

**20140122\_WHOISIRD\_ID848153**

Steve Sheng: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to today's call on the WHOIS Review Team implementation on internationalized registration data. On the call we have Dennis, Takao, Naoki, Jody, Jim, Sarmad and Nishit. And this is Steve. With that, Jim, I would like to hand over the call to you.

Jim Galvin: Okay, thank you, Steve. Welcome, everyone. Glad that we have such full attendance as we start off the new year, this is great. Okay, so we have a document that Steve had distributed yesterday. I believe this summarizes the discussion we've had so far about the elements that we have so far. So I want to just take a couple of minutes to talk about where I think we are and see if we have agreement on that. And then proposal and suggestions here for what our next steps are.

So we have a list of elements here that we've been working with. We've done some inspection of whether those are the right set of elements or not. So we do kind of have a question here about whether or not we want to look at elements in particular and see if we've covered elements or if we want to make a suggestion or advice about what elements constitute registration date or not.

But based on this set of elements, we have created some categories from the elements. Okay, so we have created categories of elements. At the time we were doing it, this seemed like a good thing to do. It allowed us to -- the idea was that we would create requirements based on categories of elements. I believe that the benefit we derive from this is we may not have to be precise about the list of elements that we're dealing with. We can, by abstracting back one layer, one level, we can focus on categories and we're more likely to be able to create requirements that are applicable, even given that data elements themselves may change. Because ideally, they will always fit into this smaller set of categories and elements.

So that's a question that we need to remind ourselves about and ask. So we have, is the list of elements complete and are we concerned about making sure that we've got an accurate set of elements given that there are several groups dealing with lists of elements. We have categories for those elements and we have to ask ourselves, do we have an appropriate list of categories or not. And then in this document that Steve has been collecting for us, we've talked about different requirements for some of these categories and we have captured that in this document also.

So when we started this document and this work, the model that I had was let's just sort of take a cut across what we need to do and see where that takes us. And then we can take a step back here and look at, okay, what are the next steps? How do we want to approach specifying internationalization requirements for registration data?

Okay, so I've given 3 questions. One is, do we have the right elements? Two, do we have the right categories? I guess I should add a question here, three, have we captured all of the requirements that we've been discussing to date in here? And then of course four would be, what are, what is our next step going to be as far as where we go with this document?

So let me focus on the first three for right now, focus on this document. Does anyone want to add any comments at all about the list of elements, the list of categories, or the captured requirements that we've been talking about?

Sarmad Hussain: Jim, this is Sarmad. I'd like to be put in the queue.

Jim Galvin: Sarmad, please, go ahead.

Sarmad Hussain: Just a question, this is about the document that Steve circulated. What's the thinking behind separating the registrants from administrative and technical contact names and addresses?

Jim Galvin: Okay, so you're asking now -- oh, that we've separated the contact information, the registrant, administrative and technical? So you're asking about that, but I didn't quite catch the question.

Sarmad Hussain: So the question is, can they be the same category or is there a reason behind separating them?

Jim Galvin: Oh, okay. So yes, actually, that is a good question. Thank you for that. You're asking can we combine registrant name and organization, administrative contact name and organization, technical name and organization into a single category and put them all together? I would think so. Anyone else want to comment? We should have a category called name and organization. All right, can we -- so let me ask this question though before we move into that. What would you propose is the requirement? Do we want to say anything special about the internationalization requirement? My interpretation by the way, I should probably add this and maybe we should put this in the document somewhere, too, but the fact that some of these requirements are blank here, for the ones that are blank -- well I have a question about the address when we get there, but I think for these, our intent was that these are free form text. We have no special requirements except that there needs to be a single language or script used for the creation of either value.

But let me just sort of put that out there and ask you, Sarmad, if you have any suggestions for a requirement that would be the same for all 3 of those things?

Sarmad Hussain: So from what I probably understand is that the name and organization would be in an arbitrary script or language and the same would apply for administrative contact as well as technical contact name and organization. So I don't see any differences. I can see registrant name and organization separated out, but because then we have different requirements. But whatever requirements we put on the registrar name and registrant, means an organization I think should have similar requirements imposed on administrative contact name and organization and technical contact name and organization. So those three I think should be having the same requirements (inaudible). So at this time I'm okay with keeping them separate, but I was just asking what was motivation to separate them or not? Maybe I missed some discussion.

