

The items on the agenda today -- discuss charter documents. That's actually the most important thing. I'm hoping we can get through that particular issue today. I see we have some great comments in there. I want to take some time to talk about what we have in the document we're working with. Steve sent a final note here to the group about our working mode. Hopefully that's a pretty short conversation. I think we had that discussion last week. And actually the WHOIS experience -- this is an old copy of the agenda I think. Because the next thing to talk about then is the data elements, as I look at what's in the Adobe Connect room.

Let's focus on the charter here. I hope that most folks have it in front of them. I realize some folks are not online and so don't have immediate access to this. I'm just going to go down into this document and go down the right hand side, the comments that are in order there. Does anyone disagree with that as a methodology here?

That brings Naoki up first. He asked the question, there's -- he highlights the comment about submission and asks two questions -- how are we going to detect whether the US ASCII data or IRD data match literally and which is to be considered primary if they mismatch? I guess one of the things my response to this -- I really am a little bit concerned about how we're going to coordinate and interact with this translation and transliteration group which is not yet active. Because they're still in a chartered drafting stage. Part of my answer to you, Naoki -- those are very good questions. I don't know if that's for us to answer or for that other group to answer and I would simply suggest that that's something we have to work out between them. Do you want to capture these questions in our charter here? Just so that we don't lose track of them? Or do folks have a different reaction to this question? A different suggestion what to do with them? Anybody?

Dennis Tan: My thoughts are alongside yours. So, let me ask -- you've had a chance to follow up with the chair or the other guys on the translation and transliteration group? That was one of the action items from last week.

Jim Galvin: Yes. That was an action to me to reach out to the person who is going to be chair of the charter drafting group. And I have not been able to get that done yet. One of the things though, they're going to work in a sort of consensus way. So, the specifics about what they're going to do -- that group hasn't even met yet as far as I know. So -- anyway, it's an open question. So, no, I haven't completed the action and I don't know what that person is likely to say about what they're going to push for.

Edmond: I have a different opinion on this. I think that the group should have something to say on this because the transliteration group in my view is really focused on translation and transliteration. The question that's being asked is there is an internationalized set of data - - whether they must reconcile with the ASCII data? And that is not necessarily a transliteration or translation issue. It is possible that -- in fact I think it's perfectly legitimate to have a different set of information -- let's say a registrant will provide data in English for contacts that don't speak English or can't communicate in English and will provide information in Japanese for contacts and people who can correspond in Japanese. I mean, this is just one example. Whether that is allowed or not, we probably need to have something to say about it because we're more focused on the requirements of the ICANN data. No necessarily to say yes or no but at least to not close a door. I don't know. The transliteration and translation group seems to be much more focused on having this one set of data. This particular question asks about whether this -- in my mind asks about whether it's possible to have multiple sets of data catered for that different data.

Jim Galvin: Thank you, Edmond. I think if I can summarize what I think I heard you say, so, rather than focusing on the translation and transliteration aspect of this, since we're supposed to be specifying requirements in internationalized data, we could have a requirement -- we could decide it's an important requirement is if there are two version of the data or two -- I'll say version of the data present, they should be equal or equivalent? Maybe is the right way to phrase it? We could certainly make that decision as a requirement. And that would let the other group decide on whether or not there's one or two and where that translation and transliteration function occurs. Did I --

Edmond: And also say they don't have to be --

Jim Galvin: Absolutely. You're right. I don't mean to make a presupposition. We could say they are not equivalent or that they should be equivalent. Anyone else?

Edmond: I'm trying to speak loudly because the Operator said my voice is very soft. I don't know if you guys are picking it up okay. Just wanted to get some feedback on whether I'm speaking too loudly or not.

Jim Galvin: I'm hearing you okay. I don't know about others though, how individual lines can be a little fussy. Anyone concerned about their ability to hear Edmond?

Dennis Tan: I hear Edmond fine.

Jim Galvin: Okay. So, Naoki, I think the way to respond to your two questions here for the charter is that one of the questions we should ask ourselves in this group is -- in regards to your first question, you have a question about how you detect whether -- yes. One of the questions we should ask ourselves is whether or not, if there are two versions of the data, do they need to be equivalent? And if not, then which one is primary and that's a question I think we should address those questions and I think what you're suggesting is we need to include them here. I would say that's correct. Anyone want to suggest something different? Or object? Okay. So, I'm going to make a resolution note here in this comment so we know what we're doing. Include these questions -- okay.

