20131218_WHOISIRD_ID841280

Steve Sheng:	Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening. Welcome to today's call, on December 18th. On the line we have Jim, Naoki, Jody, Nishit, Takao, and myself, Steve Sheng. And the agenda, the proposed agenda for the call is discuss—continue discussion of the data elements, and any other business. And with that, Jim, over to you.
Jim Galvin:	Thank you, Steve. Oh, okay, I see you've changed the date on the Adobe Connect. That's good, okay. First, let me say, thank you to Takao, who did the comparison against EWD documents, and identify the set of things that are in the EWD documents, what's missing in the list that we're working with. So I think we'll just hold onto that for now, and let's not lose track of that. I did have a question for you, Takao, though, the URL of Internet Complaint site, I guess that hadn't jumped out at me before, and so that was new to me. Could you, or somebody, say a little something about what that is exactly.
Takao Suzuki:	My understanding is—and so there's—there's any issues, there have to be some, URL that you can go to and then, file a claim, or stuff like that, so that was my understanding. Let me check again.
Jim Galvin:	Okay, so thank you. Takao, you're very faint. I don't know if others are having trouble hearing you, but you seem extremely far away, notwithstanding the fact that you are far away.
Takao Suzuki:	I'm sorry. So I'm using a new headset so maybe something is wrong with it.
Jim Galvin:	Okay. Actually, at that moment you sounded a little bit better so that was helpful, if you were a little closer to the mic maybe. Yeah, Internet Complaint site, I guess I hadn't noticed that particular thing before, is there a—is there a standard Internet complaint site? Does anyone know, or is—you know, you're just supposed to create—every registrar is supposed to have something?
Steve Sheng:	Jim, this is Steve. My understanding was, kind of a standard complaint site, where, if a consumer who is finding the information is inaccurate or something, they could file a report here.
Jim Galvin:	Oh, this is a data—this is a data accuracy thing?
Steve Sheng:	Yeah.

Jim Galvin:	Okay. All right. Well I don't want to—I don't want to drag that out. I can also just go look it up myself and find out, I suppose. I thought it would be a relatively easy question. Okay, so thank you to Takao, we—I mean it's good to know that we have actually a relatively short list of things that were in EWG that were not in the list that we were working in so that's a good thing. We'll obviously want to track carefully where EWG goes with all of this stuff. We have in our notes, you know, we've been drafting some requirements as we go along here just to keep in mind as we review things, just to quickly go over those again. The first requirement that we are working with, is suggesting that the language or script should—for contact information, address, so postal address information, should be appropriate for the regions in which it is located. A second, requirement is that for an email address, the local part should be a single language or script, and in the domain part, you know, each label can be its own language or script. And, of course, we need to make sure this complies, I'm pretty sure that it does, but we need to double-check with appropriate ITS standards. I remember a question from somebody in an email message about this, commenting about including requirements for—was it Takao?
Takao Suzuki:	Hello?
Jim Galvin:	Takao--
Takao Suzuki:	Naoki's comment about email address. The EAI standard that has just been standardized, it hasn't been used very extensively. Do you want to—Naoki can speak more extensively about it?
Jim Galvin:	Right, Naoki said that but—yeah, please go ahead, Naoki.
Naoki:	I commented about, internationalizing the alphabet (ph), which is, not so popular, in the current Internet.
Jim Galvin:	Yes, I did see that and, and I agree with that observation. I'm not sure what we would do with that observation. You know, I think that we are simply stating that if there are non-Latin characters in an email address then, you know, it needs to be a single language or script, and according to the EAI standards, I don't think that that statement is affected by the popularity of the standard. Does anyone want to comment on that, add more contexts to that?
Takao Suzuki:	Hello?
Jim Galvin:	Yes, please go ahead.
Takao Suzuki:	Okay. So, no, I think what, Naoki's point was that the, since, since it is—it is not indeed, you know, you know, used yet, so it seems to make sense that we always ask for, ASCII (ph) address as well. That was, that was what I understood, at this point, no?
Jim Galvin:	Ah, so you're suggesting that we should require that the address always be encoded?
Takao Suzuki:	No, no--
Jim Galvin:	So that--
Takao Suzuki:	My understanding was that if, if, we are to, to, collect data, we always ask for ASCII address as well that's (inaudible). Please correct me if I'm wrong.

