

20131211_WHOISIRD_ID839387

Steve Sheng: I'm trying to figure out who else is on the line? Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to today's WHOIS review team Internationalized Registration Data Implementation Working Group call, the expert working group. Today is Wednesday, December 11th. The call is from 1400 to 1500 UDC.

On the line we have Jim, we have Nisit, we have Naoki, we have Takao, we have Jody, and myself. Did I miss anyone? Did I miss anyone? Okay. All right. So that's all. Over to you, Jim.

Jim Galvin: All right, thank you, Steve. So I put on the agenda just a discussion of categories. Let me split that out a little bit. We had some nice work by Steve there creating the mind map representations and a little bit of discussion on the mailing list. All of that is great.

What I'd like to do is start by focusing on the categories themselves, have a little bit of discussion about whether we think they're complete. Do we want to do it a little differently? Do we still have consensus that categories are the thing to do? And then the next step would be to just pick one of the categories and begin and start to talk about what it would mean to have internationalized, what would it mean to have requirements for internationalization on that category and just start going through them one after another.

So that's my proposed agenda. Any discussion on the agenda? All right. So hearing nothing, we'll start with a discussion of categories.

As a starting point, I like just taking Steve's mind map and saying okay, that's our categories. Steve took the notes that we had from last time to create what he did. Let me just open the floor for anyone who wants to agree or disagree with the split of elements that Steve has recorded for us.

And I see that we have Edmund who joined us. I don't know if Edmund's going to -- Edmund, are you just going to be in the chat room or are you going to speak? Let's see if he says something there in the chat room. I see him in the Adobe Connect.

So Steve has put into the Adobe Connect his -- actually, I can't tell, Steve, can I move these -- oh, I can. Okay. So you put the common data registration elements in there. Okay.

Steve Sheng: Yes.

Jim Galvin: And you open them all up. Just trying to figure out -- so I guess you gave to everyone the ability to scroll that around, right, and look at it?

Steve Sheng: Yes. Everyone has the ability to scroll around.

Jim Galvin: Okay. All right. So I'm assuming for the moment then that we're at least in agreement as a starting point here these categories that Steve has got up here. So why don't we jump in here and talk about those.

What I want to do is go back. There were some comments from was it Naoki, was it your comment? I had one particular thing in mind here. Who made the comment -- oh, it was Naoki here, made the comment about postal codes and country codes. So why don't we look first at the contact information where that appears. The address information where we've got this postal code stuff.

One comment that I want to make to your comment, Naoki, and Steve, I wanted to double check what you did to create these elements, is when we had the internationalized registration data working group a couple of years ago, one of the things that we had observed is there is in the UPU a standard, if you will, for what is an address in a universal sense, in a global sense.

So I think what's important here, I think the EWG report has -- I think it covered this also and I think it knows this, or maybe they just grabbed it from the IRD report when we had that. So I think this set of elements that belong here need to align with that particular set of elements was proposed by them. So I don't know if that answers your comment about postal code and whether to include it or not. Do you have any comment about that, Naoki?

Naoki Kambe: I don't have any more comments so far.

Steve Sheng: Jim, this is Steve. May I comment?

Jim Galvin: Yes, please, Steve, go ahead.

Steve Sheng: When I made this visualization, the data elements that I took are the data elements currently outputted by the DCLD registries. So I have not checked with the EWG. I read through the EWG report on their data elements. I need to double check to make sure these elements comply with their proposals. So I need to do that exercise.

This is just what's currently the output today, not what will be output tomorrow. The goal of the exercise is trying to see if we can grab as high-level categories regardless of the particular underlying data element. Thank you.

Jim Galvin: Okay. So that sounds good. Thank you. We will want at some point to check our alignment with, well, with what's going on now, what the EWG does, and probably take a look at the weird (ph) stuff, which I think started from the same starting point that you've got here. I'm less concerned about the weird stuff in this category because I see it is being informed by all the other activities. So I think they just chose a set of things to work with. So we really want to focus on the EWG.