So, we'll move on to the next one here. The next question is also from Naoki where he asks -- only -- let's see. He's highlighting the phrase international contact data. And he asks the question -- only contact data to be considered for internationalized, also IDN to be considered? Dennis comments that he agrees. The domain name should also be in local form, that is the IDN. I think that -- I think it's actually a question we should ask ourselves. You're right. There always seems to be a focus on contact data. I try to generalize and say registration data and I think when we look at the elements we should say something about which of the elements need to be internationalized.

For example, I know in FX document, when we were talking about data elements we made observations that things like that the registrar ID or contact ID probably don't need to be internationalized. They're internal identifiers and could be whatever. It really shouldn't matter. Most people don't see them or don't know them or they have a singular registry that determines what they are. Contact information is sort of the copy thing that needs internationalization. But I think what I would suggest in response to this comment here is I'd rather change this contact data to say registration data so that we leave it an open question for right now until we dig into the elements and then we can see if there's anything else and exactly what the requirements are in individual elements. That would be my suggestion for the purposes of the charter. Any other comments?

I'm going to put a note in here about these and leave the -- I'm writing a comment, change to refer to registration data and leave the other elements to be internationalized when we review the list of elements.

Steve Sheng: It's Steve. I couldn't get on to the queue.

Jim Galvin: Steve, yes? Konichiwa. I'm glad you're able to join us. Go ahead.

Steve Sheng: Yes, regarding this point, I did the inventory of the GTLD elements. There are a lot more elements than just the contact data. There are 40, 50 if not more elements. I think your question -- this question is very important. What other data elements can be internationalized? For example, I noted some of the IDN TLDs, their domain servers are also have a label. So, similar questions like should that be internationalized? I think that's a very important question. Thanks.

Jim Galvin: Thank you, Steve. You did say in your message, Steve, that you're not online, right? You're not looking -- I don't see you listed on the list of people, you're not able to be looking at this document as we are?

Steve Sheng: No. I don't have internet access at the moment so I'm not looking at it. Sorry about that.

Jim Galvin: That's okay. I just wanted to make sure. Moving to the next comment, there's -- just as there's a section in the background for submissions, there's a section labeled display. There's an old comment in there about this needs some additional thought. Dennis asked a very good question -- exactly what do we mean by display? And I think you're right. I agree with your comments, Dennis. At least from my point of view the intent was that it's for end user consumption through web interface or through -- web interface or whatever client is in use. Rather than submission for display, I'm sorry -- let me start over. Rather than display, I think a more typical term here in the WHOIS taxonomy proposed by ASAC was directory services. We could phrase that there and then the intent is to create a list of questions similar to those under the submission category to put here. So, Dennis, if we change that to say directory services, would that be helpful and respond more directly to your question? Or would you like to propose something different?

Dennis Tan: I agree with that, Jim.

Steve Sheng: This is Steve, I'd like to get in the queue if possible.

Jim Galvin: Yes, Steve, go ahead.

Steve Sheng: So, one of the questions in recent display issues -- I haven't seen data there. There's different parts of the data when it comes to life cycle. There's submissions, right? And then there's just storage. The data is represented in a certain way in storage. Then there's the transmission, how data are transmitted to the servers and their display. I see there are four elements -- submission, storage, transmission, and display. I guess my question, the thing I constantly think about, which part of these -- needs to be more or less standardized and determine requirements? Do we really care about display? Different

clients, once they receive the data, they may chose to display it differently. Or is it that we care about the representation during submission so everybody has the same baseline and then they can -- different registries, different clients can chose to display it differently. That's my question.

Jim Galvin: Thank you. I've been doing a lot of the talking here. I certainly have a partial answer and my own opinion but let me see if someone else would like to speak up first?

Dennis Tan: Maybe I'm going to try to be successful articulating these thoughts but let me just say so we store data and the idea is to whether we store it in ASCII form or Unicode for or UDSA form? And then for display function, for the end user consumption, we will start with a client whatever web browser or stand alone client would have to go to this data service, request the information, use some protocol -- I guess it will be the WHOIS protocol which is not -- if I understand, does not support internationalized code form so it's going to be ASCII.

So, the client would have to convert the native -- I'm sorry, whatever encoding is to actual native characters? And so the actual conversion of the registration data? If that's the case, one of the requirements is for the client or whatever application is consuming the information has to abide or comply with latest -- I don't know -- I want to say IDNA so it converts the right domain name in empirical form to the native form? I'm just -- I don't know if that makes sense. But bottom line is that I think we have -- we need to have requirements for display purposes or how the service has to behave for the end user.