Jim Galvin: So ask for an ASCII address as well, meaning, the encoded form, or an alternate address?

Nishit Jain: Alternate address, that's, that's my understanding. That how I understood it.

Jim Galvin: So, Naoki, is that what you're looking for? You're suggesting that, the email address should always be multi-valued, meaning there should always be two of them; an ASCII address and an internationalized version?

Naoki: I think, international email will permit it, will also require the user's ASCII address.

Jim Galvin: I mean my reaction is that, an encoded address is an ASCII, that's the point of the EAI standard, is to create a mapping to and from an ASCII-based version of an address, an internationalized version. I mean, I would be less inclined to suggest that we should always have two email addresses, and instead suggest that the email address should always be stored and presented in its ASCII form. I mean, I'm not sure I agree with that, but I would prefer that to suggesting the email address is, is a multi-valued field. What do you think, Naoki?

Naoki: I think we need to research about email, (unintelligible) the email.

Jim Galvin: Hmm--

Takao Suzuki: So, may I?

Jim Galvin: Yes. Please, Takao, go ahead.

Takao Suzuki: So my understanding is that, you know—I mean, Naoki's concern is that, you know—on compatibility. If somebody enter an email address and then that cannot be reached, that's not a good thing, but as, Jim, you suggested, you know, I believe that my understanding he's saying, he's actually, you know, it would work, so, as long as actually, you know—it becomes time to actually be able to enter, such names, we should be—we shouldn't have a problem of using—using that, you know. No ASCII, alias or local part, so, so I don't believe that that's an issue here either.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Let me try to, say this back just to make sure I understand. I think what I'm hearing is a concern that if we take in an internationalized address, and that's what's stored and that's what's displayed, that address might not work, because for those who have not implemented the EAI standards they won't be able to directly use that address if it's an internationalized address, meaning it is composed of non-ASCII characters. Is that what folks are saying?

Nishit Jain: What I said was—yes, however, you know, by the time that that is actually used, it should actually be working with fall back mechanism, I guess, yeah.

Jim Galvin: Well, I appreciate your optimism and confidence that it's going to be working by the time all of this is required, you know, count me in on that train. But, okay. Please go ahead.

Nishit Jain: I'm sorry. My point was actually, you know—the point that I wanted to make was that that's the, we should—I don't—one—two issues. One, is I agree that we—I don't think that we need to require a, a, a, a second address, in ASCII form only, only EAI address. So that's one, and then also the other point was that, we shouldn't be really—I don't think we need to talk about the, you know, restrictions of number of languages or scripts, for that.

I agree there are domains itself that, have, that have, you know, multi scripts allowed, so if we say there has to be a single script, a single language, there will be addresses that won't, you know, meet in that category. Like, Japanese, again, you know, there'll be like,

get the domain that is with Chinese characters or Japanese characters, and then ASCII, that's allowed, and then that's two scripts right there.

Jim Galvin: Right. So, thank you for that. Actually when I was looking for a comment about email addresses, I was remembering your comment, Takao, that you had put in your email, and we got onto that—Naoki's point here about, whether or not the EAI standard was an appropriate choice. I still think that we'll have to visit the details of what this recommendation actually looks like going back to Naoki's point here for just a moment.

I still think that we somehow need to say that the email address needs to conform to the EAI set of standards and, of course, IDN standards, but to take Naoki's point, it may be that we want to comment about the issue of usability in that recommendation, if not requirement, and that speaks directly to the point of, well, if we take in non-Latin email addresses, we do need to pay attention to the fact they might not be usable directly, so that certainly is an issue to call out, and make sure it's physical.

Unidentified Participant: That makes sense to me.

Jim Galvin: So we can—yeah, we'll come back to the details of that when we—once we—so let's make a note of that particular, you know, recommendation there, Steve, in that we've got that issue that we'll have to clarify when the time comes.

And then to your point, Takao, which you had put in your email message; yes, you are suggesting that we not say that an email address has to be in a single language or script, and I think—I mean, I agree with you. I believe that there's, given that a domain name could have—well each label has to have a single language or script, that's just part of the encoding process, but I don't think that an email address, as a whole unit, can have a single language or script, because a domain name, you know, all by itself can have different languages or scripts in each label.

So, yeah, you're absolutely right, Takao, with your comment there that you had in your message.