And the other one is the UPU. We should see if we can track down that reference from the IRD report. I'm betting that the EWG is going to do that, so maybe that's covered for us. So if we start there we can double check that.

All right. So let's consider what it means to internationalize this address category or address-like element. And so I have a question to put here to the group in the context of requirements. Do we think that an address should always be as a collection in a single language or script? In other words, to phrase the question in the opposite way, would it even make sense, let alone should we allow it to be possible, for some of the elements in an address to be in one language or script and some to be in another? Any comments about that, responses, opinions?

- Dennis Tan: So if I may replay the question, so you are saying some elements from an address be in one script and other elements of the address in a different language or script? Was that the question?
- Jim Galvin: Yes. That's correct.
- Dennis Tan: And what would this element be? I envision in an address very basic, street, city, and country. So we are saying maybe a street and city could be in local language and country in a universal language, different language? Would that be a case?
- Jim Galvin: Sure. Why not? I'll take that as an example. Makes sense to me. See, what's interesting to me in this is -- I guess maybe I'll answer my own question for a moment here just to sort of carry the conversation forward a bit, but I'm thinking that whatever your contact information is, it should all be in the same language or script. Whatever you start in, you should end in. It doesn't really seem rational to me, well, I shouldn't say that.
- I think it's more sensible or more rational for it all to be in the same language or script than to allow it to be mixed languages and mixed script. On the other hand, well, so I'm interested in checking the UPU standard and actually looking at whether or not it has anything to say about, for example, the particular example that you just gave, which is that maybe in a universal sense, you might want the country code in some single, some particular singular language or script so that at least you know it gets to the appropriate country and then presumably they would interpret the rest of the address when it got there.
- I don't know what the UPU rules really are on that point, but that's one thing that stands out for me. Comments from anyone?
- Dennis Tan: Dennis again.
- Jim Galvin: Please, Dennis, go ahead.
- Dennis Tan: So yeah, I tend to agree with your response. Actually I was thinking that. So contact information should be in one single language. As far as the example of a country code or IDs, I'm inclined to say yeah, those data elements, because of the nature of being a code, have to be universal. So you can use a standard, we can use any reference point, so it could be different language or script so that the region can select from different source.
- Jim Galvin: So, Steve, let me suggest as an action point here that, and I guess you made an action point here about checking the data element mapping against the UPU, but let's have a more specific action point here to see what the UPU has to say about I'm going to call it a global address. I'm sure that they have some phrase or word that they use for it. As I recall there was a phrase in the IRD document, but I forget what it was. But let's see if we can take a look at that UPU document and see what it says about the requirements for an international address.
- Steve Sheng: Sounds good, Jim. My recollection was UPU was mostly concerned with transmitting mail across countries. And it seems what they recommend is the country should -- the name should be in English and somehow way one or the other, but other address can somewhat be localized. But I'll make a point to double check their standards, recommendations.
- Jim Galvin: Yeah. And you used a phrase which makes -- which brings a question to my mind. Yes, obviously the UPU is concerned about sending postal mail so they're worried about

addresses for sending postal mail. So here's a question. Are there addresses that are sensible addresses but are not used for postal mail?

Steve Sheng: Jim, could you repeat the question?

Jim Galvin: Is there such a thing as an address that might be used for something other than postal mail?

Steve Sheng: Is there an address that could be used other than postal mail? What is the answer to that?

Jim Galvin: I actually never thought of the question before. I would think the answer is no, but I have no idea. I'm not aware that the question's been asked or if it's even a sensible question.

Steve Sheng: That's a good question.

Jim Galvin: Okay. So let me assert a requirement here just to test the group here. It'll have one point of clarification yet to be determined, but let me suggest that for address information a starting requirement is that it must all appear in a single language or script with the exception that we want to check the UPU requirements with respect to country code and maybe some other things. I think I remember that particular issue that Steve is talking about, the country needs to be in English or something like that.

Anyone object to that requirement, that we suggest that address information always needs to be in a single language or script with that one qualification? Any comments?