Jim Galvin: Can I ask again who was speaking? I'm not sure I recognize the voice.

Dennis Tan: It's Dennis.

Jim Galvin: I agree with you, Dennis. There is something across display to say about display. Because we want to be able to support various forms of options in display. At least that's what I would expect. I heard Steve asking a somewhat larger question right there. I heard Steve asking there's four components in this registration system if you will. You can talk about submitting data, storing the data, transmitting the data -- it has to move from place to place -- and then about the display of the data. I think -- let me rephrase your question, Steve. Here we only list submission and display. Maybe more specifically, Steve, the question you're asking is there anything we need to say about storage and transmission and do we want to include that here? Is that what you're asking, Steve?

Steve Sheng: Yes, Jim. I was mostly asking -- clarifying the question. Personally, I felt registries should have the freedom to store the data in a certain way as their system is set up. It wouldn't be so far fetched for us to require how they store it but I guess the requirement is -- it's really -- the devil is in the details. So, similarly, for transmission rates, over the wire, it seems that it's useful to have a standardized data model so that different clients, regardless how they do the internationalization they should have a standard vocabulary to work from and then the display, I'm not sure whether we need to tackle that. I'm just raising questions here.

Jim Galvin: Sure. Thank you for that. Going back to what Dennis was saying -- the comments you were making, Dennis, I think are good things to add for some of the detail here under the display and let me suggest that you add some of them here, you try to write some of that out under display here so we have that in the charter. I think we need to fill this out anyway and maybe add some of that directly. But let me call back the larger question from Steve about shouldn't we be thinking about storage and transmission? Do we need to be concerned about that in this group here too? Do you want to respond to that, Dennis?

Dennis Tan: Give me a couple minutes.

- Jim Galvin: Okay. Not a problem. Anyone else have a reaction to the question of whether we should be thinking about the issue of storage and transmission?
- Edmond: I think one out of three frameworks with formal use and if we also elaborated on storage, I -- at this particular point I fail to think of any scenario where we should specify the requirements for storage. However, I do think that the submission -- can I use the word condition? It's probably relevant for our discussion and this might be a good framework for us to utilize when we consider our final report and how organized that discussion on particular analytics -- so, I don't -- maybe we don't need to throw away the storage concept. At this point I can't think of a reason why that should be part of the requirement for specifications for what we do but certainly for submission and transmission and display. Submission up to a certain degree, I certainly think transmission and display would be relevant, especially because the -- in our requirements, I guess we should think about what needs to be advised for the registrar to the end client and we should consider what the end users would like to deal with. So, certainly for transmission and display, in terms of submission, I can understand that some of the elements might be relevant but that also gets to the terms of EPP and that realm of things as well. Not to say that we won't with some of the elements but I guess overall this actually provides a framework for the elements.
- Jim Galvin: Thank you, Edmond. Anyone else want to comment?
- Dennis Tan: I'm reading the final report in the ICANN registration data from May 12 and going over the collection, storage, and display items, I think that we need to address that in the working group. To start out, why at least as it relates to these three and also data escrow - - we need to elaborate a little bit more whether international data will have to be sent out to the escrow backup under those data provisions.
- Jim Galvin: Dennis, thank you. In terms of a specific thing that you said, you were commenting that a question we might consider is when we escrow data elements, should we be escrowing translated versions if there's more than one version of it? Should we include both of them or just one? There may be other related things. And those are in fact storage questions.
- Dennis Tan: Also the integration. I know there is -- in the future, long, near future, I guess all things are -- but today we have registration and we have to take that into account as well I guess.
- Jim Galvin: Okay. Thank you. Anyone else?
- Edmond: For those who don't see the text I just sent to the message room online, I agree. I think Dennis has a good point. I think the escrow storage element is quite relevant.
- Jim Galvin: Okay. I'm editing here in the document together. Anyone else want to speak? I think for the moment -- not for the moment. I believe we've talked about directory services and storage actually put those two headings there in the document. No one has said much about transmission but it feels to me like it would be appropriate at least for the purposes of the charter there's really -- there's no downside to with respect to storage and transmission in particular we could probably just make a sentence that says we will consider storage and transmission issues as part of our work. For directory services it feels like we should have a list of questions we want to consider in the context of directory services. We actually do have a suggested list of questions from Naoki which -- where did they go? Is it because I changed that heading that the comments disappeared? Let me make sure I can find these things in the history somewhere. There they are. Okay. That was scary. I thought I'd somehow deleted your comment there, Naoki. I liked your set of questions here. I'm going to copy your set of questions out and put it in the actual text here for right now so that they don't get lost. That's better. We'll need to clean that up. Dennis, you were also in our discussion here, commenting on some things under directory services and asking some questions. Let me ask specifically if you can just look at what I just put in here, that Naoki had typed four -- please consider anything else you'd