Okay. So getting onto your second comment then, Takao, you also made a comment that we don't have a clear understanding of the definition of common script for the registration data here. And we say Latin, you know, referenced as a common script. My response to that comment is, I think that this question—I think that this –I think the question that you're asking; I believe that question is supposed to be answered by the translation and transliteration group. I think that we can reference the potential existence of a common script where it's important for us to do that, and relevant for us to do that. But I don't think we have to define that, because as I understand it that's what that translation and transliteration working group is supposed to do.

Takao Suzuki: Okay.

Jim Galvin: I guess it would be, obviously, extremely important for us to pay attention to make sure that that's what that group does, and is going to do. We should probably maintain, Steve, this question of, what exactly is a common script, and reference the fact that we expect this other group to answer it.

Steve Sheng: I took a note of it, Jim.

Jim Galvin: So, if we do get ahead of this other group, if we have to say something about it we, you know, remind ourselves that we have to do that.

Takao Suzuki: Yeah, it's just that I mean in our, discussions, we talk a lot about the, Latin, no Latin, and then—but I think often we are actually talking about the ASCII as opposed to—U.S. ASCII as opposed to Latin so that was my point (inaudible).

Jim Galvin:	Yes, I agree with that, too, Takao. I mean—I guess my working assumption, if you will, when we say common script, is that we're talking about U.S. ASCII. We are essentially talking about the de facto standard, if you will. I mean, who is—it's supposed to be a U.S. ASCII-based protocol, all the data inside is that—I mean no one has ever declared that that's what it is, but I think we kind of accept it as a given, for now.
	Okay. And then, Takao, you raised another good question here in item 3. What do we do about regions that are not listed in the member countries?
Takao Suzuki:	Yes. It may be okay. I was looking for some examples, but if it's not reachable I—it may be okay, you know, to be handled, but I just wanted to point that out.
Jim Galvin:	So you offer Antarctica as an example of something which is not included in member countries in the UPU.
Takao Suzuki:	Right. So that anybody who registers a domain with that address, that was my question.
Jim Galvin:	That's an interesting question.
Takao Suzuki:	I haven't asked, Jody, to look it up in our database, to see if there's anyone with that address.
Jody Kolker:	Could you ask that question again, Takao? I don't think I quite got it.
Takao Suzuki:	I said that, if there's anyone that have an address with the—like the North Pole (ph) for instance.
Jody Kolker:	With an address?
Takao Suzuki:	Registered a domain with that address, the North Pole, for instance.
Jody Kolker:	With a North Pole?
Takao Suzuki:	Yes.
Jody Kolker:	Ah, I think--
Takao Suzuki:	That's where, you know—like remember we chatted about for instance, about Mars (ph) email?
Jody Kolker:	Right, right. I don't know. I can check though.
Jim Galvin:	Or even Antarctica, more generally, rather than just the North Pole in the specific. But even if one exists, you know, I mean that's an interesting data point that one exists, but it does bring, more generally, the question of how one would validate the address if there are no rules about the address listed under UPU. I wonder if the EWG has taken notice of this, and if it has found its way into any of their discussions?
	So I'm thinking I'm going send a note to somebody who I know on the EWG, and just raise this particular question. Give them something to think about, especially since they are also dealing with the scope of issue, the data accuracy issue. Antarctica is not really a member country, and there are no rules about what things are supposed to look like, certainly does make data accuracy an interesting problem.
	Okay. So I think those are the questions that have, come up on the list so far. Anybody else want to ask a question or follow up on anything that we talked about last time before we jump into looking at some new data elements?

	Okay. So let's jump into looking at some new data elements. So we've gone through address, we've gone through email, and now I'm just having a little trouble moving around my own copy of this thing. Oh, there we go. I'm just moving it the wrong way. Okay. So we've gone through address, we've gone through email, and we talked about statuses. I don't think we talked about dates, did we talk about dates?
Steve Sheng:	I don't think so. We talked about phone numbers, to use the UPU 163 (ph). I think that's what we talked about.
Jim Galvin:	Right.
Steve Sheng:	I don't think we talked about dates.
Jim Galvin:	So, the date standard. So let's jump in and talk about dates then. So yeah, we talked about address, email, phone and fax numbers, and we talked about statuses. So with respect to dates, I'm trying to remember what's in the IRD document, Steve.
Steve Sheng:	The IRD document used the date to comply with the ISO 30—it was ISO 31, let me--
Jim Galvin:	Right. There's an ISO standard format of dates.
Steve Sheng:	Yes.
Jim Galvin:	So for display purposes, that's what the date would be.
Steve Sheng:	Yeah, ISO 8601, 2004. Let me place that in here, the reference, let me--
Jim Galvin:	So the question that comes up in my mind is, should we say anything about internal representation? For example, I guess what I'm thinking is that dates should always be stored in UTC, or maintained in UTC, but displayed according to the ISO standards. You folks have any thoughts about that?
Steve Sheng:	I mean the ISO standard is used by EPP (ph), I think. Let me just quickly check what the EPP used ISO standard—EPP and EPP-2. That would be—okay, would be 5031, remaining (inaudible)—no, two.