Jody Kolker: This is Jody for the Q.

Jim Galvin: Please, Jody. Go ahead.

Jody Kolker: Country and country code are both of those in this address block?

Jim Galvin: Well, that's an open question.

Jody Kolker: The reason that I'm asking is will country code -- you've stated that country would need to be in English, or we think it needs some research on that yet. Would that also include country code then also? That's why I'm asking.

Jim Galvin: That's a good question, and I'll bring up -- I'll complicate your question further by observing the unfortunate political discussions that go on with respect to what is a country code.

The EWG, I don't think they have anything in their report, but I remember some discussions where they mention this, and of course more generically there is the question of what is the country code. It's generally accepted that the country code is determined by the ISO3166 standard. And so we leave it to some other person to decide whether or not a country code is real or not. And those are all 2-character, US-ASCII letters.

So I don't know the answer to the question, but it's a very good question. We should make a note of that question and keep that open, Steve. I think that in the spirit of we're going to focus on categories of information and it's not actually our responsibility to specify what the detailed elements are in there, it may be that we don't have to answer the question but we might want to speak to some issues around the question like this issue of where the code comes from. It is perhaps something like the country itself, might be a US-ASCII string. We could probably speak to the issues around it without making a decision. But let's hold that question. Is that okay for right now?

Jody Kolker: That's fine with me, Jim.

Steve Sheng: Jim, this is Steve.

Jim Galvin: Yes, Steve. Go ahead please.

Steve Sheng: Edmund raised a question here. Looking at what's been typed in the note section, must be in one language or script, does that include alphanumeric exceptions? For example, Unit 1A in the Chinese is (inaudible). So the building and the room are in I guess in the hand script but the unit number is in the ASCII.

Jim Galvin: Well, that's a good question. So what that says to me is -- so I started with the suggestion that the requirement was that address information always appear in a single language or script. Edmund is bringing up a perfect working example of well, maybe mixed scripts need to be allowed and so we can do this as a binary decision. We can flip it and say okay, address information can always be in a mixed language or script, or we can dig in a bit here and suggest that only the address line, what would be typically called address line one, address line two, address line three, that kind of thing, would be allowed to be in a mixed script, but perhaps everything else could be in a single language or script.

So to phrase that -- bring that back and phrase it differently, I think that in looking at the internationalization requirements for an address, I think we have 3 choices. One is it has to be in a single language or script, but Edmund's given a good counter example for that. Two is that we allow mixed language and script throughout. Or three is we suggest that only certain elements are allowed to have mixed language or script and all other elements need to be a single one.

People have any preferences or comments about those three choices?

Dennis Tan: Jim, Dennis for the Q.

Jim Galvin: Yes, Dennis. Please go ahead.

Dennis Tan: Thank you. I think it is the difference between the script and language. Script entails a specific character set, being Latin, being non-Latin. Language, the definition of language is much more broader so that if, for example, Edmund's example of Unit 1A and the other one in Chinese, I believe the second example is common usage. So I would say that's Chinese language. That's language, that's the common usage. So I don't know if we need to qualify -- I guess we need to qualify that it's one language but qualifying as common usage so that we don't confuse the registrant or the user to have to input these characters.

Jim Galvin: So if I understand what you're suggesting, I mean it's true that a language could be represented with more than one script.

Dennis Tan: Correct.

Jim Galvin: And a language -- I don't know that a language uses, well I guess it could use mixed scripts too would be the way to say it. My reason for saying language and script when I say it is because a script by itself is not often enough -- a script designation by itself is often not enough information to know what you need to know about how to display what you've got, and saying a language is not always enough either. Sometimes one or the other is sufficient, but sometimes you need both a language and a script tag for whatever string you're looking at in order to know what you're doing.

And Edmund is typing something interesting in the chat room here. He's also observing that address line one, address line two, address line three have no special semantics. So

you really don't know what's in those things at all because there's no requirement for them to be anything in particular. Therefore, we can't even say that you could have mixed there or not. He's also adding -- he's talking about in Japanese building names may be even more interesting. Mixing in some Japanese characters is not uncommon in Hong Kong.