like to add there from what you said earlier if it's not already covered here. Just directly to document and do that.

Dennis Tan: Okay. I'm with you.

Jim Galvin: Okay. So, moving on down to the next comment here, we have from Naoki -- oh. What is -- Naoki asked what is the full name of the working group? Should this be described somewhere? Now I'm going back up to the top and it is interesting that we don't actually have the name of the working group here. So, good comment, Naoki. Yes. I'll just put a comment in here for now for reference but, yes, we should include the name of our working group in our charter.

Moving down to the next comment, yes, editorial comment, changing to be defined rather than -- it says the working group has two deliverables, the current text says determine the requirements for internationalized registration data. The second bullet is produce a data model for the internationalized data that matches the requirements. He's suggesting changing determine to define. If no one objects I think we'll just do that. And an editorial comment fixing the acronym. Then you asked the question, Naoki, what type of data module is expected to be produced? Can we show something as an example? Yes. What would you propose we put here, Naoki? For producing a data model? What do you -- do you have a suggestion or example on what you think we should say here?

Naoki, if you're speaking, we're not hearing you.

Naoki Kambe: Are you asking me?

Jim Galvin: Yes. Your comment, you're asking what type of data model is expect to be produced and I'm asking did you have a suggestion that you wanted to put here?

Naoki Kambe: I have none. But just a comment, I can't imagine completing this --

Jim Galvin: I guess my expectation, sort of the logical step to take in this process would be to say that we'll do something that's XML based. We could abstract back from that if we want but since EPP is XML-based, that's sort of the logical notation and syntax to use for describing the data module. I'm open for anything the working group thinks they would prefer doing. That may not be the best choice because not all XMLs use EPP even today so I'm not sure XML would be the best choice but it seems like a logical choice in my mind but I'm open to whatever the group prefer or suggest that they do. Anyone else have any comments? I think we can ask that question of ourselves when the time comes as we get to producing the data module we can certainly consider what choice of data model we want. Naoki? Do you want to include explicitly in here questions about what data model we chose or can we just leave that out for now and just recognize that's a question that we will have to address when the time comes.

Naoki Kambe: I have no -- but XML -- as example. Thank you.

Jim Galvin: Alright. So, let's I'll make a notation here to add a suggestion about using XML but leave the question open for discussion when we are drafting the data model. So, we'll find some words to fix that up in the document. Moving down to the next question, there's a sentence that says the results of the working group will go through the public comment process to ensure broad input is received. Naoki asked about the details about the public comment process and does the charter need to mention how to collect it? My reaction is - - we can add some kind of footnote that refers to it but I would simply -- I would presume that we use the ICANN ordinary public comment process. Steve, maybe you can speak to this? Is that accepted and understood phrase? Or perhaps we should say more here to be more explicit?