So on that, Jim, I have two thoughts on that. One thought is, are we—should this working group be considering setting requirements on the storage centers, given that registry or registrar specific? Shouldn't we just be focusing on the transmission and display, because that's where any users or consumers get to interact with the data? So that's kind of a high-level question. Regarding your question about the date and times, they would use— they would be able to show the correct, the UPC (ph), because it was a TLD (ph) character at the end. |
Jim Galvin:	A TLZ character at the end?
Steve Sheng:	Yeah, yeah, yeah. So here is the EPP standard which is what this also uses. All daytime values presented via EPP must be expressed in universal (inaudible) using for volume count
Jim Galvin:	Right.
Steve Sheng:	So that's what, that's what this, this ISO standard also does.
Jim Galvin:	Yeah, so that's probably the right thing to do. So it doesn't matter where you are looking at the data, you always just get the UTC dates--

Steve Sheng:	Yeah.
Jim Galvin:	--and you can make that local if you need to or want to.
Steve Sheng:	Yes. So that would be my quick feedback on this point.
Jim Galvin:	Well, that seems like the right thing to me, you know, we just pull forward just as we did with statuses, we pull forward within the EPP documentation, we should do the same thing for dates. Any comments?
Unidentified Participant:	I agree.
Jody Kolker:	This is Jody. I agree too.
Jim Galvin:	Takao --?
Steve Sheng:	The standards for dates should use the relevant EPP standards, in this area, in particular that RFC 5733, and then the ISO standard, something like that. Right?
Jim Galvin:	Yes.
Steve Sheng:	Okay. All right. Good.
Jim Galvin:	Okay. So, let's jump to talking about names then; so, organization, personal names.
Nishit Jain:	Hi. This is Nishit. Can I comment?
Jim Galvin:	Yes, please, Nishit.
Nishit Jain:	I was going through the final report of IRD Working Group, in that I've—I'm seeing—looking at the—for internationalizing the dates that's in UPC (inaudible), but here we are talking about RFC 5733. What is the difference between these two RFPs?
Jim Galvin:	Well, that's a good question, Nishit. Yes, we should take a look at what the difference is between those two documents. Could you type those document numbers into the chat room over here, on the side?
Steve Sheng:	Yeah, sure.
Jim Galvin:	Would you be willing to take as an action to check that out for us, for next time?
Nishit Jain:	Okay. I will definitely go through it.
Jim Galvin:	Okay. Thank you for that. Thank you for--
Nishit Jain:	No, just that--
Jim Galvin:	Right—no, that's good, so thank you for noticing that. See if we can—we'll, you know, have to clarify that. Okay. So again, back to, talking about names, well, I'll put something out there. I think that, with respect to names, that has to be pretty much open for a registrant to be able to type in whatever is appropriate for them. It's not—I believe that if we accept the principle that a registrant, you know, should be permitted to use their own local language or script for, you know, entering any registration data, it seems reasonable to me to allow them to put in their name in, you know, whatever form is considered normal to them. Not quite sure how I would phrase that, you know, in a recommendation so we'll have to give some thought to characterizing that but—so that's my suggestion. Any comments, or

questions, agreement, disagreement? So I'm going to take silence as agreement, with respect to names. I'm sorry, go ahead. Did somebody want to talk?

Jody Kolker: Hi, Jim. I'm trying to organize my thoughts. This is Jody. I believe that the customer or the registrant should be able to enter it in. I agree with you, that they should be able to enter in their name in their local script/language, and whatever that may be. EPP does support allowing that customer to do that, or that registrant, and allowing it to be registered at the registry that way, I believe. I guess where the complications come in, is how is that displayed in the current WHOIS system, and I don't know if that's what we are trying to solve. You know, how it's displayed in the WHOIS system, or if that matters at the current time. Our working group is only to the best way for the registrant to enter their information. Is that right?