Jim Galvin: Okay, thank you. So yes, you're asking if we can bring them together. You're okay with them being apart, but you're asking what others think about those 3 data elements, can they be in the same category or should they be separated?

Jody Kolker: Jim, this is Jody for the queue.

Jim Galvin: Okay, so first, Sarmad, did I restate your question in a summary?

Sarmad Hussain: Yes.

Jim Galvin: Okay, thank you. So Jody, please go ahead.

Jody Kolker: I think -- I'm having a hard time hearing Sarmad unfortunately, but I think that I agree with him that the admin and the technical contact name and organization, those could be grouped together. And I think Sarmad said this at the end, would we have a different proposed requirement for the

registrants than we could for the admin and the technical? Because I see that we have a different proposed requirement or we don't have one yet for the administrative and the technical contact address. But for the registrant, we're proposing that that is in a script that's regionalized I guess. But we don't have that for the admin or the technical contact address. So I think it depends on what we're going to say that the registrant needs to be as far as script language. Will it have a different proposal than the admin and the technical contacts?

Jim Galvin: Okay, Jody, let me ask this question. So Sarmad, you used the phrase arbitrary text when talking about what might be used to provide the name and organization information. Can I ask you to expand on what you meant by arbitrary text? I mean, how far did you want to take arbitrary?

Sarmad Hussain: So I guess what I am saying is that that is better said by what we call proper nouns or proper names and organizational (inaudible) instead of proper names and common names. And in some instance I would also put in the address (inaudible). But then we just have (inaudible) because the address field and main field may have different (inaudible).

Jim Galvin: Okay, so I understand the idea of using proper names, proper nouns for name and organization. I'm thinking forward a little bit to the idea of how that would be validated, how one would know for sure that that's what you've got. Actually, I think what I was looking for when I asked the question was -- I think for the name and organization, I said this before and I guess I want to test this with all of the folks here, that they would be restricted to a single language or script. Now in the case of, as Jody was pointing out, in the address area, for the registrant address in particular, we have the additional constraint of a language or script that's regionalized, that's localized for wherever the address exists.

Would we want to say something like that about the names or would we say something like a name has to appear in just one language or script and that they can't mix languages and scripts in there? And otherwise it's just free form text. I mean would there be any -- can we put any additional constraints on it or not in those three cases? And Jody is asking in particular if there might be constraints on the registrants' name and organization given that we have a constraint on the registrant address.

So with all of that, let me ask my question again, Sarmad. When you said arbitrary text, did you have any constraints at all that you wanted to put on that? Or did you really mean arbitrary?

Sarmad Hussain: I think I certainly agree that it is going to be uniform script and the language within that script I guess. But I think that for proper names I guess language is not that prevalent in some (inaudible). So for example, many names we use in Pakistan are actually (inaudible) language names but these names even go -- so you don't have (inaudible). And organization names are also like people names. So I think (inaudible). So I do agree that we can actually put restriction on that they must come from (inaudible). What I'm saying is that there may be also other requirements (inaudible). And those can be done with maybe different forms of requirements (inaudible).

Jim Galvin: Okay, so I am having a little trouble understanding you, too, as Jody was saying, but I think what I heard is you're agreeing that a single script is at least an appropriate requirement for the name and organization field. Is that much correct so far?

Sarmad Hussain: Yes.

Jim Galvin: Okay, and then you are also asking the same question that Jody is asking I believe, which is, we've made a distinction about the registrants' address as compared to the administrative or technical addresses. And is there any additional constraint that we would want to put on a registrant name and organization as compared to the administrative and technical name and organization. Is that correct, you're asking that same question, right?

Sarmad Hussain: Yes, that's still there, so that needs to be I guess -- we need to I guess clarify that a little more.