- Steve Sheng: When that text was written, I was envisioning exactly as you describe, that the ICANN common comment process where we post the report and the amounts on the ICANN website and then there will be 21 days to receive comments and 21 days to reply to comments. At the end of 42 days, a summary of the comments and the analysis will be posted and those will be taken into consideration for revising the reports. So, that's how the ICANN public comments work. If we want to be more specific we can say we'll go through the ICANN public comments process and maybe put a URL, a footnote to describe how that comment process works. One point we probably want to consider, the ICANN -- we need to reach out to provide comments, for example the IETF. That's a question to consider. But regardless, even if we reach out to the IETF, putting forward the public comment URL to the IETF and we provide comments in the ICANN public forum. Thanks, Jim.
- Jim Galvin: Okay. Thank you, Steve. Let me piece apart what you said into two parts. First, responding to Naoki's questions about the charter, would it answer your questions, Naoki, if we called it the ICANN public comment process? Put the word ICANN in there and as Steve suggested have a footnote that references the description of the process online? Would that respond to your comments and questions?
- Naoki Kambe: --
- Jim Galvin: Okay. And the second comment that Steve raised I guess is a question to the group. Do we want to call out for ourselves that we should ensure to include the IETF in the comment process? As Steve suggested, that could be as straight forward as sending a copy of the URL to a couple of key places in the IETF, certain mailing lists and such. But do we want to call that out now, here, in the charter? Or leave that as something that we'll deal with when the time comes?
- Naoki Kambe: I couldn't understand that. Can you say it again?
- Jim Galvin: Once again, Steve was asking if in the ICANN public comment process normally the only people who participate in the public comment process are those who are in the ICANN community. And pay attention to announcements about requests for public comments. Steve is suggesting that we might want to consider making sure that the IETF community is aware of our work product and the opening of a public comment process. And thus asking them explicitly to comment. And to provide some feedback in the ordinary ICANN public comment process. My question is do we want to include in our charter an explicit recognition of our desire to include the IETF or not? We can certainly -- we're never excluded from doing it but do we want to explicitly state that we want too do that when the time comes. That's the question.
- Naoki Kambe: I don't have a strong opinion but I think it would be fantastic if they were included.
- Jim Galvin: Anyone else?
- Jody Kolker: Is there any reason not to include the IETF?
- Jim Galvin: I'll answer the question and say no. There's no downside to explicitly calling it out. It's just a question of whether we want to explicitly call it out here or just assume we'll take care of it when the time comes. Do you have a preference, Jody?
- Jody Kolker: No. I don't have a preference. I just wanted to know if there was a downside to including them.
- Jim Galvin: I'm going to suggest at this point that we add an explicit reference to include IETF in the public comment process. I'm going to make that also a comment in here and we will adjust this charter document to reflect that desire. That brings us to the bottom of the charter. I think we have an open action here to clean up in the background section the

directory services questions and maybe add a few sentences about storage and transmission so that they're covered. I do believe we answered everyone else's questions, comments, on the charter. So, with that, let me ask, any other comments or questions on the charter?

Nishit Jain: Regarding my comments, I hope you add that in?

Jim Galvin: Oh, yes. I had that open in a different window and I forgot I had it open here. Yes. Nishit did send a Word document with a couple of comments in it. Let's take some time here to go through that. One of the questions that Nishit asks is observing that we have this other team doing related work, namely the translation and transliteration team from the GNSO, we do say that want to work together and share information but which team's recommendations will act as a priority? Do we want to say something about the priority issue about our work? Anyone want to speak to that question?

Steve Sheng: One way is to keep the two groups knowing what the other is doing, is have someone from this group who will first of all have at least everyone subscribe to the mailing list for the other working group whenever that's formed? Likely after the Argentina ICANN meeting. Second, probably have a liaison coming back to this group as well so that we both know what each other is doing, very clearly defined requirements. That's just a suggestion.

Jim Galvin: Thank you, Steve. I agree with you that we should establish some kind of close coordination and some mechanism for doing that. But I think that Nishit's real question here is -- so that let me just jump and take a leap of faith here and jump to something from that. That would suggest to me that the answer to Nishit's question about which team recommendations will act as a priority is if we're closely coordinated, we want to avoid conflicts like this. So, we should never put ourselves in a position where we have conflicting recommendations. So, the goal here, the answer to the question of which team's recommendations take priority is that we should work to not have conflicting recommendations so we don't have to answer that question? Would that be fair? Anyone object to that? Can anyone think of something better to do or to say about that? I think, Steve, let's take as an action, especially if the other group gets to working, they're not actually doing anything yet. But we have an ongoing action to maintain close coordination and once they do get started, we'll have to establish with them a way to stay coordinated, some mechanism, and you'd suggested a couple of ways. Let's just leave it as an open discussion as to which way we go. We could have a liaison. We could have members of both groups on both mailing lists just to make sure we have some tracking in case something develops. There are different things we can do. We'll resolve that question later. Anyone object to that?

Next on Nishit's questions, he says the charter at some point needs to discuss the following points, debating the issue of and degree of representation of internationalized registration data and, two, to provide a functional framework for the entities agreed upon. So, Nishit, do you have a place in the charter where we could put these two points? Do you have a suggestion on where we might make those points in the charter?

Nishit Jain: I don't know. I have a question -- could we put -- representational things -- for example whether to make -- registration, does that have to be in Chinese also? And what other laws -- will they accept in ASCII?