Jim Galvin: That's an interesting question, Jody, you know. I'll give you my view on the answer. I think that the actual display is going to be decided by whatever protocol is used for the directory service itself. So, I thinking about the weird stuff in particular in the ITF given that it's built on, you know, HTTP, whatever language or script is used, it then depends on the client to be able to display it or not display it. If the client can't display it then they don't actually get to see what's there, they don't have the font set for it.

So, I believe that—and then on the input side, you know, we get to speak to what we think is expected for the data to come in, but I think that all our real requirement, our work product is to speak to whatever recommendation we think is relevant to the data that's going to offer the best set of options for how that data is handled from input to output.

So I think it's all an open question for us. I mean that's why I think when I had offered up a simplified proposal it was partly intended to be—well sort of an opening principle, a first principle, if you will, and we're sort of exploring how well that first principle works throughout the system. My first principle was that, you know, a registrant should be able to enter the data in whatever form is most comfortable to them, and the rest of the system has to maintain it in that way.

When you go to use it, you did whatever you need to in order to use it, and I feel like the discussions that we're having are, sort of, testing the limits of that first principle. And so we are, you know, hardening or softening that requirement according to these categories that we're looking at. I don't know if that's helpful or, does that confuse things for you, Jody?

Jody Kolker: I'm not sure yet, Jim. I agree with you as far as, the registrant should be able to enter in whatever script they're comfortable with, and it should be stored that way, and then it's up to the registrar, the registry, and the WHOIS system to actually be able to display that correctly, or use it in whatever form that it needs to, in order to conduct business and, I don't know, any other agencies that may want to look at that information. But what I would shy away from is requiring the registrar or the registry to do any kind of translation or transcription, or transliteration of that data.

Jim Galvin: So, I agree with you on the translation, transliteration point. I don't think it's within scope for this group to speak to that question. I think the translation and transliteration working group is going to speak to that question of who does or does not do translation and transliteration. I suppose if we end up discovering we had some advice about that, we want to offer, we should certainly do that, but I don't feel that it's within scope for us to make a hard decision about that.

Jody Kolker: Okay.

Jim Galvin: Okay. So, just quickly, once again, I was just sort putting out there that respect to names, that organization and personal name itself, you know, the requirement should be that a

registrant can enter their name in whatever is their local language or script, in order to best represent their names.

Steve Sheng: Jim, this is Steve. I think with respect to names, it's sometimes even more challenging than the address itself, because the level of accuracy it requires, right, mainly – if we got the address slightly wrong it might be accessible, but if we got the name wrong it's much harder. And also, for name, it is very difficult to tell what language it is. You may be able to tell—you can probably tell a script that's from the Unicode properties, but it's very difficult to tell the language.

So when you translate to, you don't know from where to translate to what, or what language—to translate to what language. So that's an added layer of issues. Very similar for organization, it's just—usually they have official translations, and you generally don't mess with it by, you know, using automated translation tools to translate, you know, these organization things, where the official translation does exist. So, just a couple thoughts on that.

Jim Galvin: So, thank you for that, Steve. With respect to the language and script issue, maybe we need to make this explicit, because I'm realizing now, perhaps it was just an assumption on my part, but I would expect that every data element would be appropriately tagged with a language and a script, at all times. So, it would be the responsibility of a registrar, right, who is interacting with the registrant to know the language and script then used, and to tag the data with that as part of its transference to the registry. And that information, of course, would need to be stored with the data element.

Yes, I agree with you, and make the observation that sometimes a script is used by only language, and so it's pretty clear when you've got a set of characters what you're working with but not always. You know, some scripts support multiple languages, and the opposite is also true. Sometimes the language is only supported by one script, but it's not always true. There are languages that can be supported by multiple different scripts. And so, there are times when one or the other is sufficient, but it's usually best to always tag with all the script and the language, just to be certain.

Nishit Jain: Hi. This is Nishit.

Jim Galvin: Please, Nishit, go ahead.