- Jim Galvin: Okay. And Jody, that's correct, that's the question that you're asking, right?
- Jody Kolker: Yes, that's correct. And I have an additional question, and I'm sorry to be asking so many. I know I've been pretty quiet during most of the meetings. But for the registrants, Sarmad, when you say a single script, you mean a single script of the registrant name? Or do you mean a single script that's standardized across all domains? So for instance, we would have for instance a registrant name would have to be in a Latin script among all domain registrations? Or are you saying that only a single script can be used within the registrant name? As far as you can't mix scripts?
- Sarmad Hussain: Right, so yes, I was actually thinking one script that could be for a registrant. For one registrant it could be Chinese, for another one it could be Arabic, for another one it could be Cyrillic. So I'm not talking about one common script, just (inaudible), but I think it's hard to mix for example Chinese and Arabic.
- Jody Kolker: You shouldn't be allowed to mix Chinese and Arabic within the name, is that what you're saying?
- Sarmad Hussain: Yes. But I'm not saying that everybody has to scribe in their name in one single script like Latin script.
- Jim Galvin: Okay. So Jody, do you have any thoughts about whether there should be a single global script or whether it's just a single script chosen by the registrant?
- Jody Kolker: Well I think there's many different ways to look at it if I can be really diplomatic I guess. Is that I can see pros and cons on both ways. If it is a single script, or a common script I should say, among all registrars, I think it would be nice to standardize on that, whatever that script is. But of course I'm going to ask for it to be English and I think that's probably not correct. I guess my feeling is that, and I can change my mind on this pretty easily, I can be convinced, but is to allow the customer to be able to put in both a Latin script and a regional script or a localized script. To be able to put in both. But then it comes down to, do you require both or do you require only one I guess. And I guess I'm leaving that up for discussion among the group. And I think we've kind of danced around this question before. I'm not sure if we came to any conclusions on it. I guess I'm just bringing it up again. I don't mean to -- never mind.
- Jim Galvin: No, no, it's fine actually. It really is a very interesting question. I want to remind us of two things. That question of whether there should be a common script or not is explicitly a question for the translation and transliteration working group. And it is supposed to answer that question. It's a PDP working group, so ideally it will make a decision that will be, that will eventually become binding.
- In addition, the other reminder is, from the internationalized registration data working group that we had two years ago, that basically through a sequence of events has created this working group and the other translation and transliteration working group. It made a recommendation. Included in its recommendations was the comment that a registrant should be permitted to use their own language or script. They should not be obligated to have to use a common script. That of course is what motivates the question about translation and transliteration. Because now it becomes an issue of, well, if you want all the data to be the same or somehow universally usable, if you will, then that suggests that you might have to do some kind of centralized translation and transliteration. And that brings up the next question of who does that, who has the responsibility. It didn't seem fair, in the IRD working group we were making comments along the lines of it doesn't seem fair to force the entire world to have to learn English or whatever common script you want to choose, common language you want to use, in order to buy a domain name. And that's where the translation and transliteration question comes from.
- Jody Kolker: Okay, I'm sorry, James, to ask more questions. So the translation and transliteration group will be dealing with that question then and that's not part of our work product I guess?