Dennis Tan: I think the Japanese language mixes 3 scripts.

Jim Galvin: Yeah, so.

Dennis Tan: And they add numbers.

Jim Galvin: So Edmund is conveniently providing all kinds of examples which are leading me to suggest that there is no other option except to say that address information has to be allowed to have mixed language and script throughout. I think that's where he is leading us by all of his examples. I'm not sure how else to interpret his examples.

One thing I would like to note, Steve, for the record here is along the way here for us, if we're going to have whatever requirements we come up with, we need to make sure that we have sufficient supporting information to justify that. So I don't want to lose track of these examples that Edmund is giving us because we'll need to construct and offer specific examples to justify this particular requirement, that you have to allow mixed languages and scripts in the address elements, in address elements if that's where we end up.

Nisit Jain: (Inaudible).

Jim Galvin: Yes, Nisit. Please go ahead.

Nisit Jain: My comment on this is when it's possible mixed script that in a very broad sense among various (inaudible) but I'm looking at Edmund's examples (inaudible). What will be the native script of the registrant that (inaudible). The other scripts allowed will be Japanese instead of (inaudible).

Jim Galvin: So I think the word you used was native. You're suggesting that the language or script used should be native as opposed to mixed?

Nisit Jain: Yes. If we say that it should be in the mixed script, we are giving it a more broader sense. But when we say the elements would be in the native script and that (inaudible) also be in -- it would also contain the (inaudible).

Jim Galvin: Okay. So I think you just suggested that it should be in the native script but could be permitted to include Latin characters. Is that what you're suggesting?

Nisit Jain: Exactly.

Jim Galvin: Okay. I want to respond to that but let me shift over to the chat room here. Edmund asked the question what is the motivation of making any restriction or presumption on a single language or script? And since I put it out there to start with, I'll respond to that and say that I was simply putting it out there as a simple starting point. I didn't have any particular motivation or agenda other than it's the simplest thing, is it sufficient. And I think you've clearly demonstrated it's not sufficient, so that knocks that out.

On the issue of native script or language plus Latin characters, I guess at least with respect to the examples that Edmund has provided, that certainly seems rational to me. I really don't have enough experience to know whether or not that's the right thing or not.

Anyone else want to comment? Maybe Edmund who seems to have a lot of these examples can come into whether he thinks that's a reasonable compromise?

- Takao Suuki: I have a question. It's Takao.
- Jim Galvin: Takao, please go ahead.
- Takao Suuki: When you say native, native to what country? I missed that. Native to the location of the address?
- Jim Galvin: So that was Nisit who had that example.
- Nisit Jain: By native I mean to say that if we are contacting a multilingual registrant, the language which is selected by that registrant, which is other than Latin, that is particular native.
- Jim Galvin: So to make sure that I understand here, I think, Nisit, what you are suggesting is that native is intended to mean whatever the registrant can provide?
- Nisit Jain: Exactly.
- Takao Suuki: So I asked the question because I was wondering if it's possible or are we allowing, for instance, to put the US address in a Japanese script? Is that allowed or not?
- Jim Galvin: Yeah, that's a good question.
- Takao Suuki: I'm asking this because this is another of that weird example because, for instance, the Japanese embassy in the US asks us to write down our local address in Japanese script, so just add that.
- Jim Galvin: That's a very good question. I have to say, folks, that I have just lost my network connectivity, so Steve, if anything happens in the chat room --
- Steve Sheng: Sure, Jim. I'll monitor the chat room.
- Jim Galvin: I don't know what the rules are about that, Takao. That really is a very good question. I mean, my expectation would be that a given country has its rules about how it wants addresses to look, and so maybe that's the way to look at this.
- Takao Suuki: Right. But we brought up this UPU into this, and maybe the script has both script or the address must be actually understandable in the region, in the country or so? I mean otherwise, the Japanese case that I just brought up is actually invalid because postal system in the US will not be able to deliver mail in Japanese, not likely. Where in Japan, for instance, sorry that I'm just using Japanese, Japan as an example, most (inaudible) in Japanese, but in Japanese, you can actually send the right mail, send the mail in Japanese script, katakana, hiragana, and then also roma script, that can also be reachable, something like that.
- Jim Galvin: Okay. So as I listen to you talk I have this vague recollection that we did discuss this in the IRD working group when we were talking about the UPU document. So it would be interesting to double check this in terms of what its rules are, but I do think it is what you just said, Takao, that the address has to make sense in the region in which the actual address is located, so that's one. But two, there are actually international requirements or actually global requirements. There is a minimum standard for some kind of postal document in order to get between countries. You have to have one universal standard for at least a few parts of the address in order to ensure that it gets to the region it needs to get to. So we do need to clarify that point.