Nishit Jain: A Spanish name what—sometimes it's hard—so a Spanish name, is it in English or it's in Spanish. Why? Because they're using the same alphabet; it's hard to tag that, to try to see if it—this is, I think is (inaudible)--

Jim Galvin: You don't tag it automatically. The tag is carried with the data.

Nishit Jain: So you're saying the registrant should submit that?

Jim Galvin: Well, presumably a registrar knows what they're working with, when they're working with a registrant, I mean—but yeah, somehow the registrar has to resolve with the registrant, what the language and script is that's being used, so that the data can be tagged that first time on input, and then that tag has to be carried around with the data, you know, throughout its life.

Nishit Jain: Okay.

Jim Galvin: So, let me—Nishit, wanted to talk, but maybe I'm interested in what our registrars, you know, think about that comment that I made, if that's reasonable or not. Give you a chance to think about that, but Nishit, please go ahead.

Nishit Jain:	I want to ask one question, that if a registrar—registrant is going to put some data in his local language, so are we allowing him to select the different languages, or script for different data elements? Or to complete whose data should be in the single, local languages, which is selected by registrant.

Jim Galvin:	So, my answer would be that that just depends on what services the registrar offers. I mean, I would consider it reasonable for a registrar to support multiple languages and scripts, and give a registrant the option of selecting whatever works for them. I also think it's reasonable for a registrar to support exactly one language or script, because maybe they only work in one—they only have business in one specific region, or country, or state, or town, whatever, and they don't need any options.

Nishit Jain:	No, my question is that if a registrant is going to register a domain name in his local language, will he be allowed to put the complete WHOIS information for one particular language, or will he be given an opportunity to put some element in one language, and other—in other language? As we are discussing that these data elements will be tagged with separate language and script.

Jim Galvin:	Okay. I think I understand the question now. You're right. We are focused on requirements for categories or data elements, and you're asking the question, well, should all of these categories be in a single language or script, or will a registrant be able to use a different language or script for each separate category?

Nishit Jain:	Yes.

Jim Galvin:	Do I have the question correct?

Nishit Jain:	Yes.

Jim Galvin:	What do folks think?

Nishit Jain:	So this could open the door, for example, I could have a Chinese name, an Arabic address, you know, in some scenario, or some other script—that is script.

Jim Galvin:	Sure. And then by, you know—by a Spanish domain name.

Nishit Jain:	Oh, boy.

Takao Suzuki:	May I offer a comment?

Jim Galvin:	Yes. I believe I heard Takao on the background there?

Takao Suzuki:	Yes.

Jim Galvin:	It's quiet again.

Takao Suzuki:	Can you hear me?

Jim Galvin:	Yes. Go ahead.

Takao Suzuki:	Okay. So even like just an address—within the address itself, there's a point, in Japanese we could—and when I send a mail to Japan, I put everything in Japanese except the country name, which would be in English. So that's right there, it breaks the rule. And then that is practical way of, you know, putting the address.

Jim Galvin:	Yes. Takao, thank you for that. When we were talking about address we were—yes, we had lots of examples of the fact that an address, in particular, could have multiple

languages and scripts in use, just as part of drafting the address and recording it. So we can have a single language—single script requirement for the address data elements.

So, I guess you're right—so, okay, so the point you're making, Takao is that, given that that's true, you can't have a requirement on top of that, that says that you need to use the same language or script throughout all categories of data elements.

Takao Suzuki: Right.

Jim Galvin: So, Nishit, does that answer your question?

Nishit Jain: Yes. Because I can see if you say for a particular data element might mix script, or (inaudible) script will be allowed. So I can see that we are creating problem for—in case of validation, and also in case of transliteration and translation, because if we say that particular data element could be inserted in mixed script—I'll take an example like in—let's say that I can insert a particular data element in Devnagri (ph) as well as in—if I say it's in mixed script, I could insert it in Devnagri plus in Chinese, so isn't it going to create a problem for us, even in case of validation and for translation and transliteration?

Jim Galvin: Well, you're asking if it creates a problem for translation and transliteration, and of course, date validation. And I guess the answer is, yes, it makes those problems harder, but I'm not sure that, you know, our job is to make the job easier for the consumers of the data. Maybe that's an interesting question. What's our (inaudible) doing to make it easy for the registrant, or make it easy for the consumer?

Nishit Jain: We should consider both of them. Like I have suggested last time also that we could allow user to put—instead of saying as a mixed script, we could say that user will be allowed to put in one—his local language plus he could, optionally, in English also. So, in that case we could cater to the input mechanism or addressing system.