- Jim Galvin: That's correct. It's not within our scope to answer that question. I don't have any problem talking about the question and some of the issues that go with it because certainly it's relevant to what we want to do here. I believe that the answer to that question is important to us and it's important to how we want to say what we want to say. So I think that we have to be closely coordinated with where the translation and transliteration group goes. Actually I'd like to explicitly ask that question of this group. I really do think that the question of whether there is a common script or not, and I suspect we don't care what that script is, this group doesn't care what that script is. But it is, I think, important to know whether there is going to be one or not. Because I think it does affect what we're going to say about requirements. Does anyone disagree with that?
- Sarmad Hussain: Jim, this is Sarmad, can I get back in the queue?
- Jim Galvin: Yes, Sarmad, go ahead.
- Sarmad Hussain: So I guess quickly responding to what you just asked, the answer is I think what we propose that we necessarily have to require or not require a single script. So for example what we could do is we could say that there is this name field and then there is a language deck. And we can say that this name in this language deck can actually be in the way that we can use multiple times as long as manual script has changed. And so that gives us at least a data model, and how many times it is used for how many scripts and languages and then we put it into policy.
- Jim Galvin: So I agree with that, Sarmad. I mean from a technical point of view it's fairly straightforward to say that if you're going to have multiple languages and scripts present, that you simply have a language tag, language and script tag for each data element that indicates what it is. And obviously if you have multivalued fields, then that's what you would have. The question that I would have though, in response to that, is who owns the question? Is it this working group or some other working group that exists or is yet to be formed as to the relationship between those multiple values? I mean if translation and transliteration occurs, is one considered the definitive value and all the rest are optional, secondary that may be present? What if -- are they supposed to be checked to make sure that they really do represent each other? What happens if they don't and you have to get into all the failure modes? So do you agree that those issues are also questions that have to get answered if you're going to allow multivalued fields?
- Steve Sheng: Hi, Jim, this is Steve. Id' like to be entered into the queue.
- Jim Galvin: Okay, Steve, thank you. Just waiting for Sarmad to respond.
- Sarmad Hussain: So I think at this time I am actually not very sure how much process related were the (inaudible). It's not something we can avoid. But I think there are two ways of processing that information. That we solicit some process which is just a big process of input and then work on the data elements. And I think at least for me I'm in the second mode where I am actually thinking that the process is being done outside and we then look at that process and try to figure out what the data elements should be or the requirements for the elements. But then (inaudible) I guess in this group and in other groups as well.
- Jim Galvin: Okay, thank you. Steve?
- Steve Sheng: Jim, regarding your question which group, I think primarily the responsibility will be in the PDP working group to address these questions. So we probably don't want to dance around this issue forever in yet another group. So probably the PDP working group needs to come to a conclusion. One thing this group could be helpful is to outline those questions. And we can write it in the report, these are the questions. And also, does the working group have any thoughts? Feel free to write it in there. But that will be like more of an input to the other group. This group can provide advice on this issue, but it's up to the other group to make a decision on this particular issue. So those are my quick thoughts. Thanks.

Jim Galvin: Right. Thank you. So Sarmad was suggesting that we be careful to separate our requirements on the data elements from the process that surrounds managing them. And I agree with the distinction. And Steve, you're suggesting that, I believe, so those process questions really belong to the translation and transliteration working group. Any other comments from anyone?

So here's my concern about this. I don't know for sure where these process questions need to be answered and I agree with Sarmad that we don't have to answer them all right now. But at some point I think that it does matter to this group whether or not there will be multivalued data elements. I think that one of our work requirement, our work product is to choose the, to propose and recommend a data model. Which is then of course subject to further review. We're just -- we're not a PDP working group so we just make recommendations.

But I think that if we can coordinate this with the translation and transliteration working group and know we should put to them the question of whether or not we care about whether or not there's more than one value in a data element. Because I think that it is useful, it's not important for us to speak to the issue of whether or not multiple, multivalued fields, multivalued data elements, are synchronized or not. And especially given the new accuracy requirements on registrars, I think that this is an important issue that is going to need attention. And so though Steve was saying we should put together questions that we could put in our document as input to the other working group, I'm thinking there's an opportunity here for us to communicate with them now and pass on the fact that there are certain questions that we do care about and we want to make sure that they're in front of that group and they get some time to think about them. And perhaps address them sooner rather than later so that we can keep our two groups synchronized as opposed to working in parallel, coming to a synchronized conclusion. Anyway, I don't know, I hope I made sense there.

Just to quickly summarize, the point that I was trying to make was that I don't want to just delay not talking about it. We don't have to talk about it now, but I want to keep the questions in front of us. And I do think that we should coordinate with the translation and transliteration group about the fact that we care about these questions. Because some of what they do affects the answers to those questions and I think the answers to those questions affect what we do, too.

Okay, bringing this whole discussion back up again, coming back to the question at hand, we have three name and organizations data elements and we have three address data elements. And the question is whether or not those can be combined. In the case of the name and organization, registrant, administrative and technical, let me make a proposal here that we, people can think about. This doesn't have to be an absolute at the moment. But in the absence of a requirement that distinguishes any one of them, I think the three of those, registrant, administrative and technical name and contact, so the name and organization field can be a single category with all three of those in it. And the only proposed requirement is that any individual value must be comprised of a single language or script.

For the moment we have no other restrictions on what language or script is chosen, just that only one can be used when entering any value so that you don't have a mix of characters in a name. Anyone object to that or want to add more discussion to that suggestion?