So as I'm thinking about this, I think what's important -- so now we're getting into an interesting space here. If the requirement is that an address needs to be in a language or a script appropriate for the region in which that address exists, perhaps that's the requirement.

One of the things we're going to have to be able to speak to is how is a registrar supposed to know what's an appropriate language or script, and maybe the answer to that is well, if you're selling to those registrants, then you're supposed to know what those registrants can or should do. If you don't, then you can't sell to those registrants. I'm not sure that's a good answer, but that's what's in my mind at the moment. Any comments about that?

Global registrars might not like that too much, but I'm not sure what else to say about it. Okay, so let's play that back one more time here. I think the place that we've gotten to with respect to internalization requirements for address information is that it is allowed to be in a mixed language or script and two, it must be in an appropriate language or script for the region that it represents, for the region in which it's located. I think we've got those two things now. Anyone disagree with that summary at the moment?

So Steve, did you capture those words that I said here?

Steve Sheng: The language or script appropriate for the region it is located? The language or script of an address be appropriate for the region that it is located?

Jim Galvin: Right. So that's the current draft requirement that we're talking about here. Okay. This has been a very good discussion about address information. Can we think of any other questions or comments here about address information? We have some action points here.

So Steve, you'll be able to follow up on these actions to get us the reference material that we need to check some of these things?

Steve Sheng: Yes. I can do that.

Jim Galvin: Ah. And I see you've posted in the chat room here a point or two postal addressing systems in member countries and other things. Good. So we have some stuff we can look at.

Steve Sheng: So on the first link, it has for every country, and then you can just put down like which country you want. And then it will show you that for that particular country how the addressing works. So I just gave two examples for that.

Jim Galvin: Excellent. All right. So we have something that we can review and check out for next time rather than doing it right here and now.

Steve Sheng: Right.

Jim Galvin: All right. If there's no other comments or questions about addressing information, let's see. We have a little bit of time left here. Let's pick another smaller one. I'm just going to jump up and say let's pick email and talk about it for a moment.

I think the only thing to say about email is that there is a standard specification in the ITF for internalized email addresses for both the local part and the domain part. And I think we just pointed that for the requirements I believe in those cases that for the local part it does all need to appear in a single language or script. I think the encoding imposes that restriction. And for the domain part, you can actually have each label in a different

language or script, but a specific label can only be in one language or script again because the encoding that puts that into the US-ASCII, the puny code imposed with that restriction. Anyone disagree or want to say something different?

So Steve, we can double check those things, but I think the email address requirements are pretty well established and we just need to restate them and provide the appropriate reference.

Steve Sheng: Noted that.

Jim Galvin: So let me try to move up to some other things which I think are fairly straight forward here, like let's jump up and look at statuses. I'll just put something out there. I mean, anyone want to make a proposal for what we should say about statuses? Anyone else want to drive here for a moment?

Jody Kolker: This is Jody for the Q.

Jim Galvin: Please go ahead.

Jody Kolker: I guess from a registrar's point of view, should the statuses, and this is just a question for discussion, should the statuses reflect what is used in EPP, in the EPP standards? I know that that is in English, but is that acceptable to use those for the status codes?