Jim Galvin: So, if I understand your suggestion, you're saying that, rather than leaving it completely open-ended, where, you could use as many languages for scripts as you might find necessary, or interesting, we could say something like, for an address, in particular, for a concrete example, there should be one language or script, which covers most of the data, and you're allowed one other alternative language or script to use as needed, to cover some additional information that might not be easily representable in your native language or script.

Nishit Jain: Yes. And that alternative language, I could suggest that it should be in—it should be native (ph) script, because in most of the examples, we can see that user puts in his native—native or, I can say, local language, plus sometimes the—you know, he used to put in (inaudible) also.

Jim Galvin: So, the only concern that I have with specifying what that alternate language would be, would be that we should be careful to coordinate and, perhaps, not overstep with what's going on in the translation and transliteration working group—excuse me. One of the questions that they are going to answer, is should there be a common script? And if so, what should that be? So, I would think that we might want to—I mean we could consider having as a requirement that a registrant, you know, be able to use their local language or script, plus whatever the common script is determined to be, if there is one; as opposed to trying to say what that is.

Does that make sense to you, Nishit. Does that sound okay?

Nishit Jain: Yes.

Jim Galvin: But taking this a step back, we still have the question here of, do we want to limit the number of languages and scripts that can be used, or do we want to simply allow the

registration process, whatever the registrar supports, and the registrant is willing to provide, they can have as many different languages or scripts in their registration information as they need or want?

Nishit Jain: I could say that if a registrant would be given a chance to select language and script for a particular data element. And if you select a particular language or script, he could be allowed to put the data in that particular language only. Plus, additionally, we could allow—to put in a native script also along with a local language or script. That's only a suggestion.

Jim Galvin: So what I'm thinking through in my mind here is, I'm trying to distinguish what you are suggesting, Nishit, with what we've already recorded. You know, we are saying that, with respect to an address in particular, whatever language or script is used, it should be consistent with the region represented by the address. So it should be something which would be permitted by the region, the one thing we don't do is put a limit on the number of different languages or scripts that might be used in the address, but I would think that the region restriction would control that, rather than leaving it completely open-ended.

What I think I understand you're suggesting is that we should somehow put a limit on the number of languages or scripts that can be used. Do I understand correctly what you're asking for?

Nishit Jain: Yes.

Jim Galvin: Does anyone else want to comment on that?

Steve Sheng: Jim, it's about one minute to the top of the hour, and I have to go, to get onto a next call, so--

Jim Galvin: Yeah. Okay. So, if you recorded that question, let's hold that question then--

Steve Sheng: Yeah

Jim Galvin: --and we'll pick that up next time. I want to suggest that we not meet for the next two weeks. If no one has any objections; next week is the Christmas Holiday here in U.S. and elsewhere. The following is Wednesday, January 1st, so it's the first day of the New Year. I'm both on vacation and on holiday, so if no one objects, if I could suggest that we not meet again, until January 8th.

Unidentified Participant: I'm fine with that

Jim Galvin: So, not hearing any objection let's go forward with that, Steve. And in the interest of expediency, since you need to move on, let's just adjourn here. Wish people a Happy Holiday in whatever way they choose to celebrate. And adjourn this call, and we'll pick up again on January 8th.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Jim. We'll do that. One additional action item, I think probably for myself, is we already started to go into a lot of the data elements, and such, I think it will be useful to document along the way.

Jim Galvin: I'm not sure what you mean by that.

Steve Sheng: To start writing about—the outline of the first draft of the report, so that to make sure all of these key points are not missed. Especially, you know, any requirements will come up, the justifications we need to provide to those requirements. So I'm just—as a note to myself—not to miss those, you know, in the actual reporting. So, one action item that I'm thinking of taking on to start, like a first—outline of the first draft of the report, if that's okay with the working group.

Jim Galvin: I think that would be fine. So, starting to collect the notes that we are leaving behind in these note files, and pulling them into a central location, I think that would be ideal.

Steve Sheng: Yeah.

Jim Galvin: So yes, please. Go ahead.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Thank you. With that, thank you for today's call. We will, you know, resume on January 8th. And wish everyone a Happy Holiday. And thank you so much. Bye-bye.

                     Operator, could you stop the recording.