Sarmad Hussain: Yes, I want to add one more thing.

Jim Galvin: Yes, Sarmad, go ahead.

Sarmad Hussain: That is in this particular case the language and/or script should be specified.

Jim Galvin: I think -- well, do you mean something different, Sarmad, than -- my working model here, and maybe we need to state this explicitly in case others don't have the same model, but I believe that when we do actually specify the data model, one of the things that we are going to have to include is that every data element is going to have to have a language or script tag. Well, any element

which -- there may be some in which we don't do that, I take that back. But any element which could have variable language or script in use is going to be required to have a tag of each language in its script. We may or may not specify a default value. So did you mean something different than the fact that everything is going to have a language or script, Sarmad?

- Sarmad Hussain: Right, so I didn't realize that there was this before. So if it is the case already, then that addresses what I was saying.
- Jim Galvin: Okay, thank you. All right, any other discussion on the name and organization? Then let's jump right to the address and talk about those. So we have a registrant, administrative and technical contact address. I think that it's fair to say that the entire address, and so, Steve, this is probably a requirement to add to this also, to all three of these, is that the entire address should be a single language or script, should be the same language or script. Which could be different than the name and organization one, but what I'm suggesting here is that you can't have a street or a state or province and have it be in two different languages or scripts. I think that it would be much more reasonable to suggest that the address components, with the exception of country which we've already pulled out, whatever language or script is used, they should all be in the same single language or script. And then the only extra requirement is that for the registrant, we are suggesting that the language or script chosen for the registrant should be appropriate for the region in which it's located.
- Steve Sheng: Jim, I have a quick question. When you say a single language or script, do you include Latin, too? For example, for a Chinese address, do you allow Latin script?
- Jim Galvin: I think so. Because --
- Steve Sheng: Because whatever script, it's often numeric.
- Jim Galvin: Yeah, so let me -- oh, I see what you're saying now. This is the discussion we were having before. For example, in Chinese sometimes you might have the Arabic numerals.
- Steve Sheng: Yes. And you could have mixed Latin characters, too. So that's the question I was asking. I think [Adam] raised this point.
- Jim Galvin: Yes, he did. So here's the technical question for the folks on this call. And maybe, I'm thinking I'm going to have to go back and ask internally of some of our folks, too. But thinking forward a little bit to the data model, exactly how would an address which has mixed script in it be stored and represented? You're not going to have a single language or script tag for the entire element. Does anyone have any answer to that?
- Sarmad Hussain: Jim, this is Sarmad.
- Jim Galvin: Sarmad, please go ahead.
- Sarmad Hussain: Before I answer that question, I'd like to probably suggest that we divide this problem into two separate sub problems. One is that address can have multiple languages. And then another where address can have multiple scripts. I can for example think of where address actually will have multiple languages within a single script. So for example, there are many street names in US which are French for example or vice versa. So I think that language restriction is probably too tight for addresses. But I think largely the script restrictions should work except for numbers or codes.
- Jim Galvin: Interesting. So let me ask another question. The registrant restriction that we have here that the address has to be appropriate -- well let's see, the language or script has to be appropriate for the region in which the address is located. Is there any reason why that restriction couldn't also apply to the technical and administrative contact? So wrapping these two things together, what I heard

you say, Sarmad, is that to separate the problem into a script plus Latin script, so some chosen script and Latin script versus just multiple scripts that might be in use. You were observing that it's common for there to be, well especially Latin numerals if you will, included in other scripts. But also, like in US for example, it's common to have say street names that are French. Imagine they might be popular in New Orleans just to make something up. I don't actually even know that, but I would guess. So it wouldn't be possible to have a language restriction, but you could have a script restriction or some kind of limit in specifying the address. And then I'm wondering if that limit could be contained by the region.

Sarmad Hussain: How do you define the region?

Jim Galvin: Yeah, how do you define the region? That's a really good question, too. We would have to say something about that. We would have to define that. See, I'm thinking, just thinking out loud a little bit, the region for me would be defined by the city -- no, state or province.

Steve Sheng: But what if that region has multiple languages? Like in the case of India?