Jim Galvin: So, let me suggest if no one objects, that you take these two points that you have here in your document and just edit them right into this charter document here. You should have edit privileges in the document. Just put the sentences in here right where you think they belong so we can all see them in context. And then we can more easily make a decision about them. Would you be okay doing that?

Nishit Jain: Okay. I'll do that.

- Jim Galvin: Thank you. Then we only have about five minutes left here. But we have a couple more comments from you. Your comment is a specific comment about the first paragraph on page one. You're suggesting one of our comments is vague and it would be advisable to specify in the footnotes that each registrar has its own rules regarding the nature of the data displayed. I'm fine with that. Steve, have you had a chance to look at Nishit's comments here? Do you have this Word document open in front of you?
- Steve Sheng: No. Not yet.
- Jim Galvin: Okay. What I was going to ask, do you feel like you can take care of that editorial change and add that footnote?
- Steve Sheng: Yes. I can do that.
- Jim Galvin: Okay. And then your next comments, Nishit, are about display. You have a couple of very specific comments here about input, console, and transliterated characters. But I think your larger points here about which and how is already covered in the question about display being a generic term. I think we've already addressed those in our discussions so far. Let me ask first if you're comfortable that we addressed those comments that you make, question about the use of display and the first point here about display in terms of which and how data elements are to be displayed? Do you agree that we've covered that already? Nishit, if you're speaking we're not hearing you. Okay. I'm going to assume for right now that we have and move on. The next comments he makes, the last one here is display in terms of fonts and rendering or reordering of characters. Nishit is suggesting that it's required to define the scope and what should be discussed under display. I do agree with the principle that we should talk about what's to be discussed under display. We've now added some questions there from Naoki and asking everyone to please take a look at those questions and add others this list. I would suggest Nishit and anyone -- really to all of us, some of the detailed questions Nishit has there, if you like you can add them into the document directly. If anyone else has any questions we can consider as part of the directory services section, please add those directly into the document and put them there. That would be the thing to do. So, I think with that I was hopeful that we might actually have been able to close on the charter but we've made some changes to it and we still have a few more editorial changes to make to it. Is there anything else that anyone wants to bring up for discussion here right now? Any other significant issues? So, hearing nothing -- I'm sorry? Go ahead?
- Steve Sheng: Just an hour ago I sent a list of the GTLD registry data elements from what's currently displayed, that's specified in the report. I'd appreciate it if the working group could take a look and provide some comments on some of those questions. Thanks. Not on the call. On the list. Thanks.
- Jim Galvin: Yes. Thank you, Steve. Okay.
- Nishit Jain: -- when you were discussing the comments which were made by me, is there any questions raised?
- Jim Galvin: Okay. Thank you for coming back to join us. Very quickly, in the end of -- towards the end of your document where you have the comments about display, I was asking I believe we had addressed your comment about display and your item number one under displays a generic term. I think we've covered those two issues during our discussion here. I was just looking for confirmation for you and with respect to your item labeled two I was suggesting that you should take the specific questions that you think we should address and just type them directly into the section under directory services in the document. Just add them directly to the document so that we can all see them in context.
- Nishit Jain: Okay. You're talking about under the B section?

Jim Galvin: Correct.

Nishit Jain: Okay. Thank you.

Jim Galvin: Okay. We're at the top of the hour. Very quickly, I believe the charter is down to being just an editorial exercise. We don't have any significant issues which is a good thing. I'm going to ask Steve to clean this up. I'm going to ask that we all take not more than two more days. So, by close of business on Friday, to please add any additional content that you need -- that you think needs to be in the document so that we can all have early next week to review it and I'm hopeful we can have a very short discussion next Wednesday at our next meeting to approve the charter and then Steve can take care of posting it on our website and we can move forward. So, that's one. Anyone object? Okay. And then number two, as Steve said, we didn't get to talking about data elements but Steve has prepared a starting list of these elements and so what I'd like to begin with for our real work next Wednesday is to begin to look through the elements and think about which elements are going to have internationalized requirements and begin to think about how we might structure the set of requirements we want to develop based on elements that we know need attention. So, that's the way I'd like to approach next week. If folks could then review what Steve has put there, that list, please comment on the list if there are things missing you want to add, obviously things we should take out is also worth considering but I want to dig into the discussion next Wednesday. Anyone object? Okay. Then with that let me ask the Operator to please stop the recording.