Jim Galvin: So let me ask a qualifying question for you, Jody. Let me separate something in your use of the word use. Are we talking about what's stored by the registrar and registry or are we talking about what's displayed to the user?

Jody Kolker: That's a good question, Jim. When I was thinking about this it would be what is displayed to the user, but displayed to the user as what's stored at the registry because the registry is basically the authority of the status of that domain.

Jim Galvin: So I draw this distinction because I think that in terms of what's stored, I would suggest that we should adhere to the standard, and so the value that's stored and reflected should be what's well defined. On the other hand, well, not on the other hand, in addition, I would also suggest that any display of the status could be transliterated by the displaying party into something more appropriate for the consumer of the data.

Steve Sheng: So Jim, let me just make sure I understand for the note purpose. What you're suggesting is for the transmission, for the storage and transmission, the status should be exactly what the registry or registrar store those to be. And then it's up to the end client to do some further localization if needed. Is that what you're saying? Or are you expecting the registry and a registrar to translate or transliterate? Just to make sure.

Jim Galvin: Yeah. So yes, someone should translate or transliterate the status for display purposes. Let me step back and not currently have a position on who or what actually takes that action. I mean actually I guess I would imagine that it's possible that both registrars and registries would at some level be obligated to do this perhaps. This is the question. I mean a registrar might want to do it as part of interacting with the registrant, right? They're already going to be providing something in a local language or script anyway, so the idea that they would have a table of how to localize these values seems completely rational to me. I mean I think I'd be hard pressed to find a reason why they wouldn't have that.

A registry, the issue is a little different to the extent the registry is providing the directory service, which it does now for all thick registries. There is the question of -- I think this gets to -- the answer to this one I think depends on what the transliteration and translation

PDP working group, which is just starting in the GNSO decides because if that group decides that there's a single language or script, well, it has two questions to answer. One is whether there's a single language or script for all data, and two, it's going to decide who should do the translation and transliteration.

So I'm thinking at the moment that we shouldn't answer that question. We should leave it to that group to answer the question. I think that's where I'm getting to. You need me to repeat that? I've kind of --

Steve Sheng: Jim, but that working group will only focus on contacts and not -- I think what you are alluding to status is say, what other thing, is a prime example of how to make -- in terms of localized audience, how to make who is output more understandable to the local audience, right? And along the lines of status, you might -- one might think what about the labels? Maybe those should be localized too to provide a better user experience for the local audience.

It also comes down to what do people use status for? And do people have the need to always use the exact status code to perform some action and translate or transliterate may or may not fulfill that need. So I think a variety of good questions must (inaudible) PDP is going to answer, but we could check with them on that point.

Jim Galvin: Any other comments from anyone? So here I thought status was going to be easy, but I think we've just touched on an item for which we still have open questions. Let me assert one requirement as a draft requirement for us to consider, and that is that the domain status should be stored and transmitted according to the value defined by the standard. And we'll leave as an open question at the moment what happens during display. So let's record our status as that for the moment, Steve.

And on the display issue, let's also make a note that there is a difference between registrars and registries, and the difference in my mind is as follows. For a registrar, it's probably reasonable to assume that they would localize it because they're already dealing with the registrant in a local way. So their ability to do that would seem to be straightforward. Let's just document that as a starting point for discussion at the moment.

On the registry side, to the extent the registry is providing directory services, not clear what the translation or transliteration requirement ought to be. So that's the open question at the moment. Any discussion on those two points? Maybe that was three points depending on how you divide it up.

Steve Sheng: Noted.

Jim Galvin: So we're five minutes before the top of the hour. I think I'm going to suggest that we not start to dig into anything else. We've provided some draft ideas here for address, email, and status. We have a number of open questions. So next week what we'll do is let's see how many of our open actions here we can close and deal with over the course of the week and hopefully come to closure on next week, so that's action, over-arching action. And then two, we'll just dig into another set of categories here, another category and see where that takes us.

Any other summary comments from anyone?