Jim Galvin: I think that's okay. I mean at least currently in my working model, and feel free to disagree with me here, but I think that's okay. If I'm selling names in a particular region, then presumably, or maybe we're going to make as a requirement here, I need to know what languages or scripts are reasonable for that particular region, that city and province or state. And any registrant that uses any one of them is okay.

Steve Sheng: Right, but then what if I'm the registrar with one language? Am I obligated to provide, to extend that information in all those languages?

Jim Galvin: So I think your question is, if I'm a registrar, am I obligated to provide information in all of those languages?

Steve Sheng: The question is why am I obligated?

Jim Galvin: Oh, why are you obligated? Well let me take it back to the are you obligated, because I don't think you are. At least my suggestion would be that that's a market question. A registrar, they might be from one country, and so they really only conduct their business in the language of their particular home country, but they are trying to sell in another country. And it's entirely up to that registrar whether or not they convert all of their information to a language or script appropriate for the region they're selling. If they don't, they may not sell too many names. If they do, they'll probably sell more. But I don't think we have to obligate them. The only obligation I'm suggesting here, and again, folks, feel free to suggest something different or challenge this, is that if you're going to sell in a region, you have to allow a registrant to use whatever language or script is accepted in that region, is recognized as that region's language or script. So it's about the input.

Dennis Tan: James, it's Dennis for the queue.

Jim Galvin: Please, Dennis, go ahead.

Dennis Tan: I just want to ask an opposite question. Given that a country can have different languages and addresses, even names, why do we want to limit to one single language or to a couple or three scripts in an address or a name? Why can't the requirement be, it's usually convention, the contact convention to write addresses and names. How are we going -- if we put that requirement to limit language, how are we going to enforce it? How are we going to verify doing one? Is it because we want the address to be accurate and verifiable? Why is that we want to limit how many languages you can use to input in those values? I think it's an open questions for everybody in the group.



- Jim Galvin: Yes, please, I can tell you what I'm thinking, but I'd like to hear others' response to the question. Anyone have an answer for why we should restrict the language or script at all?
- Jody Kolker: This is Jody. I guess I have a comment and maybe it's not an answer to the question. But I believe what we're looking for is accurate information. Is what ICANN is looking for and us as registrars also, is that the address that's entered by the customer or the registrant or the admin or the technical, whatever is entered in there is an actual address where we could actually reach that person. For instance, if we have a WHOIS complaint, etc., that we could actually reach out to this person to get that. I guess to me it's -- to me it seems like it should be regionalized. And it should be in whoever that person is contacted, however a piece of mail or however something could be delivered to this person, that's what the address language should be. It's a difficult question.
- Dennis Tan: Yes, and you bring up a good point. Because there are two different things I guess when you are saying. One is to be accurate and one thing is to be verifiable. Right? Accurate, I read it as what I'm entering in the address, I can read it and it's an actual word. I don't think you as a registrar will be asked to verify that address is correct. Like for example, Amazon.com does, I don't know if they tap into the postal system and verify the address actually exists. I don't think you do that as a registrar, right?
- Jody Kolker: No, we don't. No. We don't verify that address in that way.
- Dennis Tan: So I guess we just leave it as it has to be accurate. And that's my question, why do we want to limit that this has to be in, I'm entering the language in let it be French, but I'm not actually -- and I don't expect Jody to go far and check that the address that I'm entering is actual French. So that's my question, to what end do we want to limit a language or script?
- Jim Galvin: So my response is, it really is about data accuracy and validation. Those requirements are coming to bear on registrars. And so you need some way to -- you can't have a completely free form open ended input stream which is essentially the system that we have today. So you need to do something to improve the likelihood or probability that you're going to be able to do some kind of verification, some kind of validation. My thinking, and I could be wrong about this, but you want -- a given region of the world is going to have a common language or script or at least of set of common languages or scripts. And postal addresses are going to be represented in those languages or scripts. And so by suggesting that anybody who enters their address needs to enter it in a form that's at least regionalized, it seems to me that that increases the probability that you're going to be able to do some kind of verification and perhaps some kind of validation on it in an automated way.
- But if we don't agree with that, then we can go back to just leaving it free form. But I think we need to say something other than free form and this feels like the right thing. Anyway, that's my comment, Dennis. I appreciate it.
- Dennis Tan: I'd like to hear from other registrars, maybe Naoki from the Japanese experience.
- Takao Suzuki: Please put me in the queue, this is Takao.
- Jim Galvin: Takao, please, go ahead.
- Takao Suzuki: Yes, I just want to mention, I think I've talked about this before, but when we say script, I just want to make sure we agree on the term. Because when you say Japanese script, that is one thing. But when you say Japanese script that can potentially include Hangul script, Katakana script, Chinese script and Latin script. And so if you say that there is a definition, I think it's okay for a Japanese address or a Japanese corporation name and such. But if you say that script means Hangul or Katakana or Chinese or Latin, we may have a problem in that Japanese is one case that can be mixed.

Jim Galvin: So we're going to have to be careful how we expand on this and how we explain it. It still feels like we believe for the moment that it's okay to say that the language or script for the address, it has to be something appropriate for the region. When we get to expanding that into full descriptive text about what we mean by that, we're just going to have to be careful. That's what I hear you saying, Takao, right?

Takao Suzuki: Yes. Thank you.

Jim Galvin: Okay, we're within a couple of minutes of the top of the hour here. I want to try at least one thing. Do we have -- do we have consensus on the idea that this restriction that we have on the registrants is simply that the language or script has to be appropriate for the region, whatever is used in the registrant's address, is there any reason why that wouldn't apply also to the administrative and the technical contact addresses? Couldn't we combine all three of those? And I don't mean to suggest that the registrants and technical and administrative contact has to be in the same region. Those could each be in a different region which means they could each themselves be in a different set of languages or scripts. But it seems like a reasonable restriction that the address should be represented appropriate for wherever it's located.

Steve Sheng: Jim, this is Steve.

Sarmad Hussain: This is Sarmad, I'd like to get in the queue.

Jim Galvin: Okay, Sarmad, and I think these will be the last two comments here for today. So, Steve, go ahead.

Steve Sheng: The language or script of an address should be appropriate for the region where it's located. It seems to me that this requirement is kind of vague. But if we articulate in this way, I would recommend we think about some examples. When it's appropriate and when it is not appropriate, so that readers can get a better sense of what is appropriate and what is not. So that's my suggestion.

Jim Galvin: So I agree with that, Steve. We should certainly include examples as we're trying to expand on what that means. So Sarmad, please go ahead.

Sarmad Hussain: I was just thinking that administrative and technical contact (inaudible). I think these are possible services that could be sublet to other people. And especially for example in the case of proxy and privacy contacts. So that restriction may not hold at all times.

Jim Galvin: So if I understand what you were saying, Sarmad, you are concerned about proxy and privacy services and therefore the restriction about the inputting of the address may not apply in those cases. Is that correct?

Sarmad Hussain: No, what I'm suggesting is that language and script of a registrant may be different from language and script of administrative contact and language and script of technical contacts.

Jim Galvin: Yes. Right. The language or script used for the registrant might be different than the language or script used for the technical and also different from the language or script used in the administrative. Yes, the restriction is that the language or script that's used for that address should be appropriate for the region in which that address is located. And that each address might be in a different region, and that would be okay.

Sarmad Hussain: Okay.

Jim Galvin: Okay, so I think if no one has any objections, I'm not hearing any objections to combining those three as we combine the three up above. So Steve, if we could update this document in that way. And then I'm suggesting for next week we'll just continue our discussion on this particular topic and continue going through these elements. Again, just trying to abstract our requirements out as

we prepare for flushing out our document and providing a work product here and then moving towards looking at the data model. Any other business from anyone?

Okay, Steve, then over to you to end our call.

Steve Sheng: Thank you. The action item I have is to collapse the first table of the addresses into one, registrant, administrative and technical into one. Similar for the registrant name, administrative and technical name of organizations. One thing for the group is, in this current table there are some text in red. So those are discussion points and proposed requirements that need to be further rectified or verified by the working group. So if you get a chance to review those and provide comments, those will be very helpful. We will resume next week to wrap up the requirements for this and that's it. Did I miss anything?

Jim Galvin: Sounds good for now.

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