Steve Sheng: I think when we're done I'm just going to read out the kind of the notes, the proposed requirement and action items when we are done.

Jim Galvin: Okay. That's fine. So one last question to the group. Any other business for today before we move to closure? Okay. Let me suggest then that we move towards

adjournment and ask Steve to read out our actions here and comments, actions and questions and then adjourn. Over to you, Steve.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Jim. Just to quickly summarize, for this call we went over several categories of data elements, and particularly the address and the status. The proposed requirements obviously just need to go through the mailing list for further discussion. A draft requirement in terms of for address, the language or script of an address should be appropriate for the region that it is located. Did I get that right? The language or script of an address should be appropriate for the region that it is located.

Jim Galvin: Yes. That's fine.

Steve Sheng: Okay. For email, the requirement needs to comply with the latest IETF standards on internationalized email address. In particular, the local part needs to be in a single language or script. The domain part, each label needs to be in a single language and script, but the labels can be in different language and scripts. Did I get that right?

Jim Galvin: Correct.

Steve Sheng: The domain status should be stored and transmitted as defined by the relevant standards, for example EDP. Be mindful there are people who don't use EP. So those are the proposed requirements.

In terms of open questions, we have open questions should country name and country code be in the address category? For status, for the display of the status, should there be a translation or transliteration for local audience? And on this, the note is there's a difference between registrants and registries here. For registrar it might be reasonable to do so, may or may not be. For the registry side, it's unclear what the requirements may be. Did I get that right?

Jim Galvin: Correct.

Steve Sheng: The action items, the first one is to check the data element mapping with alignment with the EWG in weirds. I can do this, Jim, but I was wondering if someone from the expert working group can do a pass too so that we have like two sets of eyes to look at this to make sure because there are a lot of data elements, to make sure that they are not missed?

Jim Galvin: Yes. Does anyone want to volunteer?

Jody Kolker: I'm sorry, what was the action? I couldn't hear you, Steve.

Steve Sheng: The action was to check the data element mapping with the alignment with the EWG reports and the weirds effort. So we have a list of data elements here and they're broken into different categories. It's to look at the EWG proposed elements and see are we missing anything or new types of elements that would require new categories?

Jim Galvin: You know, let me propose something a little different, Steve, and I'm sorry we're at the top of the hour. Let me apologize to folks and their time. It occurs to me that maybe we should just adopt the EWG elements. Is there a reason why we wouldn't do that?

Steve Sheng: I think it's more a process issue. From the process perspective it's unclear what will happen to the EWG effort, right, or the timing? I think more or less a process and a timing question.

So the requirements that we develop here we eventually either go into contracts through a PDP or some sort of negotiation process. It's unclear that -- I don't know. It's unclear

that we would adopt something that is in the works. So that's my only comment. I don't mind, I just don't know what the process should be.

Jim Galvin: Yeah. I don't know either. All right. So let's just hold that question for the moment, hold that issue for the moment. Your list is a collected list that you've created for other things and you've done this work in the past about the collected data elements. Let's just work with them for right now. I'm more interested in checking the alignment with UPU addressing issues, but I think the EWG is doing that too. So maybe we should just double check that and leave open the question of which data elements are we really talking about.

I suspect we should be focused on the EWG elements, but let's you and I consider that question off line okay?

Steve Sheng: Sure. So if anybody wants to volunteer to look at the EWG elements again, I can send you the raw mind map file and then you can play with it.

Takao Suuki: I can give it a try. It's Takao.

Steve Sheng: Who is that?

Jim Galvin: That was Takao.

Steve Sheng: Takao. Okay, thank you, Takao. Great. Second is check UPU standard on global addressing. I sent a few pointers but I think I will dig more. And the last action item is need to make sure sufficient information to justify the requirements. Yes, I will document as much as possible, but I think when the time comes we will really need your input in terms of particular language and scripts. So I will put myself and then all of the working group here.

So that's all, Jim.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Thanks, Steve. You can close us down. We're adjourned.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Thank you. Operator, could you stop the recording?